



# Progress Report

on Assessment of Student Learning

December 1, 2008

# **Progress Report on Assessment of Student Learning**

**Submitted by: New Mexico Junior College**

**December 1, 2008**

## **Historical Perspective**

During our most recent 2005 North Central Association (NCA) accreditation visit, New Mexico Junior College (NMJC) was cited for failing to develop, to document, and to implement a systemic, multilevel, and comprehensive assessment plan that utilized data for learning improvement. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) expressed the following expectations for NMJC, and in this written report the college will demonstrate how attempts are being made to address each of these expectations.

- Development of student learning outcomes at both the course and program level;
- An institutional-level assessment plan that includes learning goals for all program areas, a realistic timeline, a data collection process, actual interpretation of data, and evidence of data-driven decisions that result in improvement of student learning;
- A true function “to close the loop”, and;
- Development of an action plan by the faculty based on assessment and expected outcomes to make changes for the next semester, year, and beyond.

## **Institutional Response**

In addressing the development of student learning outcomes at the course and program-level, the college has broadened its strategy to include course-level assessment along with department/program and institutional assessment plans.

### ***Course Assessment***

Concerning course assessment, in the spring of 2008 faculty members were charged with the task of beginning an evaluation of their course-specific learning outcomes. The faculty was required to enter into a data system (TracDat) defined outcomes, assessment methods (including benchmarks), observations, and action plans. Action plans included specific notation addressing how the faculty planned to improve that particular course in subsequent semesters based on the findings. This task functions to “close the loop” in the assessment process. Faculty was also encouraged to record classroom assessment techniques (CATs) and/or rubrics into the data system. Since the onset of course-specific assessment, NMJC has realized a 15% increase from spring 2008 to fall 2008 in the numbers of full-time faculty submitting course-specific learning outcomes. Over 70% of the college’s full-time faculty is actively participating in this process and the college aspires to reach 100% faculty participation next year.

The general education assessment process, which will be described later in this document, was a vital component of the overall course-level assessment and the NMJC faculty performed in an exemplary fashion in submitting 100% of the required documentation. The quality and expedience of the faculty submissions allowed NMJC to be the first of the New Mexico colleges and universities to submit its general education assessment report which went well beyond the minimum state requirements.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) monitors faculty assessment plan submissions and is available as a resource to assist faculty. Attached are several examples of course assessment plans

prepared and submitted by faculty (See Attachment A). Additionally, the following timeline is followed in regard to course-level assessment:

1. Defined outcomes and assessment methods/benchmarks are input into TracDat at the beginning of the semester the course is offered.
2. Observations are entered as collected throughout the semester.
3. Action plans are input into TracDat and summary reports are generated within three weeks after the end of the semester. These reports are reviewed by department chairs/deans and the findings are discussed with the faculty before the subsequent semester the course is offered.
4. Changes for improvement in student learning are implemented in subsequent semesters that the course is offered.

### ***Department/Program Assessment***

Program-level assessment began in the spring of 2004. Each department/program worked as a team to develop three to five general objectives which were to be used to guide student learning outcomes. The learning outcomes, strategies for evaluating expected outcomes (assignments/measures), benchmarks, related institutional student learning outcomes, results, analysis, and action plans have been entered into a data system for the past four years. The action plans included specific notation addressing how the faculty planned to improve that particular course in subsequent semesters based on the findings. As a further development, beginning in 2007, the faculty entered the above data into TracDat.

The following timeline has been implemented for department/program assessment plans submitted by designated "writers."

- 1) The outcome, assessment, and benchmark to be evaluated is selected and defined the semester prior to the semester being assessed.
- 2) During the semester selected for assessment, data is collected (observations) and action plans are developed based on the findings of the data collected.
- 3) Final action plans and TracDat summary reports are generated in the subsequent semester. These reports are reviewed by department chairs/deans and the findings are discussed with faculty involved in these programs before the subsequent semester the courses involved are offered.
- 4) Changes for improvement in student learning within the programs are implemented.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) monitors faculty assessment plan submissions and is available as a resource to assist faculty. Attached are several examples of assessment plans submitted by departments/programs (See Attachment B).

