

**ASSESSMENT MEETING**  
**November 9, 2006**

Present: Debra Backus, Larry Bloom, Sharon Gott, Seyed Mirkhani (part of meeting)

Presiding: Sherry Becker-Gorby

Regrets: Tim Tirrell

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
Minutes	The Minutes from the October 24, 2006 meeting were reviewed. The minutes were approved as presented.	
Course Level Assessment: Survey/Inventory Update	Program Directors have administered the Faculty Course Assessment Survey. D. Backus received 16 out of 26 completed surveys. L. Bloom had 2 faculty complete the surveys. S. Mirkhani's faculty have completed the surveys (no numbers reported). SB-G will compile results for program directors for next step of course evaluation project.	Program Directors will mail hard copies of surveys to SB-G
Course Level Assessment: Target Course and Pilot Update	Program Directors provided a status report of pilot project progress. D. Backus has questions developed for PSYC, but needs a revision to put into multiple choice format. She is meeting with the instructor to final these. D. Backus asked if S. Mirkhani would be most appropriate person to work on developing standard questions for CIS 108. It was agreed that S. Mirkhani should develop these questions since the course is in his department, although offered as a gen ed. S. Gott reported that she is ready with questions and faculty L. Bloom is working with his faculty. Would prefer to conduct assessment of lab practicals in the future, but will use the standard test question format for fall pilot. S. Mirkhani has completed questions for pilot and is ready for fall pilot implementation.	SB-G will follow-up with S. Mirkhani regarding the CIS 108 questions.
Program Level Assessment: Progress/Updates	SB-G distributed a copy of the transitional studies program assessment via email prior to the meeting. Committee members discussed feasibility of using this plan as a model for their program plans. All agreed to use similar format and modify as needed for their specialized program needs. D. Backus has begun her draft and is nearly finished. S. Mirkhani has submitted his initial draft for BOS and BUS. L. Bloom is on hold until finished with program revision.	Program Directors will continue with drafting plans that are in process. S. Gott will finalize Transitional Studies Assessment plan and submit for December LOT meeting.

	Transitional Studies assessment plan. A revision was recommended to remove the references to the ORT courses since these are not in her area. S. Gott will make the revisions and submit for LOT review in the December LOT meeting	SB-G will review and provide comment to plans as they are submitted.
Course Evaluations: Institutional Trends	SB-G provided update on progress with Course evaluations. List of faculty teaching in Fall 2006 that also taught in Spring 2006 was provided to S. Bungard. She will begin processing reports for this group first. SB-G has also requested an institutional summary for the spring semester. This will serve as a comparison for individual faculty as well as bring note to institutional trends.	SB-G will follow-up with S. Bungard regarding progress on summaries.
Faculty Evaluations: Tracking Sheet	SB-G asked S. Mirkhani and D. Backus to provide a summary of their efforts regarding tracking sheets. Concern was duplication of efforts and could a uniform sheet be developed. S. Mirkhani has provided Crystal with a copy of the faculty file that M. See develops for faculty records. Crystal will be able to pull fields of information from this file and insert into the database she is developing for D. Backus. D. Backus has worked with Monica to devise a database for tracking only evaluations. D. Backus will forward a copy to SB-G. D. Backus suggested a meeting with Crystal, Monica, Seyed and Seyed to coordinate efforts. A time will need to be set for this session	D. Backus will forward a copy of her database to SB-G.
Web Site and Bulletin for faculty development	On hold until S. Mirkhani can be present for the meeting	
Website for Assessment Committee	On hold until S. Mirkhani can be present for the meeting	
Other: Faculty Evaluations Process question	D. Backus asked for clarification on faculty evaluation process. The question centered on need for signature and time restraints. It was agreed that for observations that yielded no instructional or personnel issues, a summary of observation remarks course be sent via email from the program director as an attachment with an explanatory email to the instructor. In lieu of a signature, the faculty member will be instructed to send a return receipt email. For situations with instructional or personnel issues, the faculty will be scheduled for an on-site appointment. S. Mirkhani has one faculty who needs to have the comprehensive evaluation. D. Backus will finish compiling her data to determine who needs a comprehensive evaluation. L Bloom does not have any faculty ready for a comprehensive evaluation at this time.	SB-G will prepare a draft list of issues and forward to Tim T.

Other	<p>Several issues surfaced during the course of the meeting that were not directly related to assessment, but related to academic services. SB-G compiled a list of these items and will forward to Tim T. These may require discussion/action items through other committees or separate meetings to be determined by the Dean.</p> <p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Space issues in the new facility and delivery of courses</li> <li>• MCRF revisions: impact on course descriptions and credit hours; concern that listed course outcomes are too prescriptive not allowing for impact of text book changes.</li> <li>• Math for Industrial Technologies: Course outcomes too ambitious, may be geared more toward engineering rather than technician; needs discussion and revision</li> <li>• Applied physics: No lab is listed on MCRF, course needs to have a lab component; may require revision of MCRF</li> <li>• Staff availability during key registration times: Many were at conferences during first week of registration; need to consider impact on daily operations when scheduling conference attendance; also need to limit, as possible, the required meetings during this time</li> <li>• IMT certificate programs: too many options for reasonable implementation; embedded 2<sup>nd</sup> level prerequisites impacting effective implementation, needs major revision (should there be a major program revision again or done of a course by course basis as needed).</li> </ul>	
Next Meeting	The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 28, at 12:30 in the HARCO room. After this meeting the committee will return to it's previously established meeting times (alternating Thursday at 9:00).	

Respectfully submitted by Sherry Becker-Gorby  
Approved: November 28, 2006