Assessment Committee
C&T Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

September 1, 2015   C 12-205, 4 PM

Attendees:

- Harry Holdorf, Bill Klein, Synthia Doaks, Andrew Eisler, Bill Fletcher, Kimberly Green, Carrie Wells, Melissa Secrist
- Domanique Culpepper was unable to attend via phone conference due to technical issues in the conference room

I. **Introductions**

II. **Discussion of Purpose and Overview of AA and C&T Program assessment**
The group discussed the reason behind the creation of the C&T Program subcommittee as being a group focused on the specific needs of those programs and their faculty. Meetings will be held every other Tuesday with every third meeting (schedule alters slightly) as a meeting with the Assessment Committee as a whole.

Discussion of the AA assessment program and cycle was included: faculty are assessing in one course each term and using a common rubric and assignment.

III. **SWOT analysis of C&T Program assessment**
See attached.

IV. **Creation of focused goals**
Committee asked to consider what they would like the group to focus on as goals for the academic year and report on those goals at the next meeting.

V. **Adjournment**

The next meeting will be held via phone conference/webinar on Tuesday, September 15th at 4 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Carrie Wells.

Career & Technical Program Assessment

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
• Data Collection Process (PASS) • Faculty willingness • All programs have SLO • Practical assessments	• Incomplete or inaccurate data • Adjunct isolation, turnover, and lack of participation • Closing the loop • Benchmarks too low • CCCs may not be completely assessed • Final grades may be reported in PASS • Adjunct faculty are reporting but not informed • Inconsistent measuring tools across the pgm • Accountability for program performance • Improvement intervention has been for full time faculty members' students only • Program sizes and locations • Lack of understanding of purpose and "how to"	• Improve SLOs • Include external data • Improve accountability with yearly program performance mtgs • Align practices to improve performance based funding measures • Create a yearly milestones calendar/assessment cycle • Expansion of the assessment program to include more courses, rotating schedules • Educate on purpose, system, and creation of assessments • Mandatory reporting "block-ups" • Chance to redefine assessment	• Common assessments may be perceived as infringing on academic freedom • Faculty feel overloaded • Faculty feel as though they are being evaluated based on their student performance results • Performance based funding • New programs getting by without assessment plans • Continued misunderstanding = frustration and lack of cooperation