

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 12, 2015

Meeting began 11:04 - Meeting was adjourned at 11:59

Members in attendance (sign-in sheet gathered):

Ragena Mize	Dir. Assess & Accred.
Dennis Smith	Faculty – Science instructor
Cindy Lamberty	Faculty – Science instructor – Geary Campus (ITV)
Nancy Zenger-Beneda	Dean Science/Math
Jamie Durler	Comm. Art/English instructor
Brent Phillips	Dean Humanities/SS/Business
Randy Gantvoort	Wind Energy
Amanda Strait (guest)	Online Dir. (Canvas)

Item 1 – Welcome & Minutes presented/ agenda presented & accepted –
Moved - approved Cindy L / 2nd Jamie D

Item 2 & 3 – Assessment Handbook & posting student artifacts on the website were briefly discussed. Handbook needs updating as items in handbook date back to 2002 – 2008. The assessment Director moved this for later consideration until a direction and plan are accepted by the assessment committee before beginning the revision/updating process. No vote was taken regarding this.

Item 4 – Course Outcomes were suggested as a focus for consideration for all future planning by the assessment committee as a direction of support as the college will be implementing course outcomes directly into canvas with the purpose of connecting course outcomes directly to rubrics to measure the level of learning and instruction per outcome to attain future data – which is departing from our past practices using the CAS. N Zenger-Beneda suggested course outcomes integration with Canvas be listed within the assessment committee minutes to indicate approval for future reference. No vote was taken to approve the implementation of course outcomes into Canvas as a transitional piece to collect data as this was not an option for the assessment committee to vote on. Director of Assessment updated regarding the continuing plans for entering outcomes into Canvas and requested outcomes be sent to her so they can be placed into the Canvas software.

Item 5 – Awards & Recognition – A request by N Zenger-Beneda outside of the assessment committee meeting requested the reinstatement of awards and recognition for individual course assessment and program/discipline – the information resourced from the Assessment drive showing the most recent information was provided to the group for review and recommendations updating were requested for the next meeting to allow for contemplation and dialogue with peers. Emphasis was suggested by the director as goal to try to align the awards criteria and recognition to what our current / future practices will be.

Item 6 –The director advised the group because the Assessment committee is not in the master contract – we can modify our actions to align with assessing the learning outcomes so we as a committee analyze the data and make suggestions for additional support or professional development opportunities based upon data. Discussion included former practices and ideas of integration. Requests were made to see more on open pathway and examples from other colleges regarding what others schools were doing in the area of assessment. Handouts were provided directly from the HLC website as they related to open pathway and assessment. It was suggested by the director that we make sure to plan for where we are and where we want to be and not be held to past practices. We need to look at the past, present and future to be sure we are doing what it in the best interest to support student learning and the institution. We need to focus on purposeful data collection so feedback, reflection, and implementation occur – in other words an assessment cycle practice in established. The director requested members go to their departments and faculty peers to discuss the needs and goals gathering information to bring to next month’s meeting. We want to be certain we are using the data collected for a purpose and not collecting data as part of a task or ritual. Several faculty at the meeting expressed they knew data was collected but on a rare occasion had that data been discussed with them as individuals, or by department or as a faculty as a whole to reflect and determine a plan based upon data.

The director asked questions in reference to General Education outcomes/Artifacts to determine what role or future role either the Gen Ed committee or the Assessment committee played regarding the collection and evaluation of artifacts – basically – what are we doing with the data. It was requested to solicit ideas and comments from their peers before revising / updating current practices. A discussion between N Zenger-Beneda & Cindy Lamberty briefly discussed if the Gen Ed committee was needed – the Director indicated this was a topic which would be discussed with the Gen Ed committee in the near future as well as discussed with Dr. Backlin for suggestions and guidance.

The goal of this meeting was to begin dialogue regarding reflecting on current practices and determining what if any practices should be redesigned to better align with our current faculty practices and future goals.