### ***Institutional Assessment***

Institutional-level assessment processes began with three initial student learning outcomes: communication, critical thinking/problem solving, and self & community. Institutional rubrics have been developed for each of these outcomes and scoring teams for each outcome were selected. The scoring

teams consist of three fulltime faculty members, one from each of the college divisions (Arts & Humanities, Math & Sciences, and Careers & Technology). Each member serves over a period of one academic year and the team is responsible for assessing 50 artifacts per semester. To strengthen the assessment process by adding consistency and continuity, each scoring team is assigned a team liaison who is a member of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC). The liaison is requested to serve no less than a two year term. The liaison meets initially with the scoring team to standardize scoring of the rubric and make available copies of the artifacts to the scoring teams. The courses supplying artifacts are selected by the Vice President for Instruction by a random selection process and professors of the selected classes are notified the semester prior to required delivery.

The scoring of artifacts has been taking place since spring of 2007. Communication was the first outcome to be formally assessed by the scoring teams. Critical thinking/problem solving began in the fall of 2007 while self & community began in spring of 2008. During the first year following each of the outcomes being assessed, the SLOAC used feedback from the scoring team members to refine the institutional assessment process. Minutes from the meetings of the SLOAC demonstrate the processes undertaken on this initiative (See Attachment C). Upon sharing of the data with the faculty, an action plan to address strengths and weaknesses discovered through the analysis was generated by the faculty.

Additionally, data collected from the scoring teams was submitted to the OIE and analyzed. Once analyzed, the results were given to the SLOAC for discussion. To close the loop, in the fall of 2008 the analysis of data was shared with the faculty. An action plan to address strengths and weaknesses discovered through this process was generated based on input from the faculty (See Attachment D).

The following timeline has been implemented for institutional assessment plans defined by the SLOAC committee:

- 1) Prior to each traditional 15-week semester, a liaison, scoring team members, and courses that will submit artifacts are identified.
- 2) At the beginning of the semester in which the assessment is taking place, artifacts are delivered to the scoring teams via the liaison.
- 3) Data generated from the scoring team is delivered to OIE from the liaison prior to the end of that semester.
- 4) OIE analyzes the data and presents the results to the SLOAC for discussion.
- 5) The SLOAC presents these results to the faculty.
- 6) After input from the faculty, an action plan to improve student learning is generated.
- 7) Based on recommendations from the faculty, plans are established to provide resources to improve these student learning outcomes.

Attached are several examples of executive summaries generated from the collection of artifacts and scoring process that is included in NMJC's institutional portfolio reflecting analysis, results, and action plans (See Attachment C).

## ***General Education Assessment***

NMJC has taken substantial steps in regard to general education. In June of 2007, a philosophy of general education was adopted by faculty (see below). This philosophy serves as the core of the assessment process for all transfer students.

General education is an important component of students' education at New Mexico Junior College. In order to be a well-educated, successful, and valuable participant in the rapidly changing local, state, national, and global community, students need to be conversant with a broad-based understanding of various educational disciplines. The general education core of the program of study for an associate degree or certificate helps students develop a greater understanding of themselves, of their relationship with others, and of the diverse world in which they live. The general education experience provides students with opportunities to explore broad areas of commonly held knowledge and prepares them to contribute to society through personal, social, and professional interactions with others. Upon completion of their degrees, these students will enter a world in which they can expect to hold different jobs and perhaps a series of careers over the course of their lives. In order to prepare for this exciting and challenging future, students will need to become familiar with past achievements, present developments, and future possibilities. During the course of their freshman and sophomore years, students should seek to enlarge their historical, aesthetic, cultural, literary, scientific, and philosophical perspectives, to improve their critical and analytical thinking, and to enhance their skills in locating, managing, and communicating information. The general education experience fosters students' personal development by exposing them to new directions, perspectives, and processes.

