Randy presented information on the scope of the team and our mission to collaborate the information that DACC is already using for assessment as well as creating new initiatives if necessary.

The Institution has created a new core CQI team from the previous subteam “assessment”. The new core team is named Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

This committee will focus on departmental level assessments.

Reviewed the core components and what each will examine.

Core Component 3A:
1. evidence of assessment at multiple levels
   a. We as an institution have this met. We will gather the criteria through the Institutional Effectiveness team.
   b. Need to deliver examples of evidence for all levels
      i. Course
      ii. Program
      iii. Institutional
2. Results of assessment are delivered currently to all key constituent groups: board, admin council, administrators, deans, etc.

As we develop work groups for the individual criteria we will gather information and questions to bring to Randy Fletcher. After the sections are written, Randy will fill in the gaps.

It is important to try to address each Example of Evidence. Some we may not have, others we may create or use something existing that is not listed in the examples.

Rich Mountain Document answers all bullets. We are using this document as an example of what criteria we will need to put in the report.
Maurice Miller performs individual course level assessment. Randy said this will be best used in another area of the criterion example.

We currently use CCSSE (community college survey of student engagement). We do not have employment rate assessment currently.

Jane asked us to all divide into four subgroups, each group addressing a component of Criterion 3. We passed a listing around for members to sign up for their desired component.

Meeting dates were set. At the next meeting we will divide into the subgroups and start composing questions for Randy as well as an outline of how the team will proceed.

Directive:

1. Subteams will look at samples of evidence.
2. Create questions; examine what data we currently have
3. Determine what needs to be requested/pulled from Mainframe.
   a. All requests for information from Randy should be directed through Jane Brown.
4. Need to address: Do we? Can we? Will we?
5. Each subteam should appoint a facilitator/spokesperson.

Directed to examine the DACC Self-Study web page: www.dacc.edu/selfstudy

Pull out all materials that pertain to the Self-Study Accreditation. Use these documents to gather ideas of information to use.

Next Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2007</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Laura Lee Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2007</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Laura Lee Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2007</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Laura Lee Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting adjourned.
Criterion 3

Core Component Subteams

Core Component A: The organizations’ goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

Lori Jones  
Ben Jun  
Brian Fink  
Rich Christman  
Jane Brown

Core Component B: The organization values and supports effective teaching.

Shelby May  
Maurice Miller  
Kathy Sturgeon  
Tim Bunton

Core Component C: The organization creates effective learning environments.

Alice Cowan  
Margie Arlington  
Ted Gallagher  
Tom Szott

Core Component D: The organizations’ learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

Carolyn Jensen  
Merilyn Shepherd  
Holly Nordheden  
Angela Eells  
Becky Osborne