NORTHLAND
COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Assessment & Program Review Committee
Meeting Agenda & Minutes - 9/19/2012

3:00 PM - 4:00 PM, Oct. 31, 2012 | Location: Polycom: EGF, Rm 301; TRF, Rm 662

Meeting Objectives
- Agree on Committee Work plan & Communication for year
- Determine Program Review Data needs and location/availability
- ILO Assessment Project - rubric updates

Agenda

1. Approve Minutes
2. Last Meeting Follow-up
   a. Program Review
3. New Business
   a. Meeting Schedule for year
   b. Communication for year (i.e. Google Docs?)
   c. Program Review Process 2012-2013
      i. Data needed - Sherry L.
      ii. Program List
      iii. Launch meetings
   d. ILO Assessment - 2012-2013
      i. Review data from Inservice Worksheet
      ii. Review new rubric: Applied & Information Technology
4. Any Other Business
5. Next Meeting

Attendees

Andy Mueller,Beth McMahon, Brian Huschle, Cassie Hilts, Jim Jesme, Jim Retka, Jeff Bell, Peggy Rogers, Steve Crittenden, Tishara Melcher
Not present: Jodi Stassen, Brian Suckow, Jim Jesme

Note-taker

Mary Jo Bydal

Minutes

Meeting schedule, trying new schedule of one hour meeting once a month. Beth asked anyone has any issues with new schedule. Tishara won't be able to make about ⅔ of meeting times, asked about getting subs for meetings. Tishara will ask Jodi about to get subs for meeting, will try to work it out with Jodi.

Use of google docs, do people still like to use google docs. May need to change how documents are archived so they are not lost in the see of material. Beth asked about using Share Point for archiving documents. Jeff, Peggy agreed to stay with google docs. Andy asked about saving documents in google docs, but is fine with it. Beth will send out an email to the committee members about their google information to give everyone access to google docs.

Comprehensive program review plan. Brian - last year many of the program requested data while they were working on review, that is difficult if not impossible to obtain. Brian had conversation with Kent about demographic information, Kent said he is not worried about demographics specially, but wanted to know the geographic area that students are coming from.   Sherry believes that she can sort applicants by their declared major (zip, state, origin-home address). She would need some clarification of what information people are interested in, home address versus where they actually live. Sherry can look up information by subject area or program area (gender breakdown, ethnicity), but some of those data may not reflect what students are actually in the program at that time. Some of issues with demographics may be due to the fact that Brian was using the 2008 review form, which is not addresses as strongly in the new form, 2010. So some of the issues with demographic data may be less of an issue with the new, 2010 version. Brian asked if we wanted to add an item about the need for demographic data about student origin, Sherry is looked up Welding data as a model to see if the data on student origin - home address could be located. Sherry is able to pull data showing students origin- home address and their most current zip code. So it is possible for Sherry to let programs know zip data, but not sure if that data is useful in terms of marketing. The origin information is only for the state, not a very specific location. It may more useful for program faculty to gather data from their students about how they heard about Northland. But, if college isn't going to market for each program, not sure if that information may be useful. Tishara -if we move to that step it would be useful to have information. It was determined to remove the need for demographic information about geographic location for the program review instructions.

 Beth asked the committee to look through the program review document to look for any changes, page by page, looking for clarification/addition/deletion. No specific questions, issues on the document was brought up. The logo for the form needs to be updated. Beth, Brian - we need to send out the information to those programs that need to do program reviews this year. The timeline listed for program review is fall for launch, submit draft by February 1st, and present to committee and deans on April 1st. In the past we have deviated from process of the program faculty presenting to the committee. So we need to either start having faculty present to the committee or remove from instructions. The current procedure is that the

committee reviews the documents, which will slow down the process, but if an administrator (Brian) looks through them then that draft date could be moved back to March 1st. Beth asked that their would be a report back to the committee about the program reviews. Beth asked the committee if they are interested in reading and going through these program reviews. Beth asked if a statement should be added the committee members are available for help with putting together the program reviews, instead of committee reviewing each report. The document will also be amended to say that the program faculty will not need to present to the committee. Brian will have Jodi, and Jim help out in reviewing the program reviews and at the end of the year there will be a report to the committee. Jim asked if at the end of the process if any action is done regarding the program review. Beth- there is a disconnect between program review and assessment. Brian - programs that putting together their second program review, should start from their old plans and determine what worked and what did not and why. The timeline for program review is 5 years, which means all data should be from the past 5 years, which will be better communicated to faculty.

ILO assessment -at inservice we requested a worksheet about the two new rubrics, Global and Civic Responsibility and Applied Technology and what courses and assessments they will use. The data is being compiled right now. There has been many faculty asking about the applied technology rubric and that it may need to be reworked. Andy, Tishara, and both Brians will form a task group to look at the rubric. Brian will organize the meeting and send out emails. Beth asked for timelines, rubric will be reworked by next meeting and we will we look at the information Mary Jo is compiling from the faculty about the two rubrics. Focus of November meeting will be to look at the data from the communication and critical thinking rubrics and where that data should be archived.

Brian - confirmed list of programs that will be under review this year - Auto, AVIA, Construction, Marketing, RN Nursing, PN Nursing, PTA, OTA, Respiratory Therapy, and Massage Therapy. Brian - since PN is going through accreditation not sure if it is helpful to have them go through program review. Liberal arts will be not under review this year, but should be next year. Brian made it clear that there are state mandates that all technical programs undergo a 5 year review, and also something the Higher Learning Commission is interested in seeing.
Adjourn - 4:01 pm

Action Items

- ...
- ...

Future Meeting Agenda Items

- Personal Development Rubric
- Program Assessment Results
-

Meeting Schedule 2012-2013

Distance Ed. Committee – all at 3:00 PM (mostly Wednesdays/ one Tuesday)
- ○ *Wednesday, 9/19/12*
- ○ *Wednesday, 10/31/12*
- ○ *Wednesday, 11/28/12*
- ○ *Tuesday, 12/18/12*
- ○ *Wednesday, 1/30/13*
- ○ *Wednesday, 2/27/13*
- ○ *Wednesday, 3/20/13*
- ○ *Wednesday, 4/24/13*