Additionally, NMJC has undertaken curricular mapping of all general education courses and the faculty has committed to a three-year assessment rotation of all general education courses. The format of the general education report requires an assessment of general education courses as listed under Area I Communication, Area II Mathematics, Area III Natural Sciences, Area IV Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Area V Fine Arts and Humanities. For each of these areas, state focus groups have stipulated prescribed competencies that must be assessed for that area. Using TracDat, faculty submit their plans to assess the outcomes, the results of the assessment process, and how these results will be used to strengthen and improve their courses. This assessment process takes place throughout the year and the date of reporting to the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) is September 30 of each calendar year. The initial submission to HED was September 30, 2008 and can be found at [www.nmjc.edu](http://www.nmjc.edu).

### **Executive Summary**

New Mexico Junior College has taken substantial steps in the continuing improvement of its assessment processes which support NMJC's mission to "promote success through learning." Since our most recent

HLC accreditation visit, the college has undertaken the following modifications to its assessment policies:

- Onset of course-based assessment;
- Broadening of department/program and institutional assessment procedures and sharing of data with all constituencies to serve as the function to “close the loop”;
- Development of an action plan by the faculty based on assessment and expected outcomes to implement changes for the next semester, year, and beyond, and;
- Adoption of a defined philosophy of general education and the completion of a first year report regarding the assessment of general education courses.

NMJC will continue to evolve its assessment policies and procedures, and the college believes that the measures taken to date will greatly enhance the usefulness of the data gathered and will allow all constituencies of the college to make use of assessment results in planning for improvement in learning for future student cohorts. All of the above cited modifications and improvements will be reflected in an updated Assessment of Student Learning Handbook which will be completed by the end of this academic year.

# Attachment A

## New Mexico Junior College Course Assessment Plans

Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives  
 New Mexico Junior College  
 Course-Bus-AC124/10065 Principles of Accounting II

**Course-Bus-AC124/10065 Principles of Accounting II**

**Outcome: Analytical skills**

The student will develop analytic skills.

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Practice Sets: AC 124	The student should have a competency of 85% in measurable areas on their practice sets for Accounting 124		Yes

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
05/02/2008 - Students Met the competency standard in 9 out of 10 areas. The competency standard was 85% and we had an 84% in the General Ledger area <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> Areas of Weakness will be addressed next semester either with more lecture or more homework. <b>notes:</b> We have broken down Practice Sets in Measurable areas and scored them. This is based on an Assessment Rubric.	05/07/2008 - We will have to spend more time in Lecture and homework on the General Ledger area		Pending Follow-Up

Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives  
 New Mexico Junior College  
 Course-Anthro-AN123/10130 Intro to Cultural Anthro.

**Course-Anthro-AN123/10130 Intro to Cultural Anthro.**

**Outcome: Competency 1**

Students will identify, describe, and explain human behaviors and how they are influenced by social structures, institutions, and processes within the contexts of complex and diverse communities.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008

**End Date:** 05/02/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class was assigned a critical review project to locate two anthropological articles that each student independently researched. They were required to write one page for each article--answering a number of questions that were integrated with the four competencies agreed upon by the Social Sciences/Behaviorial Department in the critical review form/rubric.	For the AN123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, 70% of the total students in the class must make a 70% or better on the assignment that was given to them in a rubric.		Yes
<b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Assignment Rubrics			

**Observations**

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
Assignment Rubrics - 06/06/2008 - In the AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, ten students initially were present. Due to an illness, one student had to withdraw from the class. Of the remaining nine students, seven completed the assignment with 70% or more satisfactory responses on the rubrics.	06/06/2008 - The AN 123--CRN 10130 class Cultural Anthropology class met the requirements this semester. I plan to continue the project for assessment purposes next Spring--2009, when the class is offered again. I believe that immersing the students in historical and current research/writing is a must as it reinforces how human behaviors are influenced by various social structures, institutions, and processes within the numerous and diverse communities.		Loop Closed
<b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met			
<b>What will you do with this data?:</b> The AN 123--CRN 10130 class Cultural Anthropology class met the requirements this semester. I plan to continue the project for assessment purposes next Spring--2009, when the class is offered again. I believe that immersing the students in historical and current research/writing is a must.			

