Division Directors Notes  
June 27, 2019 | 9:30-11:30 | Room G2

Purpose Statement: The division directors will meet and create a supportive environment in which to exchange information, solve problems, and create improvements that will benefit students through academic affairs.

Members: Dr. Heidi Pasek, Dr. Leanne Frost, Charla Merja, Russell Motschenbacher, Heather Palermo, Jeri Pullum, Joel Sims, Laura Wight, Toni Quinn

Absent: Jeri Pullum

Guests: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Review of Agenda</th>
<th>II. Roses and Thorns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. New Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Team Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Plan is coming along. It is no longer a requirement to include core themes and CLOs in the Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IV. 8-Week Advantage |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Ongoing Progress on Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty On-Campus Non-Instructional Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandy Wright presented her proposal on training for Faculty On-Campus Non-Instructional Days (see attached). January training was a good start but feedback indicated faculty had already heard the information in Division meetings. Natasha Jankowski noted that the college is still in a reporting process, not engaging faculty or faculty-driven. NWCCU is moving to two standards with focus on the second one (student learning and achievement). The proposed training would replace the TILT and equity training.

1. Discussion sessions:
   - Assessment at course level may be unnecessary
   - Invite concurrent dual credit instructors to the training
   - Adjust LOAs to include verbiage re: participation in training
   - To alleviate concern that less vocal/experienced faculty might be left out:
     - Include more vocal/experienced faculty to facilitate small groups
     - Utilize targeted questions
   - Format: small groups/large groups/small groups
   - Directors: coach that this will be a part of faculty assessment
### 2. Work sessions:

Goal in common course outlines is to ensure that essential course outcomes are included in these documents, and all are on website.

Having solid accurate curriculum maps is important to accreditation and was also stressed by Natasha Jankowski. **Sections below refer to the attached proposal.**

- Section 2.a.ii. May change-Mandy wants to ask where CLOs are occurring in the curriculum and what their plan is to attain them
- Section 2.b. Goal is to help faculty develop at least a rough draft of programmatic assessment plan. Identify program outcomes and schedule of assessment of which ones and how.
- Culture of Evidence rubric may be useful in these sessions.
- Section 2.d. Perhaps better addressed in faculty evaluation process; will discuss with Division Directors.
- The group discussed the course outcomes map. The intention of the common course outcome and curriculum maps are intended to be master documents for the programs. Only align with what you are actually going to access.

### Next steps:

Once August training is completed:

- Add assessment as a standing item to all division meetings
- Mandy will work with new Instructional Designer to develop process for ongoing training / workshops and support for faculty. Could morph into Academy under the Instructional Designer
- Academy: More challenging training in good assessment practices
  - Those completing this training could serve as ambassadors to other faculty
  - Possible rollout fall 2020
  - Provide more ongoing intentional support for faculty
- Incentivize or reward participation
- MSU offers diversity certificate as a professional development opportunity for faculty—could fall under responsibilities of Instructional Designer.

Dr. Pasek stressed holding faculty accountable, tying all back to Strategic Plan, and that this will help faculty become better instructors.

**ACTION:** Mandy will let Leanne know who has not completed the curriculum maps.
**ACTION:** DD to discuss with Mandy when to discuss questions for self-reflection: during faculty training or during faculty evaluation process?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date assigned</td>
<td>Action item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2019</td>
<td>Send out 8/19 training calendar invites to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/19</td>
<td>Mandy will let Leanne know who has not completed the curriculum maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/19</td>
<td>Work with Mandy Wright on when to discuss questions for self-reflection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>during faculty training or faculty evaluation process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal for Faculty Non-Instructional Time
Fall 2019
Submitted by Mandy Wright

Rationale: We need dedicated time for faculty to discuss student learning assessment and develop solutions to address ongoing concerns about our assessment process. This cannot be a top-down mandate or process and we need to show faculty that student learning assessment is important to us as an institution. One way to show our investment is to dedicate time during non-instructional days. Doing so will create a foundation on which we can continue to build professional development throughout the academic year. Front-loading this work will also allow for a smoother transition and implementation of revised processes in fall 2019.

Sessions would be divided between Monday 8/19 and Tuesday 8/20, ideally in the morning on both days. That would allow faculty to have planning time in the afternoon on Tuesday to implement any curricular or syllabus changes that come out of the mapping work and other discussions.

Proposed topics

1. Discussion sessions:
   a. Review assessment process on our campus and changes that need to happen
      i. Particularly in context of revised NWCCU standards
      ii. Need for faculty engagement and creating a more “organic” process
   b. Review/discuss proposed revisions to CLOs
   c. How and when do faculty want to assess student learning at the course/program/institutional levels?
      i. Set the course for revising the process and creating policy
      ii. What should course-level assessment look like? What happens if we eliminate reporting this information?
      iii. What should program-level assessment look like?
      iv. What should CLO assessment look like?

2. Work sessions to:
   a. Map outcomes: course>program>CLO
      i. Review/create common course outlines/curriculum maps
      ii. Determine where signature assignments should occur and how they should be assessed (if needed, based on Monday’s conversation about assessing the CLOs)
      1. Based on CLO alignment, create faculty groups to develop/revise rubrics and eventually participate in norming (for future)
   b. Develop Programmatic assessment plans
      i. Facilitate program director completion of Culture of Evidence Rubric
   c. Draft CLO assessment process
   d. Draft questions for self-reflection (if needed)—possibly to integrate into faculty evaluation process
Notes:
- Concurrent dual-enrollment faculty will be invited
- Problems with assessment come from not understanding what it is and how to do it
- Make sure discussion sessions are interactive and that there are multiple ways for people to engage (e.g., Poll Everywhere)
- People (Laura) still don’t understand purpose of common course outline, or how to fill it out
- Model best practices in the training by sharing outcomes and how the effectiveness of the training will be assessed, using good assessment methods (muddiest point, likert scale, etc.)
- Heather is willing to help out with the trainings as an assistant.