



**Northland Community & Technical College**  
**Assessment and Program Review**  
**May 1, 2007 10:00am-12:00pm**  
**Room 106**  
 (Committee approval forthcoming.)

**Attendees:** Jeff Thomas, Kate Schmalenburg, Mike Normandin, Michelle Thomas, Dorinda Sorvig, Kent Hanson, Andy Mueller, Dennis Wierima, Kerry Jaegar, David Christian, reporter: Renee Kringlen

Topic	Discussion/Outcome
1. Welcome	
2. Review of Minutes from March 21, 2007	Make changes and post.
3. Additional Agenda Items	None
4. Report on Program Review (Avis)	Nothing to report as Avis was absent from meeting. - There is a need for a summary of highlights indexing important information and research as well as indexing a data base of program reviews.
5. Report on Program Assessment (AI)	Witnessed good sessions during the April meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AI went over the Automotive Assessment and mentioned a few things that should be changed or added. Instructional cost could have more information, for example the average cost over the years configured from the spreadsheet that Mary Jo sends out.</li> <li>Kent would like to see added information where implications should lead to action plan.</li> <li>The APRC would like to go public with some of the program reviews to create a marketing tool.</li> <li>Prompts should be taken out of the final report.</li> <li>Need to get changes to Mary Jo (Renee) for the Automotive assessment report.</li> </ul>
6. Report on survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All are in virtual office. Several have tested the link. Overall, people have a good</li> </ul>

activities (Michelle and Susan)	<p>understanding of what they need to do with the exit surveys. There is still some confusion about what constitutes a test versus a survey. A few people come to Michelle with a test, suggesting that it is a survey. There is a need to clarify this issue, communicating what the tool is all about. Lori Anderson's exit survey is an excellent tool, a "survey-test" combination that may be used as a model; however, the survey portion lies in the interpretation of the results. The only way you fail at this (survey process) is not to do it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kent mentioned that Dorinda and Barb (Nursing) sent feedback on the nursing survey. Nursing will collect all data and update the survey for next year. Discussion ensued about the way the questions were asked. Some concerns stem from not knowing what program responses were referring to. Programs need to communicate on both campuses to resolve this issue. Could the survey have separate programs and degrees at the top so it is easier to clarify?</li> </ul>
7. Assessment Organizational Chart –	Tabled until next meeting as Kerry forgot to bring the up-dated version to the meeting.
8. In-service from April 9th-	<p>Comments were very positive. Super impressed by the reports. Even those that did not report felt that they were on track.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State of Assessment reports are posted on virtual office.</li> <li>• Kent thought that the April in-service went well. Negative comments were only that they had their assessments done. Alas . . . we cannot please everyone.</li> <li>• Kerry did not like the fact that people missed the in-service because they wanted to take a personal day. Some of these individuals come to him after the fact, taking time away from his office/student/class duties to bring them up-to-date so assessment report can be completed on time. The reason for the April in-service was to provide faculty with the opportunity to meet and solidify their assessment process, the very reason requested by faculty—"need the time to meet!" The April in-service served to inform faculty of what they needed to know and to do in the stages of the assessment process. Failure to attend creates hassles for all involved in the assessment process, creating extremely frustrating circumstances.</li> <li>• Liberal Arts survey needs to be reduced.</li> <li>• Assessments need to be done yearly.</li> <li>• Assessment is a continues process. Yearly assessments feed into the 5 year review report. That way, the assessment process is always updated. The 5 year review stems from data collected during the yearly assessment process. Once given "birth" (yearly assessments), programs need to continue to nurture ("feed") the process.</li> <li>• Emphasis should be place on tracking the 1-2 year assessment process, surveys, and data collection.</li> <li>• Program must submit a "State of Assessment" report to the deans yearly.</li> <li>• 5 year program reviews are due when scheduled.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kent wondered who will fill out the Liberal Arts assessment report. Thought was divided: it is up to “disciplines/departments” to have information to give the Division Chairs so that they can put all data together. LA assessment report needs to be completed for this year. Liberal Arts need to be in progress; there is not enough data for developing an action plan as yet. Current survey data should be part of the LA assessment report. The administration wants some level of report from Liberal Arts for this year.</li> </ul>
9. Goals for 2007-2008	<p>Kerry is stepping down. He thanks the committee for the experience. Remember, this committee is handling academics and only academics (i.e., Student learning).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue assessment process.</li> <li>Keep close records on the response rates of the surveys. Determine the best ways to increase responses.</li> <li>Address concerns over facilitating the assessment process. Are we going to be able to continue to have two people in the facilitating role, one for each campus? Are we going to have the same support people?</li> <li>Although the assessment process, per se, is in full swing, it is no more than a dress rehearsal, a dynamic piece that needs reshaping as more information/data comes in.</li> <li>Focus a campaign for 2009-2010 HLC visit. Need to send a message to the faculty that a “command performance” performance is coming.</li> <li>The APRC is sending the issue with the matrix program back to the Academic Affairs Committee (with love) in light of union and contractual issues.</li> </ul>
10. Oct. Meeting Date	discuss at fall in service.
11. Other	<p><b>Committee members leaving after the 2007 academic year:</b> Kerry Jaeger, Kate Schmalenberg, and Tim Reuter. The APRC needs 2 EGF and 1 TRF faculty for FY08, and an election for a chair. Additional committee members need consideration. It was suggested that an IT person join the committee and a Division Chair. Both would increase effectiveness in their areas as well as create a better network for communication of the assessment process. The committee suggested to maintain the current link (Co-chair David Christian) with Academic Affairs.</p>
12. Meeting Adjourned	<b>12:00 pm</b>