**Outcome: Competency 2**

Students will articulate how beliefs, assumptions, and values are influenced by factors such as politics, geography, economics, culture, biology, history, and social institutions.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008

**End Date:** 05/02/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
In the AN 123-- CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, the students were assigned a critical review/rubric that required each of them to locate and research two anthropological	AN 123-CRN--10130 Cultural Anthropology--70% of the students in the class must make		Yes

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active

articles; write a one page paper over each article; and answer a number of questions that connected the questions given out with a rubric to the four competencies that the Social/Behaviorial Sciences Department agreed upon.

**Assessment Method Category:**

Assignment Rubrics

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status

Assignment Rubrics - 06/06/2008 - In the AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, there were a total of ten students who were enrolled. One student had to withdraw, due to an illness. Of the remaining nine students, seven completed the assessment assignment with 70% or more in satisfactory responses with the rubrics. Two students did not make at least a 70% on the assignment.

**Observation Type:**

Benchmark Met

**What will you do with this data?:**

In AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology, I plan to continue with the project. The class is scheduled for each Spring semester. There is a crucial need for students to research/write gaining additional skills in applying connections between the values and beliefs one holds to the numerous institutions, such as political, economic, geographical, one uses in communities across the entire world.

06/06/2008 - In AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology, I plan to continue with the project. The class is scheduled for each Spring semester. There is a crucial need for students to research/write gaining additional skills in applying connections between the values and beliefs one holds to the numerous institutions, such as political, economic, geographical, one uses in communities across the entire world.

Loop  
Closed

**Outcome: Competency 3**

Students will describe ongoing reciprocal interactions among self, society, and the environment.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008

**End Date:** 05/02/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active

In the AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, the students were assigned a critical review/rubric that required each of them to locate and research two anthropological articles; write a one-page paper over each article; and answer a number of questions that connected the questions given out with a rubric to the four competencies that the Social/Behaviorial Sciences Department agreed upon.

**Assessment Method Category:**

Assignment Rubrics

In AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class 70% of the total students should make 70% or more in satisfactory responses to the assigned rubrics.

Yes

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status

Assignment Rubrics - 06/06/2008 - In the AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, there

06/06/2008 - I plan to continue using the rubric assignments in AN 123

Loop  
Closed

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>were ten students that were initially enrolled. One student had to withdraw, due to an illness. Of the remaining nine students, seven students completed the rubric assignments with 70% or better in satisfactory responses to the rubrics. Two students did not attain at least 70% on the rubric assignments.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> I plan to continue using the rubric assignments in AN 123 Cultural Anthropology each spring that it is offered. I believe it is very important for students to be immersed in historical and current research since the course material that involves humankind, is constantly changing--in regard to the individual, community, and world.</p>	<p>Cultural Anthropology each spring that it is offered. I believe it is very important for students to be immersed in historical and current research since the course material that involves humankind, is constantly changing--in regard to the individual, community, and world.</p>		

#### Outcome: Competency 4

Students will apply the knowledge base of the social and behavioral sciences to identify, describe, explain, and critically evaluate relevant issues, ethical dilemmas, and arguments.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008

**End Date:** 05/02/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
<p>In the AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, the students were assigned a critical review/rubric that required each of them to locate and research two anthropological articles; write a one page paper over each article; and answer a number of questions that connected the questions given out with a rubric to the four competencies that the Social/Behavioral Sciences Department agreed upon.</p> <p><b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Assignment Rubrics</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">anthropology-rubric-2008.doc</a></p>	<p>70% of the total students in the class should make 70% or more in satisfactory responses to the rubrics constructed by the full time instructor.</p>		Yes

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>Assignment Rubrics - 06/06/2008 - In AN 123--CRN 10130 Cultural Anthropology class, there were a total of ten students enrolled. One student had to withdraw, due to an illness. Of the remaining nine students, seven of them completed the assignment with a 70% or better on the rubrics. Two students did not complete at least a 70% on the assignment.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> In AN 123 Cultural Anthropology, I plan to continue the project involving research/writing assignments. I believe that it is crucial for the students to be exposed to as much historical and</p>	<p>06/06/2008 - In AN 123 Cultural Anthropology, I plan to continue the project involving research/writing assignments. I believe that it is crucial for the students to be exposed to as much historical and current literature in the field as possible. One can certainly see the need when one is reading any Social/Behavioral Sciences journals, magazines, etc. that often allow the reader to examine ethical issues and problems that do exist in our world today.</p>		Loop Closed

**Observations**

<b>Observation</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Follow-Up</b>	<b>Observation Status</b>
current literature in the field as possible. One can certainly see the need when one is reading any Social/Behavioral Sciences journals, magazines, etc. that often allow the reader to examine ethical issues and problems that do exist in our world today.			

Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives  
 New Mexico Junior College  
 Course-Allied Health-HC112 Medical Terminology (Web Enh.)

**Course-Allied Health-HC112 Medical Terminology (Web Enh.)**

**Outcome: outcome #1**

All students will pass Medical Terminology with a score of 70 or better.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008

**End Date:** 05/02/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
The final grade of each student will be reviewed for pass rate of 70 or greater.	100% of HC112 students will demonstrate an understanding of Medical Terminology based on test and quiz scores.	Every semester	Yes

**Observations**

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
05/09/2008 - 2 students out of 39 failed the course with a score below 70% for 95% pass rate. These two students did not meet attendance or assignment requirements. <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> Continue to monitor and meet more frequently with students not attending or making an effort on assignments.			Loop Closed

**Outcome: Comprehension**

Students will be able to recognize ,pronounce,spell and construct words that are used in the medical field.

**Start Date:** 08/18/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Comprehensive final exam will reflect students comprehension of medical terms. <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Final Exam <b>How will you use this data?:</b> I will use this data to evaluate the current text book. <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Med Term Final Exam (paper).doc</a>	75% of students will pass with a 70 or better on completion of this class.	end of semester final exam	Yes

**Observations**

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives  
 New Mexico Junior College  
 Course-PE-PY111H/10234 Fitness for Life

**Course-PE-PY111H/10234 Fitness for Life**

**Outcome: Improvement of the heart rate**

The student will see a decrease in both the resting heart rate and exercise heart rate by the end of the class.

**Outcome Type:** SLO-Course Specific  
**Start Date:** 08/18/2008  
**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Check resting heart rate and exercise heart rate on workout days and record them daily. Check improvement at the end of the term.	70 per cent of the class will see an improvement in both heart rates	We do labs 2 times a week on Monday and Friday	Yes
<b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Clinical/Field Placement/Internship <b>How will you use this data?:</b> We will use the data to see if the workouts contain enough cardiovascular workouts to improve heart rates.			

**Observations**

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

**Outcome: Understand Lifetime wellness and fitness needs**

The student will know how to assess their own fitness needs and be able to set up their own fitness program to meet those needs.

**Start Date:** 01/14/2008  
**End Date:** 05/02/2008  
**Outcome Status:** Current

**Means of Assessment**

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
multiple choice/true false/completion exams	80% of the students who complete the class will be able to retain 70% of the information presented in the class	midterm/final exam	Yes
<b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Standardized Test			

**Observations**

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
Standardized Test - 05/12/2008 - 56% of the students who completed the class retained at least 70% of the information presented in the class.	05/12/2008 - I will spend more time reviewing relevant data for written testing		Pending Follow-Up
<b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> I will spend more time reviewing relevant data that pertains to the written tests.			

**Outcome: Improve muscular fitness**

The students on completion of the class will see and improvement in muscular strength and endurance.

**Outcome Type:** SLO-Course Specific

**Start Date:** 08/18/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Take a maximum lift in 3 lifts at beginning and end of the semester. Record the results and see if there was improvement. <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Clinical/Field Placement/Internship	70 % of the students will see an increase in their maximal lift capacities.	Lift Monday and Wednesday during labs.	Yes

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

## **Attachment B**

### **New Mexico Junior College Department/Program Assessment Plans**

# Assessment Plan

## New Mexico Junior College

### Program-Business

#### Program-Business

**Mission Statement:** The mission of the Business Department is to educate, mentor, and empower students to become accomplished business professionals and lifelong learners in a dynamic environment. Our goal is to serve the business community through programs and collaborative partnerships that enhance the intellectual and economic quality of our region. We are committed to enhancing student learning through effective and innovative methods of teaching.

