

Minutes from the October 12, 2007, New Mexico Assessment Task Force meeting

NMSU Albuquerque Center, 1-3 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Carmen Santana-Melgoza at 1:10 p.m.

In attendance:

Introductions: The members in attendance introduced themselves and welcomed new attendees.

1. There was a brief recap of the September meeting in Santa Fe; overview discussion centered on Dr. Flores' address to the committee, particularly about his comments dealing with "the law" and our assignment. Brief discussion ensued about the original "charge" of the committee.
2. Discussion then arose about, "where to go from here?" given the Santa Fe meeting with Dr. Flores. Attempts were made to make sense of what might be a conflicting message from HED.
3. Brief conversation ensued about articulation issues, such as: Are courses equivalent? How are colleges assessing that the courses are teaching the same material? Is there consistency in reporting the equivalency of transferring? Is assessment taking place to validate the articulation?
4. Marsha Lichtenstein presented a DRAFT Proposal for discussion, REPORTING OPTIONS FOR NM COLLEGES. This was presented due to the responses that the original proposal does not have sufficient "meat". Several statements were made establishing support for a "common form", which differs from the original Draft (7-16-07). This is to be a form for "common reporting", not to be a "rubric". and will result in an explicit list giving options.
5. Robin Kuykendall from Clovis Community College presented their form. This led to some mutual appreciation of the material and agreement that a common form could be worked out.
6. Discussion ensued about concerns of "who" are we doing the assessment for? Who is the audience? It appears that it is still unclear who will review that the template has been followed and each course meets articulation requirements. Is the assessment Task Force a "police" group? Or is this a duplication of what is already done? If so, why do it? Renee Wharton stated that this might provide evidence about what is being accepted, and what is not. Comments were made that if the legislature is the audience there could be serious implications with the resulting information. Agreement was reached that, "If we do this for Student Learning, the students are the right reason for assessment". As such, assessing the competencies is the right way to go.
7. Discussion proceeded suggesting that information should be presented at NMHEAR in February, about the peer audience and who the assessment is for. After a common form is developed common subjects would get together for each area to discuss how to evaluate. References were made to the April 2006 minutes suggesting similar issues at that time.
8. A subcommittee will develop a template which can serve as a common form. Patrice Caldwell will chair the subcommittee, along with Marsha Lichtenstein, Robin Kuykendall and other

volunteers. They will have something to present to Carmen by the November meeting. This work could lead to the Articulation Task Force revisiting their list of courses.

9. A question then arose about reporting. Interpretation is that the law talks about "...the commission....shall report.... Is it this task force or another entity? Carmen will draft and send out to this task force a response for review and comment to be presented to the Articulation Task Force.
10. Discussion then centered on NMHEAR and the need to remind faculty to SAVE THE DATE, remind them about the website. Suggestions were made about setting up poster sessions and round tables to make attendees aware of the developments over the year. There is still time for proposals until November 19. There is a two hour allotment for the Assessment Task Force. Several comments were made in support for a Poster session by this Task force, and for roundtables for each competency. It was agreed that we should solidify the presentations for NMHEAR by the November meeting. We also need to decide about the December meeting, whether to hold it or not due to the proximity to the Governor's Summit.
11. Carmen reminded the attending members to send her the name and other pertinent information of anyone involved with assessment on their campus.
12. Chris Burnham agreed to post his paper "...as a corporate piece..." The committee concurred with the need to have the paper posted to HED. Carmen will circulate to the Committee Chris' paper for comment.
13. Pat Seitz reminded the members about the CNM conference on October 19<sup>th</sup>.
14. Public "thanks you's" were made to Carmen and her efforts in keeping us together and moving forward.
15. Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.