

Assessment Advisory Council Minutes September 1, 2011 Babylon Student Center-Montauk Point Room 3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

In attendance: Dr. Jean Anastasia, Dr. Robert Beodeker, Richard Bliss, Michael Boecherer, Nicholas Bosco, Pina Arcomano Britton, Richard Britton, Dr. Donna Ciampa, John Cienski, Jennifer Farquhar, Dr. Gary Campbell, Carissa Forde, Cheryl Gillespie, Dr. Tina Good, Dr. Alex Kasiukov, Dr. Roslin Kahn, Dr. Dorothy Laffin, Dr. Christopher McDougal, Steve McIntosh, Dr. Patty Munsch, Dr. Jeffrey Pederson, Dr. Jean Nicholas Pestieau, Dr. Kathie Rogers, Gregory Sarafin, Bridget Young, Dr. Christopher Shults, Dr. Phil Christensen, Dr. Allen Jacobs, Dr, Nathaniel Pugh, James Lagonegro, Kathy Massimo, Dr. Lanette Raymond, Dr. Catherine Wynne

• Accreditation Update – Dr. Phil Christensen, Co-chairperson

After Dr. Christensen completed his presentation, Dr. Good asked a question about whether or not there is a Middle States standard that explicitly states that institutions must engage in assessment on an annual basis. Dr. Christensen responded that, to the best of his knowledge, there was no such standard. Dr. Shults then responded that at a Middle States meeting held at Nassau Community College in April of this year, Dr. Linda Suskie, a Middle States Vice-President, informed the gathering that continuous improvement, which is the terminology used by Middle States in reference to both institutional assessment and the assessment of student learning outcomes, requires annual evaluation and use of results. Dr. Shults then indicated to the group that Dr. Christensen and he would look into the matter and would let the council know what we found.

• Introducing an SCCC Assessment System – Dr. Nathaniel Pugh, Vice President, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

After Dr. Pugh completed his presentation, Dr. Good asked about the purpose of the document what the group is being asked to respond to. Dr. Pugh explained that the document was a communication tool and blueprint for how training for planning and assessment would occur across the campuses. Dr. Kathie Rogers then asked who would be responsible for determining when the campuses would be visited. Dr. Pugh responded that although months were listed, it was his hope that the executive deans, with collaboration from the campus leadership, would set up the meetings. Dr. Good then



requested that the document be sent electronically. Dr. Pugh stated that it would be sent out the next day to the entire council.

- Finalizing the Subcommittees Dr. Christopher Shults, Chairperson
 - Subcommittee rosters (proposed)

Dr. Shults asked the council to look at the subcommittee rosters and indicate if they were satisfied with their proposed placements. He then noted that two people in particular, Ms. Farquhar and Dr. Good, had multiple areas of experience and expertise and could reasonably serve on different committees. At that point, Ms. Farquhar indicated that she would like to speak with the library managers to find out whether they would prefer for her to serve on the Administrative and Educational Support units (AES) assessment or General Education Subcommittee.

• Subcommittee charges

After Dr. Shults made a brief presentation regarding the charges, Ms. Gillespie asked for clarification about the charges as it was difficult to determine what activities needed to be completed first. Dr. Good then added that the amount of work given to the subcommittees was substantial and that without release time from other activities or compensation, the amount of work was burdensome. Dr. Rogers agreed that there was simply too much work in the charges to be completed by the subcommittees. Dr. Shults then indicated to the council that the charges do not reflect all of the work that would be completed in one year, was based on the work that needs to be completed to build the college's planning and assessment systems, and that priorities would be set. He then reinforced to the council that all documents put forth are up for discussion and that their concerns were fair and reasonable. He asked the council to put forth some recommendations on how we could reconstruct the charges. There was much discussion among many members including Ms. Britton, Ms. Young, Dr. Laffin, Dr. Kahn, Dr. Kasiukov, Dr. Rogers, Dr. Good, and Mr. Sarafin with the conclusion that each of the subcommittees would receive amended charges that listed each charge by the semester in which it would be carried out. The subcommittees would then have the opportunity to review the charges and suggest areas where they be pared down if appropriate. Dr. Kasiukov then explained that his hope is that even with an ambitious set of charges, that the results from the subcommittees would be less, not more work for departments. He wants the subcommittees to put in the work on the front end to ensure better college-wide results later. Dr. Good then noted that it was her understanding that one of the primary charges of the AAC would be to provide budgetary recommendations based upon the results of the reviews. Dr. Shults noted that he had not been informed of this and that it was not in the new AAC charge, however, the proposed assessment templates included a section where



the units and programs of study would provide rationales for budget requests. She then noted that it was in the CAPIE. Dr. Shults agreed to check the CAPIE to assess the original intent of the AAC.

• Subcommittee support

Dr. Shults made a presentation explaining how the subcommittee chairs were chosen (areas of expertise, enthusiasm about the opportunities, and located within campuses), that each subcommittee would have an AAC co-chair as a liaison, and that he would be sitting on each subcommittee in an ex-officio capacity. He also noted that as the work of the subcommittees ramped up, we could make adjustments to how often the larger group met.

- Discussion about the *Implementing the CAPIE* Document Dr. Christopher Shults, Chairperson
- Discussion about the Assessment Manual Document Dr. Christopher Shults, Chairperson
- Discussion about other binder documents Dr. Christopher Shults, Chairperson

Before starting, Dr. Shults noted that all of the documents were provided for reference and planning purposes and that he would not be putting the word draft on any documents given the fact that we have so many documents currently with draft on them and that they were living, breathing documents created for the benefit of the council. Dr. Good asked for some clarification regarding when the documents would be approved and finalized, especially the Assessment Manual. Dr. Shults explained that he felt this particular document would never be final as it is a best practices and support manual that should grow, change, and evolve as best practices and vocabulary changes. He also noted that when the planning and assessment website is fully operational, the document would be accessible to all college members. Dr. Good suggested that reviewing the documents as a committee would be cumbersome and suggested that a small subcommittee should be established to review the documents and to bring recommendations back to the larger group. She explained that better recommendations would come from engaging in small group dialogue rather than reviewing the document in isolation. Dr. Kahn disagreed with the notion that a small group of members should bring forth recommendations to the council based on her concern that the findings would not necessarily reflect the opinions of the entire council. She emphasized her desire to retain her right of review.



At this point, Mr. Sarafin (the Ammerman student representative) spoke up and suggested that if the subcommittees will be meeting anyway, they could engage in small group reviews and then bring the suggestions forward through the subcommittee liaisons. Indicating that the ACC has not established any formal parliamentary procedures, Dr. Shults asked if we could vote on Mr. Sarafin's suggestion in order to move forward. When asked whether the subcommittee would approve Mr. Sarafin's suggestion, the majority raised their hands with an "aye" vote.

• Gathering Evidence of Continuous Improvement – *Dr. Allen Jacobs, Co-chairperson*

Dr. Jacobs provided a brief presentation indicating that he had collected data from the program review documents indicating areas where improvements had occurred as a result of the assessment portions of the program review. He also noted that Dr. Shults had concerns about the amount of evidence and would be crafting a document to collect the information needed for the Periodic Review Report.