**Outcome: Analytical skills**

The student will develop analytic skills.

**Outcome Type:** SLO-NMJC

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Practice Sets: AC 124	The student should have a competency of 85% in measurable areas on their practice sets for Accounting 124		Yes
Practice Sets : AC 223	The student should have a competency of 85% in measurable areas on their practice sets for Accounting 223		Yes
Practice Sets <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Capstone/Final Project	The Intermediate Accounting II students were required to build a set of books utilizing Excel. They were to build a Chart of Accounts, General Journal, General Ledger, Working Trial Balance, Financial Statements and Investment Plan. They were to submit a set of books then I would review and make recommendations for correction. They would then correct.		Yes
Practice Sets <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Capstone/Final Project	Everyone exceeded the Benchmark. All students that finished the class made an A on their practice set		Yes

**Related Courses**

- \* AC 223 - Intermediate Accounting II
- \* SC 123. - Keyboarding and Document Processing II

**Outcome: Communication**

The student will demonstrate communication skills applicable to the business environment.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Demonstration of an impromptu speaking technique using a three part rubric: BU223	80% of students in BU223 will be able to demonstrate an impromptu speaking technique using a three part rubric.	Spring Schedule	Yes
<b>What will you do with this data?:</b> For instructional improvement			

#### Related Courses

- \* BU 213G - Supervision
- \* BU 223B - Personnel Management
- \* BU 223C - Small Business Management
- \* SC 123. - Keyboarding and Document Processing II

#### Outcome: Think creatively

The student will develop the ability to think creatively

**Outcome Type:** SLO-Program Specific

**Outcome Status:** Current

#### Related Courses

- \* BU 223 - Business Communications

#### Outcome: Problem-solving

The student will develop problem-solving skills.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Online Quizzes: SC223D	80% of SC223D students will be able to complete the quizzes with at least 80% accuracy.	Every semester.	Yes
<b>What will you do with this data?:</b> To improve instruction and encourage the use of Practice Tests.			

#### Related Courses

- \* BU 213 - Principles of Management
- \* BU 213F - Personal Financial Management
- \* BU 213G - Supervision
- \* BU 223C - Small Business Management
- \* BU 233 - Business Statistics
- \* SC 113C - Business Mathematics

#### Outcome: Concepts & theories

The student will learn the main concepts and theories in the program.

**Outcome Type:** SLO-Program Specific

**Start Date:** 01/21/2008

**End Date:** 05/07/2008

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
<p>Comparison of exam grades before use of Aplia and after use of Aplia: EC213</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> This data will be used to evaluate whether Aplia is a useful tool to help students learn concepts and theories in NMJC's EC213 classes.</p>	Economics students who do their homework using Aplia will have higher exam grades than do students who do their homework without Aplia. The mean scores will improve by 10%.	Every Semester	Yes
<p>Self-report: EC213</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> This data will be used to evaluate whether Aplia is a useful tool to help students learn concepts and theories in NMJC's EC213 classes.</p>	50% of students in EC213 will report that Aplia helped them to learn concepts and theories of Economics.	Spring 2007 and Fall 2007	Yes
<p>Simulation for Records Management: SC133</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> This data will be used to evaluate whether allowing students to check the simulation as they do the work is a good teaching tool.</p>	All SC 133 students will be able to complete the Simulation correctly.	Fall 06	Yes
<p>Written report: BU113</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> To ensure students are learning basic business concepts and are able to apply them to real-world business analysis. Helps identify areas of weakness that need to be emphasized in future classes.</p>	80% of students in BU 113 will be able to successfully research a publicly traded company and prepare a written report which includes a description of the organization and its products, analysis of the management style of the CEO, and a brief financial analysis of the company.	Every semester	Yes
<p>Students in Principles of Management will complete a series of six essay assignments in which they will be asked to demonstrate their understanding of concepts and theories presented in the class.</p>	Students will achieve a grade of 70% or higher on the essays.		Yes

