

ACC Meeting Name: Achieving Excellence Committee

DRAFT Minutes

Meeting Date: October 26

Time: 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Location: HBC, Room 201

Chair: Soon Merz

Members Present: D'Maris Allen-Mierl, Kathleen Christensen, Steve Clary, Zach Corbell, Vida Forrest y Salazar, Sandy Gaskin, Donetta Goodall, Rich Griffiths, Ron Johns, Virginia Lawrence, Nancy Miller, Theresa Moore, Charles Quinn, Robert Daley, Grace Tan, Soon Merz, Roslyn Wallace.

Absent: Linda Welsh, Kyle Pierce, Lyman Grant, Sylvia Galvan Gonzales, Mike Midgley, Sheila Ammons, Mary Harris, Norma Jacobs, Margaret Reid, Diane Whitley-Bogard, and Cleaburn Zwerneman.

Agenda Item A: Welcome and Introductions

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Soon welcomed everyone to the AEC Meeting. The members introduced themselves. Soon stated that the focus of the first year for AEC will be educational. Therefore, there will be reading assignments for AEC members from the two books that have already been distributed “**Assessment in Context**” and “**Core Indicators of Effectiveness.**” Soon announced that we have invited the author of **Assessment in Context**, Ronald L. Baker, to speak to the committee on November 30th. He will be at ACC all day, and we hope to have him speak to a large audience. Soon invited any suggestions from members on how to harness the talents of this dynamic speaker and to disseminate his message with a larger audience.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item B: Review of Agenda

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Members had no revisions.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item C: Review of Minutes

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: None

Decisions: Minutes from the October 26, 2007 meeting were approved.

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item D: Categorization of Assessment Activities at ACC

Presenter: Roslyn Wallace and Soon Merz

Discussion:

Soon explained that five major categories were identified from the list of assessment activities generated by AEC members at the last meeting. The five categories are: Improvement, Student Achievement, Accountability, Accreditation and Compliance. Soon asked the members to split into groups and then assigned each one of the major categories to a group (two groups were assigned 2 categories). The task was to review the list of assessment activities and decide whether or not the assessment activity applied to the assigned category. After about 15 minutes, the whole group reviewed the list together, with Soon moderating the discussion. As each activity was read by Soon, a representative from each small group reported to AEC as a whole whether or not the assessment category applied to the activity. The product of this exercise was a list of assessment activities that had been coded by category.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item E: Categorization of “Assessment and Me at ACC”

Presenter: Soon Merz and Roslyn Wallace

Discussion:

This exercise involved categorizing comments about experiences with the assessment activities at ACC from the last meeting. All the comments had been randomly taped to two chalkboards. The members were asked to group the comments together into categories. The following is the list of categories and grouped comments generated by the AEC members:

- 1) Processes
 - a) Administration does not give faculty time to integrate effective assessments.
 - b) Difficult to quantify.
 - c) It was too difficult to get data for assessment from OIEA.
 - d) Burdensome and complicated.
 - e) There are advantages to on-line assessment formats that are not used as widely as they could be.
 - f) Challenging to develop appropriate assessment tools for the classroom.

- g) For a large course – many sections – it is hard to administer the assessment.
 - h) U-LEAD is not a good tool for faculty.
 - i) Writing student tests and grading students' work takes many hours.
 - j) Backwards process: pick what want and search for applicable justification.
 - k) Student assessment is seldom based on performance and formats are all very similar (lack variety).
 - l) Frustrating process for program review.
 - m) Assessment in occupational areas is easier.
 - n) Criteria and conditions are sometimes not clear.
 - o) Developing an effective assessment process can be time-consuming, however, when the time and effort are devoted to effective development, the actual assessment process is easier and ...
 - p) Bringing in a variety of perspectives for the SWOT program review was valuable and eye-opening.
 - q) Self study for external accreditation was poorly supported by OIEA.
 - r) Frustrating. Difficult to get needed data – OIEA.
 - s) We have great data but need better analysis.
 - t) Not well communicated. Parts of process not visible to users.
 - u) Hard to do; harder to use.
- 2) Attitudes
- a) Lack of interest.
 - b) Faculty feel that it is an invasion of academic freedom.
 - b) Faculty will not buy in.
 - c) No one at ACC will make faculty do it. Some waffle and the process falls apart.
 - d) Faculty do NOT take it seriously.
 - e) Sometimes faculty are suspicious of assessment
 - f) My experience with assessment depends on several factors – if there is focus and clarity, the experience ...
- 3) Results
- a) There is a HUGE gap in understanding about assessment.
 - b) Not properly institutionalized.
 - c) U-LEAD process is not helpful – we aren't using the assessment data effectively.
 - d) Sometimes assessment confirms what we already know about characteristics or qualities in students, courses, and programs.
 - e) Results have sometimes been confusing or difficult to understand.
 - f) Program review was fairly useless.
 - g) Feel the need to better utilize the results of program review.
 - h) Pointless – results seemingly sent into void.
- 4) Positives
- a) Obtained instructive data.
 - b) It is a rewarding experience.
 - c) When assessments get done, the feedback leads to improvements.
 - d) Informative.

- e) Revealing.
- f) Productive, useful.
- g) Has helped to provide justification for a particular effort.
- h) Discovered unknown problems.
- i) Enjoyed the process for looking at needs of community with environmental scan.
- j) Improvement toward desired goals can take place after assessment.
- k) Mandated.

Vida made the point that a lot of the comments are about attitudes, but the way to change attitudes is through processes and actions.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item F: Categorization of “What I want from/for this committee”

Presenter: Soon Merz and Roslyn Wallace

Discussion:

Soon read all the comments from our last meeting concerning “What I want from/for this committee” to begin to form an annual work plan. She said that all the comments are part of what we have planned for this committee. The plan is for this committee to build a clearinghouse for best practices in assessment.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

Agenda Item G: Announcements

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion:

1. Soon said that she hopes more members will attend future meetings.
2. OIEA’s focus will be to look at our data system and start revising how we provide our data to meet our internal needs.
3. Ronald Baker, author of “Assessment in Content, A Systems Approach” will speak at our next AEC Meeting on November 30th at the South Austin Campus.

Decisions: N/A

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: N/A

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30.

Next meeting: November 16, 2007