Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, September 1, 2023

1. **Opening:** The Assessment Committee meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm by Justin Tickhill. The meeting was held online via Zoom.
2. **Present:** Dr. Gina Rossi-Kamwithi, Justin Tickhill, Dr. Kelly Gray, Dr. Steve Haynes, ~~Amy Burns~~, Wesley Adams, ~~Kelly Cominsky,~~ ~~Thomas Shields,~~ ~~Barb Keener~~, ~~Kimberly Lybarger~~
3. **Welcome new members** – Even though there was low attendance, the decision was made to proceed with the meeting and Chair welcomed Dr. Steve Haynes to the committee. Kelly Cominsky was absent due to teaching obligations and Thomas Shields was also not present.
4. **Describe the Assessment process and what each committee member’s role is in the process** As done at the beginning of each fall semester for new members, Justin explained the TASK Review process. He shared his screen and also reviewed the TASK assignments for committee members for the subsections. Documents are usually large that the committee reviews, and this way faculty committee members can focus on one area. Roles were described. CAO questioned the number of faculty now serving on Assessment Committee was only four. Chair said he would welcome more faculty but does not have the authority to ask others to serve. That would need to be done by the Division Dean.

TASK Assignments were determined for faculty members:

* 1. Lead PARS (Program Assessment Reports) Reviewer – Chair
  2. Lead CWO (College-Wide Outcomes) Reviewer – Wesley Adams
  3. Lead Reviewer of Co-curricular Materials - Open
  4. Lead PFSS (Professional Soft Skills) – Kelly Cominsky. It was suggested that member be assigned to this role as nursing students deal a lot within this area.
  5. Master of Assessment Canvas course – Chair

Chair stated the college as a whole does well with communicating with accrediting bodies and specific businesses that are hiring our students. We have good responses with what is going on with program outcomes. One thing faculty often have questions on is how to change course outcomes. The faculty know best on what their outcomes need to be and the committee and advisory board can validate that with them. We suggest a minimum of four and a maximum of 12 outcomes.

There is a list of commonly asked questions that Assessment Committee uses at reviews and these were shared with committee members. Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) said there needs to be a clear line of what is done in the classroom and what college leadership funds are used to improve student outcomes. An example shared was a welding class. They were having a hard time getting students to meet certain skills because there were not enough funds to have more stations. This became a detriment and that same type of scenario can occur in every area. What are the hindrances of not having enough funds that are causing issues. Or, if there was plenty of funding for a particular program, where would it be allocated. This is the kind of thing that HLC is looking for: clear evidence of requesting equipment, professional development or software improvements for students. They need to see where this is tied to. CAO stated there has to be a link that this committee has had the discussion with faculty and then Assessment is to follow-up on that. Chair recommended adding a funding question to the current questions list that Assessment uses with faculty when they come before the committee. ALO said she would be glad to assist the Chair with how the question should be worded.

CAO stated it is up to Assessment to realize the financial need when faculty presents program needs to the Committee. Chair shared examples of areas of need. For PTA procedures, it would be good to have an adjunct there at the same time on specific days for more student interaction. This would be helpful for nursing students as well when they do skill checks. CAO stated for nursing this has been budgeted in lab fees. We need to make sure it is documented when we have these types of conversations.

Chair, said to add something more explicit. ALO doesn’t want to confuse faculty with this. CAO recommended to ask faculty when they present their program to Assessment Committee to share what their reaction was to the data they were presented with. A lot may say students are underprepared coming out of high school. Dean of Liberal Arts said it should be more general type of questions and then let the faculty share where the evidence takes them. Chair said faculty may be uncomfortable asking for additional funds as there are no additional dollars available, and they would be told to increase the lab fees. He feels that would be something a faculty member would not bring up.

CAO – what are faculty willing to give up to achieve the student outcome? It’s not just about adding more things, equipment, people. That may not necessarily improve student outcomes. There needs to be discussion of all the steps and processes involved in that. A good example of this is what happened with Chemistry department during program review. More equipment was needed, worked through the Foundation to explore any potential funding for Chemistry and a grant was awarded. This became part of our HLC argument. It took some time, but as a result, student outcomes were improved. Programs should be encouraged to explore additional funding through the Foundation. Chair said as a committee we will need to keep this type of thing in mind and look for places where there are opportunities for funding for a particular program and share those financial recourses during program presentation. CAO stated she will discuss the importance of documentation in minutes at the combined division meeting and that minutes become evidence for HLC. The team also discussed the importance of explicit questions during meetings for better documentation.

Since there were no new committee members present at the meeting, Chair will forward the PowerPoint presentation to them and will email them the Zoom link of the recorded meeting and ask that they review both items. He said the main plan for today’s meeting was to do a review of Assessment and that was accomplished.

1. **Minutes**

May 5, 2023 – After the meeting, Chair forwarded these minutes to the four members present. He asked for the faculty member present to review and to make a motion on the minutes. Motions were made to approve minutes (via email): Justin Tickhill approved as presented, Gina approved with slight changes. 2nd: Wesley Adams accepted minutes with Gina’s updates. The minutes were accepted, despite the absence of enough faculty members to meet the quorum.

1. **Next Meeting**

Prior to the next meeting, Chair will reach out to those going for program review for support.

Would like to review CWO and PARs for English with new member. This is good to do with new members so they see how the process works and see how they fit in the meeting.

1. **Adjournment**

Chair thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 12:33 pm.

**Next Meeting will be held September, 15, 2023.**

Respectfully submitted by Amy E. Burns, Recorder