### Related Courses

- \* AC 213A - Microcomputer Accounting I
- \* BU 113 - Introduction to Business
- \* BU 213 - Principles of Management
- \* BU 213A - Principles of Finance
- \* BU 213G - Supervision
- \* BU 223C - Small Business Management
- \* BU 233 - Business Statistics
- \* EC 213 - Principles of Economics (Macro)
- \* SC 111A - Keyboarding on Microcomputers
- \* SC 113 - Keyboarding and Document Processing I
- \* SC 113B - Business Calculating Machines
- \* SC 113C - Business Mathematics
- \* SC 123. - Keyboarding and Document Processing II
- \* SC 123B - Introduction to Accounting
- \* SC 133 - Records Management

**Outcome: zArchive**

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Outcome: Use materials, tools & technology**

The student will develop skills in using materials, tools, and/or technology central to the department.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Survey of assignment completion in relation to exam scores. (PS213B Human Relations online)  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> For instructional improvement <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> For instructional improvement	50% of the students in the online ps213B Human Relations course for Spring'08 who complete their weekly chapter assignment will have higher exam scores than those that do not or are inconsistant with assignment completion.	Spring 2008	Yes
SC223D Microsoft Word Weekly Tests <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Standardized Test	85% of students wil pass the weekly test with a score of 80% or better.		Yes
SC123B Practice Set <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Standardized Test	80% if students will complete the practice set in SC123B with a grade of 85% or better.	Every Semester	Yes

**Related Courses**

- \* BU 213 - Principles of Management
- \* BU 213F - Personal Financial Management
- \* BU 213G - Supervision
- \* BU 223C - Small Business Management
- \* BU 233 - Business Statistics
- \* SC 113C - Business Mathematics

# Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives

## New Mexico Junior College Department-Languages

### Department-Languages

**Mission Statement:** The mission of the New Mexico Junior College Languages department is to provide second language instruction for the students we serve.

**Outcome: Comprehend, speak & write effectively**

The student will comprehend, speak, and write effectively in the target language.

**Outcome Status:** Current

#### Means of Assessment

Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Oral presentation in the target language: SP113  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> This data will be used to evaluate instructional techniques and presentation of the target language.	After completing the coursework for SP113, each student will be able to give a five minute oral presentation using the present and past tense to recall specific details from the Destinos storyline with fewer than 15 errors.	Every fall	Yes
Oral presentation in the target language: TS196  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> This data will be used to evaluate instructional techniques and presentation of the target language.	After completing the coursework for TS196, each student will be able to give a five minute oral presentation using the present and past tense to recall specific details from the Connect with English storyline with fewer than 15 errors.	Every spring	Yes

#### Related Courses

- \* SP 103 - Introduction to Spanish
- \* SP 114 - Beginning Spanish I
- \* SP 124 - Beginning Spanish II
- \* SP 213 - Intermediate Spanish I
- \* SP 223 - Intermediate Spanish II
- \* TS 196 - English As a Second Language I
- \* TS 296 - English As a Second Language II

#### Observations

Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
04/17/2008 - The benchmark was met by this class.  <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> I will continue to use the current teaching methods to encourage oral practice of the target language.			Loop Closed

**Outcome: Participate in the learning environment**

The student will participate in the learning environment when presented in the target language.

**Outcome Status:** Current

**Related Courses**

- \* SP 103 - Introduction to Spanish
- \* SP 114 - Beginning Spanish I
- \* SP 124 - Beginning Spanish II
- \* SP 213 - Intermediate Spanish I
- \* SP 223 - Intermediate Spanish II
- \* TS 196 - English As a Second Language I
- \* TS 296 - English As a Second Language II

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

**Outcome: Synthesize, summarize, develop & convey ideas**

The student will develop skills to synthesize, summarize, develop, and convey ideas and information in the target language.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

**Outcome: zArchive**

**Outcome Status:** Current

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
12/31/2006 - The assessment plans & results from the old assessment system can be found under "Related Data." <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Spanish.PDF</a>			Loop Closed

# Assessment Impact by Unit Objectives

## New Mexico Junior College Department-Mathematics

### Department-Mathematics

**Mission Statement:** The mission of the MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT at New Mexico Junior College is to serve its students by developing their competence in mathematics. Our mathematics course offerings allow students with diverse mathematical backgrounds flexibility in meeting their needs and schedules to achieve their educational and career goals.

