Meeting Called by: Dr. DeLong

Type of Meeting: Regular Meeting

Facilitator: Dr. DeLong, Joan Stirling

Note Taker: Dr. DeLong, Joan Stirling

Timekeeper: Dr. DeLong, Joan Stirling


Agenda Topics

Meeting

Introduction/Charter

Dr. DeLong, Joan Stirling, Dr. Dawe

Discussion

The purpose of this meeting will be to report back on General Education Outcome assessment from Miami Dade Community College system, Johnston County Community College system, and Los Rios College system and to discuss implications for General Education Outcome assessment at Ozarka College.

Michael Orf reported on the Miami Dade system. A representative sample of students is chosen with a prompt given to each of these students. Students in their final semester are selected, given the prompt in one of their classes, and turn in the writing or give the talk to the assessment committee that delivered the prompt. The prompt is assessed by the assessment team. The results are then used to recommend changes to curriculum.

Holly Ayers reported on the Johnston Community College system. The college is in the process of developing an assessment plan and is working with faculty from the Miami Dade system. Holly stressed the importance of having faculty involved in developing the system and having adequate training for the faculty. As Johnston Community College is developing their system, faculty from Miami Dade work with Johnston faculty. Holly mentioned how our Course Assessment Plan has improved over the three years of use and stated that it would serve as a good foundation.

Dr. Dawe reported that Los Rios did not have information on their website to bring back to the group. His original intent was to connect with a friend at the college but that friend is no longer at Los Rios so he was not able to gather inside information.

Scott reported of a project that he hopes to work on this summer that would help with outcome mapping and also can be used to help produce an Ozarka portfolio. He will make drop down menus on myOzarka that will allow faculty members to connect outcomes to assignments and tests. It could also have the option of ranking a particular part of an activity to some sort of assessment tied to a rubric for general education. For example, four students could be selected by the PAC to be assessed in Faculty X’s class during their final semester at Ozarka for a writing activity. The same students could be selected for a writing assessment in Faculty Y and Faculty Z’s classes, also. Faculty members X, Y and Z rank students J, K, L, and M as exemplary, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory based on a rubric. This information is input into myOzarka and is pulled by myOzarka into a report and combined with the information on writing rubrics by other faculty/student combinations. By having three or more faculty rank each student, the result is no longer just a grade and becomes an assessment procedure. This information, combined, possibly with CAAP scores and surveys, becomes part of an Ozarka College portfolio.

Discussion followed. Dr. Dawe cautioned that we must take our time and not make hasty decisions. He was concerned that we may not have the manpower to develop an assessment program similar to the larger community colleges and that we may want to try to find some exemplary smaller community colleges whose system might be easier for us to emulate. He also reiterated that, before we went too far down any particular assessment road, we should further look into the assessment academy.

Joan had completed the action item from the last meeting and had given everyone a copy of the combined HLC criteria and core components and the six top priorities for strategic direction shortly after the last meeting.

Though not reported in the meeting, Joan Stirling had ordered and received the professional development module, “Getting Started with Assessing Institutional Effectiveness.” Joan had also previewed the module and felt that it did not hold enough new information to warrant 1.5 hours of everyone’s time. She will find another reviewer to confirm the recommendation and perhaps summarize the information for the PAC.

Conclusions
Joan and Mike will look into the Assessment Academy.

Joan and Mike will identify when would be the best time for the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
<th>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look into the Assessment Academy.</td>
<td>Joan and Mike</td>
<td>April 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check with ASUMH as to what assessment they are currently doing for general education.</td>
<td>Michael Orf</td>
<td>April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on next meeting date and make an agenda.</td>
<td>Joan and Mike</td>
<td>April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next two meetings: Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometime in April AND May 7, 11 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>