Instructional Assessment Committee
Minutes

Committee/Meeting Name	Instructional Assessment Committee				
Date	11/1/13	Starting Time	12 PM (Noon)	Ending Time	1:30 PM
Location	Library 112			Recorder	Kristin
Members Present	Monique Dupuis, Don Abel, Cara Crowley, Becky Burton, Brandon Moore, Ed Nolte, LaVon Barrett, Kristin McDonald-Willey, and Walter Webb				
Guests	None				
Absent	Ann Hamblin, Russell Lowery-Hart, and Danita McAnally				

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
I. Overview	o President's Cabinet decided that the program review be combined with the PET form and a new method for collecting data begin at AC o Perfect time for change because AC was just reaffirmed o We can alter this draft to meet the needs of the College and we do not have to respond to every section every year, but what will be discussed today is just an overview of all of the IE processes pulled into one form o Have met with Dan Ferguson since he will be affected by every area on this form from core curriculum to the procedures.	*Decide on timeline (including which sections need a response on which years) • Dan's suggestion – could possibly do at the end of year every year <u>if</u> had the assistance from someone such as the area's data specialist. The suggestion would be that the data assistance could come from the data specialist during non-peak times and that the data collection and/or entry could be part of the "closing the loop" process when the specialist discusses findings with dept. chair at the end of the year at the data conference..
II. What We Have to Prove Based on SACSCOC Requirements	• **2.5** – The institution engages in ongoing, integrated and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. Suggestion: At a minimum (1) describe the planning process used at the institutional level including a list of persons and/or committees which play key roles in the process; (2) describe the process by which institutional goals and objectives are set, reviewed, modified, and (3) identify who is responsible for setting and modifying institutional goals. Provide a timeline by which the	Periodically review to see if proposal fulfills the SACSCOC criteria

Instructional Assessment Committee
Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline

II. What We Have to Prove Based on SACSCOC Requirements CONTINUED	above occurs, the plans (such as a strategic plan) that have been developed, assessment results, and improvements resulting from the analysis of assessment results. Describe how the planning and evaluation process informs budgeting decisions.
	• **3.3.1** – The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:
	   o **3.3.1.1 – Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes:** <u>Suggestion</u>: Ensure that data displays address all locations both traditional and electronic delivery; ensure that there is evidence of review of both the education program itself and of the student learning outcomes for each educational program; Ensure that goals/objectives and data gathered are meaningful
	   o **3.3.1.2 – Administrative support services:** <u>Suggestion</u>: Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple "to do" lists.
	   o **3.3.1.3 – Educational support services** <u>Suggestion</u>: Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple "to do" lists.
	   o **3.3.1.5 – Community/Public Service within its educational mission, if appropriate** <u>Suggestion</u>: Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple "to do" lists.
	   o **Note:** 3.3.1.4 – Research within its educational mission is Not Applicable
	• **3.5 and THECB –** Prove **General Education Competencies (assessment, measurement, improvement, etc.)**	

III. Review of Draft	**Committee Concerns Over Part II** • What baselines does Dr. Lowery Hart want set (e.g. is a 5% increase "good"?) • Keep years so that data can be compared • Reliability of data based on acceptance policies into a major (e.g. students classified as a certain major, but have not yet actually taken any of the major courses) • Active majors or not active majors? • Reliability of THECB data? • Use program-specific or course specific data? • Does every division have access to IDS data	**Committee Concerns Over Part II** • Kristin M. said she would schedule a meeting with Dr. Lowery-Hart and Danita McAnally to clarify lingering questions/concerns.

Instructional Assessment Committee
Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
III. Review of Draft CONTINUED	**Committee Concerns Over Part II CONTINUED** • Not enough room/instructors or in some instances market demand for programs to grow **GENERAL Committee Concerns** • Accredited programs required to complete entire review? • Length of review • Length of questions (e.g. possibly better to combine some questions)	**GENERAL Committee Concerns** • ACCREDITED PROGRAMS – Kristin M. stated that programs could just link to information that exists in current documentation. Kristin requested to see sample self-study and related information from Becky Burton so that a sample draft could be developed. • LENGTH - Kristin M. stated that all of the review would not need to be completed every year. As for question length, it was suggested that the questions be simplified and divided into separate questions, but the questions could be combined again if that is the committee's preference.
IV. QUICK OVERVIEW OF REMAINING REVIEW	Kristin briefly discussed the rest of the review and requested that any further comments/concerns be sent to her via e-mail.	

V. Follow-up Steps	**E-MAILS**
	• Kristin Edford –
	  o Suggests that form be reformatted to focus on student retention within a course (e.g. total enrollment, final grade distribution, and drop numbers).
	  o Suggest information be compared yearly with the program overview report after 3-4 years.
		E-MAILS
		• Kristin Edford – Kristin M. will review these suggestions and attempt to integrate into new Arts & Sciences (and others if applicable) drafts
		• Becky Burton – Review accreditation documents and work on sample draft for how all processes can work together

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline

V. Follow-up Steps CONTINUED	o Further clarification also needed on PART IV (D and E) in regard to which courses are in the core versus the program or both.
	  o Part V – Policies and Procedures - #4 and #5 – how would these apply to areas that consist only of adjuncts?
	  o Ensure not confusing to those with no development in Core Curriculum
	• Becky Burton
	  o Sent sample accreditation-related documents
	
	MEETING WITH DR. LOWERY-HART – Answers to Questions/Concerns
	• Move IDS data out of Question 1 – not every area will have IDS specialist and change IDS reflection to read as part of a separate question. The purpose of this review is for <u>program review</u> (even for Arts & Science transfer programs), but if dept. chairs wish to look at course level, they may do so. May consider having IDS specialist assistance with form.
	• Dept. Chairs/Program Coordinators need to set own benchmarks.
	• Could add employment area to technical field forms. Attainment of living wage skill.
	• Shifting from focus on enrollments to focus on completion with the students we do have.
	• Create two versions to showcase how much work this process is compared to previous process. When compared side to side, if dept. chairs desire to go back to previous method, it can be discussed.
		MEETING WITH DR. LOWERY-HART – Answers to Questions/Concerns
		• Send new drafts to Danita and Russell for approval.
		• Schedule meeting with all Dept. Chairs/Program Coordinators (per Dr. Lowery-Hart) to discuss process and show how new process has attempted to simplify the old process (show side-by-side comparisons of new process vs. old process) and request comments for which process is favored and/or better ways to improve as an institution.

Instructional Assessment Committee
Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
VI. Next Meeting	TBD – Early spring 2014	• Schedule Meeting in Spring 2014