

**Danville Area Community College**  
**Assessment Committee and HLC Self-Study Steering Committee Meeting**  
**December 5, 2006**  
**Copper Penny Room**  
**3:00 PM**

Members present: Randy Fletcher, Dave Kietzmann, Brian Fink, Penny McConnell, Stacy Ehmen, Glenda Boling, Maggie Hoover, Wendy Brown, Alan Thompson, Eric Simonson, Jeff Hutton, Gail Morrison, Becky Osborn, Nancy Boesdorfer, Janet Redenbaugh, Al Bello, Belinda Dalton-Russell. HLC Steering Committee members absent: Mary Coffman and Jane Brown

I. Assessment Activities

A. Assessment Calendar (handout)

Those in academic divisions also need a program/course level assessment plan by the end of December and campus wide by May 1, 2007.

B. Campus-wide Assessment Plans

The course-level assessment form is to be completed at the end of a semester starting next May 2007. Eric suggested a universal destination for outcomes. Randy explained the difference between an objective and a goal. A motion was made by Glenda Boling to accept the Course-Level Assessment Report form and seconded by Penny McConnell.

The program-level assessment form is to be completed by Division Deans of their designated program. This form will be useful in directing programs in certain areas. Program Review is separate, using division wide best practice. A motion was made by Penny McConnell to accept the Program-Level Assessment Report form and seconded by Randy Fletcher.

The department/office-level assessment form is to be completed by service areas that support student learning. Stacy, Gail, and Randy put together the form which will be used on a fiscal year basis. This report would address those areas that are departments and/or offices which focus on student service and support. There are areas that already have surveys in place but some departments have no student feedback at this time. Stacy suggested using a common language for assessment plans.

C. CAAP – General Education Outcomes Assessment

CAAP is a 40 minute test used to look at critical thinking in reading and writing. The expense is around \$11-12 per student. A decision needs to be made on what courses will reflect the critical thinking skills students acquire. It was agreed to

not make the test a requirement for graduation, but the problem is that students do not take it seriously. A suggestion was made to put on the transcript, for example, that the student scored above the national average. CAAP suggests imbedding the test in the courses. The challenge is to select courses that would target students completing a two year degree and what to do about students changing their choice along the way.

Other suggestions:

- measure critical thinking when they enter and again when they graduate
- tie the test in with Success in College
- inquire with other community colleges on what they are doing for feedback
- come up with our own measure and use CAAP to support the results
- select one area for all programs for one year

## II. Self-Study Activities

### A. Data Collection Requests or Ideas (cross-cutting survey)

Each team was given the Rich Mountain Community College Self-Study Report to refer to for ideas. It also includes the sample of a 20 question employee survey to be distributed at the spring in-service. Any data collected should be given to Randy.

### B. In-Service, January 10-12

A draft of the January 10<sup>th</sup> morning in-service was distributed. The Self-Study progress report will be given right after introductions. Maggie is working on a Self-Study Newsletter to also hand out. Career/transfer/service areas need to talk over core indicators which will also go in the February Board report.

### C. Report Template

Randy went over the five guidelines on the handout for writing a self-study plan.

### D. Committee Reports

The Self-Study Committee Chairs gave brief overviews of meeting times and subjects covered. Belinda reported that the AGS Online Team is looking at what online has been approved, what has not and why, and address that in their final report. Al assigned each member on the Criterion 4 Team to a core component. Janet reported that the Criterion 2 Team was gathering data from respective areas and to determine how our process will outcome into the future. Nancy reported that the Follow-up Team was looking at former HLC reports to see how we should respond to their concerns and to determine who to follow up with. Eric

reported that the Operational Indicators Team's first effort is an institutional snapshot (financial aid status, etc.). Maggie reported that the Communications Resource Team is working on a newsletter that will be put on the web site and will demo the new logo at the next meeting. Penny reported that the Criterion 1 Team is continuing to look at ideas for supporting evidence on how, why, and what supports documentation

### III. Other Issues

#### A. Next meeting dates (Assessment & Steering Committees)

January meetings will be during the Spring Inservice.