1. Brief discussion of pilot purpose and expectations:

- Meet with me twice this spring to talk about the process, offer feedback, etc.
- Choose an assignment in one of your courses that you think reflects student learning in one College Learning Outcome (this is called a Signature Assignment)
- Follow the CLO assessment process as outlined on the website: complete the Signature Assignment Form, grade your assignment as usual, and use the VALUE rubric to assess your assignment
- Report your assessment results before the end of the semester
- Offer feedback on how to revise the VALUE rubrics to better fit our needs as an institution

2. Review draft CLO assessment process (see graphic)

3. Discuss LEAP VALUE rubrics

- Implementing in your course—which rubric(s) is/are the best fit with your selected CLO?
- Work flow
- Offering feedback/revisions

4. Plan going forward

- One-on-one or group meeting?
- Documenting your process, results, and recommendations

Kate: Workforce Readiness (Teamwork; Integrative Learning?; Lifelong Learning?)
Elfie: Effective Communication—written
Jana: Effective Communication—written
Brie: Effective Communication or Critical Thinking
Robin: Workforce Readiness (Teamwork; Integrative Learning?; Lifelong Learning?)
Lindsay: Quantitative Reasoning (Quantitative Literacy)
Mike: Quantitative Reasoning (Quantitative Literacy)
Chris: Technical literacy (Information Literacy; Problem Solving?)
Carli: Citizenship (Civic Engagement; Global Learning)
Larry: Effective communication—oral
Steve: Technical Literacy; Critical thinking (Information Literacy)
Summary of Feedback from 2019 CLO pilot:

1. Problem Solving may be a more appropriate VALUE rubric (and possibly CLO) than Quantitative Literacy/Reasoning
2. Not all classes should have a CLO or signature assignment
   a. Identify which classes are “terminal” or “capstone” in a dept or program and focus on those
3. Figure out how to make reporting CLO assessment results easier—rubrics in D2L or online form
   a. Rubrics in D2L may not work because there is no way to make them unavailable to students, or not associated with a grade item (right?)
4. Determine how to select a random sample of students to assess
   a. Tell faculty which students & which assignment to assess
5. Plan on norming activities once we have rubrics and process figured out
Step 1: Departments create common course outline for all courses; identify which CLOs are assessed in each course

Step 2: Departments designate signature assignments in courses based on primary CLO(s) assessed

Step 3: Departments identify when courses will be assessed based on departmental rotation

Step 4: One person from department submits Signature Assignment form online for each course involved

Step 5: All faculty participating in course-level assessment also conduct CLO assessment

Step 6: Each faculty member grades the signature assignment as usual

Step 7: Each faculty member also scores graded assignments using institutional CLO rubric

Step 8: Departments aggregate institutional rubric results: one person reports at end of term via online CLO report form

Step 9: Assessment director gathers and reports results

Step 10: Closing the loop--all faculty involved in the CLO assessment meet to discuss improvements/changes, and set benchmarks for future assessment
CLO Assessment Instructions

• CLO assessment will coincide with course-level assessment, based on department assessment rotations.
• Faculty will identify signature assignments in their courses
  o These may be individual or departmental assessments. Departments should select a common assignment or task across course sections whenever possible.
  o Signature assignments should occur later in the semester in order to best assess student learning.
  o One faculty member from the department should complete the CLO Signature Assignment form
• Faculty will use institutional rubrics to score signature assignments for CLO attainment.
  ❖ Scoring should happen after the assignment has been graded.
  ❖ This evaluation is not the same as grading. Faculty will grade the assignments as usual and also use the CLO rubric for a separate assessment.
• Departments will submit aggregated scores on the CLO rubric to the Assessment Director by the day grades are due at the end of the semester
  o All sections of a course should have a signature assignment evaluation, but only the aggregated results need to be reported.
  o One faculty member from the department should complete the CLO Results form
• The Assessment Director will compile and analyze results and create a report during the summer.
• The report will be posted to the assessment webpage and will be shared with the campus at the beginning of each fall semester.
• Annually, faculty will gather in groups (based on CLO) to collaborate and discuss assessment (ideally during contract days at the beginning of fall semester).
  ❖ This is also where plans for improvement will be created for future implementation and assessment.
  ❖ These groups will also set benchmarks for future assessment.
Hi Jeri,

I think most of the information you will need is available on the assessment website. Here’s the “Activities” page: [http://www.gfcmsu.edu/about/assessment/activities.html](http://www.gfcmsu.edu/about/assessment/activities.html)

I’m thinking that we may not stay with the five-year CLO assessment rotation, although I haven’t communicated that yet. Based on some faculty feedback I’ve received, I’m thinking it will make more sense to assess CLOs when faculty assess their courses. The rotation is also dependent on whether or not we split Critical Thinking/Quantitative Reasoning. I can give you a more solid answer on that soon (I hope).

