

# Assessment Task Force

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
<b>10/15/06</b>	<b>7:40 AM</b>	<b>Albuquerque</b>
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Carmen Santana-Melgoza	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	Renee Wharton	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Wilfred Beaupre, Jozi DeLeon, Karen Luper, Andi Penner, Samantha Ortiz, Carmen Santana-Melgoza, Mary Snaden, Lisa Wilson, Renee Wharton, Carole Yee	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	Julie Bales, Bruno Bornet, Anne Campbell, Teresa Crafton, Erin O'Neil, I Robin Jones, Marsha Lichtenstein, Anita Roastingear, Larry Skogen, James Spengler, Beth Walker, Susan Wood	
<b>GUESTS:</b>	Anna Chieffo for Susan Wood – NMSU Dona Ana Joyce Hill for Jary Rupe – NMSU Alamogordo	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
<b>Roll Call</b>		<b>Carmen Santana-Melgoza</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Roll was called at 8:40 AM	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.		
2.		
3.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>NMHEAR Conference Update</b>		<b>Carmen</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Members of the Task Force were urged to attend NMHEAR Conference. Members can register online by using the member's link. The conference will be held February 22-23 in Albuquerque. There is a double time slot reserved on Thursday for panel discussions with The Assessment Task Force.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Need for planning session prior to NMHEAR conference	Carmen	Following January meeting???	
2. Institutions interested in presenting need to begin thinking about presentations		By January meeting	
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Ideas for Panel Discussion</b>		<b>Carmen</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Suggestions included presentations on best practices at different levels. San Juan stated they could present their set of rubrics and model for student outcomes. Other suggestions included institutions identifying 5 or 6 larger tasks and showing how action plans resulted. It was suggested that since several schools (San Juan, CNM, Donna Ana, and NMJC) had agreed to present their rubrics and models that we might consider poster presentations. Jozi DeLeon stated that the panel discussion could be a chance to look at competencies and how they are embedded in assessment plans. Another way to present could be through chronological sequencing to show the different stages of assessment. Poster presentations could roll into chronological history and end with an over-all view of assessment. Showing where general education as well as other areas fit into the bigger picture of assessment would be very helpful.</p> <p>Panel presentations need to include competencies. This should generate discussion. People need to understand how the competencies came to be – the work that groups such as Math and English articulation have been doing for some time. The competencies resulted from the work of these groups.</p> <p>There needs to be a planning session for the panel discussion and materials at the January meeting. Individual institutions were encouraged to complete the process to present at the conference. NMJC asked if they would be interested in how they have begun implementation of TracDat to assist in tracking assessment outcomes.</p>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Three or four individuals from the task force would serve on the panel. Others can prepare poster presentations. Depending on the time and number of poster presentations, we can either provide a brief introduction to each poster or discuss a few that represent different stages of assessment. Following the panel discussion, individuals could come and visit with individual schools to learn more and ask questions of the poster session participants.		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
1. Get with Susan about actual time frame for session – 45min, 15 min break, 45 min or solid block of time	Carmen	As soon as possible
2. Send TracDat information to Carmen	Renee Wharton	As soon as possible
3.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>NMHEAR Individual Presentation Discussions</b>			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion surrounding the different types of need for assessment information.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Conference attendees still need help in seeing the larger assessment picture. Yet, new people to assessment can still benefit from sessions such as Assessment 101.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>National Assessment Institution</b>		<b>Carmen</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The NAI presents a conference at the end of October every year in Indianapolis. It is worth attending.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Send link to NAI website		Carmen	As soon as possible
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Templates		Carmen and Jozi	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>At the last meeting it was decided that a common template would be designed to assist with reporting. Carol from NM Tech suggested not choosing just one template but putting all the choices out to the institutions. If an institution is currently using a particular template, it would take time to transfer to a new template that had essentially the same information on it. While everyone agreed that many institution's templates would serve as good models, we still needed some sense of consistency and at the minimum a list of data elements that must be included. There also needs to be a better sense of how to use templates. Jozi agreed and said that the Task Force needs to make recommendations to establish consistency across the board on how to best use the form and how it ties to competencies of distinctive groups. Many institutions need more information and need recommendations. Recommendations from Spellings Report imply consistency. If there isn't a monitor, why are we doing?</p>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>The Task Force's role is to make good recommendations. The main reason for monitoring is to ensure transferability – to ensuring courses are transferable and that all institutions have confidence that students are getting similar background no matter what institution they attend. The Task Force doesn't want to have to look at an institution because they haven't done the work. They want to deal with institutions on good faith that they are doing what should be done for assessment.</p> <p>One suggestion is to use the template (such as used for the 2005-2006 Assessment Report for Freshman Writing) could have a column added at the end to identify how assessment results are being used. Or we need to ensure that common elements are identified so we can include in our own templates. It shouldn't be as rigid as a template.</p>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
General Education Courses			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Do courses actually submitted truly belong in gen. ed. Common core?		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Institutions need to assess for themselves what belongs and what doesn't.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			

2.		
3.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
HED Website			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The templates on the HED website are used to submit new courses for general education. They need to be changed.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Joze DeLeon requested that anyone with suggestions send them to her		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Task Force members will email Jozi suggestions on what needs to be on website or what needs to be changed	All Task Force Members	As soon as possible	
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Discussion about recognition-incentives for modeling for peers			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Who are the internal stakeholders for posting of institutional plans? Is the audience within the institution or external only? Discussion ranged from sanctions to highlighting best practices.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The state is moving towards a system of more accountability. We need to do it ourselves rather than have it done for us. Assessment should be driving decisions of institutions. Assessment doesn't end when the forms are filled out. What we are doing with the results is the important factor.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Communication			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Lack of internal institutional communication is a problem. The CAO's received existing Gen. Ed. Courses to meet competencies when they met last year. New submissions were announced a year ago. The new courses were due October 19 <sup>th</sup> . Part of the problem is that no single office at an institution is responsible for HED reporting. The member may take the information back to his/her classroom but that's as far as it goes. They may not have the authority to communicate the ideas and recommendations to anyone else.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Agreed, internal and external communication can be a problem.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			
2.			
3.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Meeting adjourned 8:50am		Carmen	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			
2.			
3.			