

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 12, 2015

Meeting began 11:00 - Meeting was adjourned at 11:57

Members in attendance (sign-in sheet gathered):

Ragen 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

– Welcome & Minutes presented/ agenda presented & accepted –

Moved – Jamie D / 2nd Nancy Z-B

– **Older items** were discussed regarding Assessment Handbook & posting student artifacts on the website. These items will be handled during the summer months as the focus must be made to complete other items such as course outcomes, awards & recognition, and transition to incorporate Open-Pathway, which will affect the handbook. No vote was taken regarding this.

– **Course Outcomes** Discussion outcomes are being provided and being entered into canvas, sorted in similar fashion as they appear in the catalog and will be updated according to what is in the most current catalog. Only outcomes provided by the Deans will be entered – updates or changes need to also go through the Deans

– **Awards & Recognition** – Documentation from previous information pertaining to the awards was provided to those in attendance at the Concordia for review. A revision of the past awards practices will be modified to better reflect our current or goal of future practices resulting in rewriting the criteria and better defining the assessment awards and recognition process. Discussion involved when the awards should be presented involved Jamie D., Nancy Z-B., Cindy L. mostly with others supporting various comments – A decision was made to distribute the award(s) in the Spring at the Recognition dinner.

Additional criteria considered:

1. Having awards for 2 full-time & 1 adjunct instructor(s) and to eliminate or not offer other types of awards until additional criteria or conditions were decided upon. However; the criteria offered for individual instructor awards would be:
 - a) the teacher could self-apply – nominations not recommended
 - b) has completed all required assessment reporting according to schedule
 - c) has evidence showing how they have utilized assessment to improve student learning (providing evidence through Canvas)
 - d) improvement and/or implementation over time (limited to 4 years)
 - e) is likely to be considered for continued employment

- f) is not a department chair or dean member
- g) employed at Cloud as a faculty/adjunct member for a minimum of 1 academic year
- h) must have credentials to appropriate level where applicable

It was also suggested by Nancy Z-B, and Brent P. to also provide framed certificates, however the criteria for these was not discussed at this meeting.

Cindy L suggested lowering the award amount to \$100 from \$200 so more faculty could be recognized.

We are currently unsure what the budget for assessment awards is therefore new criteria/description will be presented to the administration for clarity before the April meeting – R Mize will gather this information

R Mize suggested keeping the awards directly to individual instructors instead of awarding money to departments due to sizing, etc. Also recognition would be directed towards individual teachers – ideally improving morale. It was also suggested those who were recognized and awarded by the assessment committee be required to present their ideas during a fall in-service to inspire others regarding how to better utilize assessment for student learning. It was consensus of the group this would achieve collaboration, recognition, and in-house professional development from our own highly qualified staff.

– Planning for Transition – review of the agenda items included thinking about what we as an assessment committee should focus on and how we plan to utilize assessment as a committee. It was determined the assessment committee meets in the following months: Feb, Mar, Apr, Aug, Sept, Oct, & Nov., however; additional meeting could be added as necessary to review assessment data and to review the criteria needed for collection & report, etc.

It was suggested we spread out the departments among the 7 months we meet to better utilize review of the data over time instead of trying to review it all within the same time frame. The decision was made to use alphabetical order to disperse the departments throughout the calendar months we meet. The planning & implementation will include asking department chairs how they would like to divide their own department – such as in the English Department as it may be necessary for the Assessment committee to meet more than 1 time in the month they are assigned in order to allow enough time for presentation and discussion, etc. The goal for next meeting is to come back with a “schedule” for the departments to present/review assessment data – the initial meeting most likely will include nothing more than a review and update.

The goal is to create a cycle for assessment such as:



This diagram was not presented, but the process was presented by RMize