Once the slide deck for the January assessment training is finished (hopefully by early next week), I can send that to you too.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Mandy

Mandy Wright  
English faculty/Department Chair  
Director of Academic Assessment  
Great Falls College MSU  
406-268-3713  
mandy.wright@gfcmsu.edu

---

From: Jeri Pullum <jpullum@gfcmsu.edu>  
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at 3:33 PM  
To: Mandy Wright <mandy.wright@gfcmsu.edu>  
Subject: Five-year plan for outcomes assessment

Hi, Mandy. I’m starting to work on a draft of the accreditation ad hoc report. Can you send me the five-year outcomes assessment plan? I would like to include it in the report. If there are other presentations you’ve made that help explain all you’ve been doing, I’ll take those as well.

Thank you

Jeri

Jeri  
403.1000  
403.882.4529
Hi Jeri,

As you’re working on the ad hoc report, I wanted to let you know that I have changed the plan for CLO assessment. Instead of following a 5-year rotation, I am going to ask faculty to volunteer in the spring to test out the process with the intention of full implementation in fall. We are going to use the AAC&U VALUE rubrics and see how they work, then revise them for institutional use in the fall. Once the process is fully implemented, faculty will be asked to assess CLOs when they assess their courses, so there will be ongoing CLO assessment from different areas of the college. The website has been updated to reflect this, both on the CLO process page and on the Assessment Activities page.

Here’s the slide deck Carli and I will be using for the January faculty training. Feel free to pull any information that may be of use to you. https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/10B0OK19s5HNwIB1uk3FzFEE4ycZogDnFgExJ-_5iJQ/edit?usp=sharing

I’ll be out of town until the 7th, but feel free to get ahold of me then if you have questions or want to talk more about this.

Enjoy the holidays!

Mandy

Mandy Wright
English faculty/Department Chair
Director of Academic Assessment
Great Falls College MSU
406-268-3713
mandy.wright@gfcmsu.edu
This submission form is for all items that do not require action by the Curriculum Committee. If after discussion the Curriculum Committee determines that an item does require action, it must be resubmitted on the appropriate submission form for discussion at a later meeting.

**Purpose:** This section describes the Information Item being brought before the committee.
I am proposing splitting CLO 3 Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning into two separate CLOs.

**Rationale:** State the reasons for discussing this issue
As faculty have been working to align their courses with CLOs, there is a clear divide between which courses map to the critical thinking piece and which map to quantitative reasoning. As we move forward with assessing the CLOs through common campus rubrics and signature assignments, it will be difficult to have one comprehensive rubric for CLO 3 as it is currently written. Separating these two concepts will also better support the institution’s strategic plan, making alignment with core themes and indicators more logical.

If CLO 3 is divided into two outcomes, the proposed outcomes would be:

- CLO 1: Effective Communication
- CLO 2: Technical Literacy
- **CLO 3: Critical Thinking**
- CLO 4: Quantitative Reasoning
- CLO 5: Workforce Readiness
- CLO 6: Citizenship

**Required documents:** When necessary, provide sufficient documentation to support summary statements. Please see attached current and proposed language.

**Required Signatures:**
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<td>Submitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>CC Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised JAN 2016
Current language

CLO 3: Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning

The ability to analyze data, arguments, assumptions, and problems in order to draw conclusions.

Assessment Criteria:

- Identify problems, formulate hypotheses, gather evidence, interpret and evaluate information appropriate to program-specific problems.
- Select and use theoretical models, quantitative techniques, information sources, and technology tools.
- Engage in reflection, creative thinking, and expression.

Proposed language

CLO 3: Critical Thinking

The ability to explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Assessment Criteria:

- Identify problems, formulate hypotheses, gather evidence, interpret and evaluate information appropriate to program-specific problems.
- Take a position while also recognizing the perspective of others, as well as one’s own biases.
- Engage in reflection, creative thinking, and expression.

CLO 4: Quantitative Reasoning

The ability to comfortably use numerical data to examine hypotheses and test or solve problems in order to draw conclusions.

Assessment Criteria:

- Select and use theoretical models, quantitative techniques, information sources, and technology tools.
- Reason and solve quantitative problems from authentic contexts and everyday life situations.
- Understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence.

Revised JAN 2016