#### Outcome: 2-Application of mathematical methods

The student will be able to apply mathematical methods already learned to new problems and situations.

**Outcome Type:** SLO-NMJC

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
<p>Common questions on final exams: MA 113A, MA 113, MA123, and TS113F</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We want to determine how well students have learned necessary skills from previous courses and possibly make changes to materials used or time spent teaching certain skills.</p>	<p>1- Final exam questions that directly address prior knowledge will have 70% of students scoring 2 or better. 2- Student work will demonstrate use of prior knowledge by accurately and neatly showing all steps necessary to solve the given problem.</p>	<p>Every semester</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Basic Math: No prior knowledge assumed. Elementary Algebra: Questions 1 and 3 use previous knowledge. Intermediate Algebra: Questions 4 and 5 use previous knowledge. College Algebra: Questions 2 and 4 use previous knowledge. Trigonometry: Questions 17 and 18 use previous knowledge.</p> <p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We will see if students are connecting previous skills to new techniques.</p>	<p>For each question, 70% of students will score 2, 3, or 4.</p>	<p>Every semester</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Test</p>			<p>Yes</p>
<p>Common questions on final exams: MA 113A, MA 113, MA123, and TS113F</p>	<p>1- Final exam questions that directly address prior knowledge will have 70% of students scoring 2 or better. 2- Student work will demonstrate use of prior knowledge by accurately and neatly showing all steps necessary to solve the given problem.</p>	<p>Every Semester</p>	<p>Yes</p>

#### Related Courses

- \* MA 113 - College Algebra
- \* MA 113A - Intermediate Algebra
- \* MA 113B - Statistics
- \* MA 113D - Mathematical Analysis with Business Applications I
- \* MA 113E - Mathematics for Elementary Teachers

- \* MA 114B - Technical Mathematics I
- \* MA 123 - Plane Trigonometry
- \* MA 123D - Mathematical Analysis with Business Applications II
- \* MA 144 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry I
- \* MA 154 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry II
- \* MA 233 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry III

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
03/30/2008 - Basic Math: N/A because no previous knowledge is assumed. Elementary Algebra: Questions 1 and 2 require use of order of operations and distributive property which are covered in Basic Math. Both of these questions scored above 70%. Intermediate Algebra: Questions 1 and 2 require students to recall previous knowledge. Question 1 was 68% and question 2 was 66%. College Algebra: Question 2 was 71% and Question 6 was 74%. <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met <b>notes:</b> Even though Intermediate Algebra was not at 70% we were pleased with the results on these two questions and will need to focus attention on other topics.			Loop Closed

**Outcome: 1-Synthesize & integrate information**

The student will demonstrate the ability to synthesize and integrate mathematical information and ideas.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Common questions on final exams  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We will use this to evaluate the effectiveness of the text books we currently use. We will also determine if changes to course outlines was effective (specifically Basic Math). We also want to determine the need for additional courses and the benefits of the technology used (MyMathLab).	Students will be able to solve common questions on final exams with 70% accuracy.	Every semester	Yes
Common final exams  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We will use this to evaluate the effectiveness of the text books we currently use. We will also determine if changes to course outlines was effective in better preparing students to move on to other course.	Students in Basic Math will be able to obtain 70% on the final exam.	Every semester	Yes
Common questions on final exams  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We will use this data to help determine if students are meeting key course objectives that will prepare them for subsequent courses.	For each common question, 70% of students will score 2 or better.	Every semester	Yes

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Common Questions on final exams	At least 70% of Basic Math students will score 70 or better on the final exam.	Every semester	Yes
<p><b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We use this data to determine if the objectives for each course are being met by the various types of course offerings (traditional, on-line, hybrid, ITV).</p>	At least 70% of Elementary Algebra, Intermediate Algebra, College Algebra and Trigonometry students will score 2, 3, or 4 on the common questions of the final exam.		

### Related Courses

- \* MA 113 - College Algebra
- \* MA 113A - Intermediate Algebra
- \* MA 113B - Statistics
- \* MA 113D - Mathematical Analysis with Business Applications I
- \* MA 113E - Mathematics for Elementary Teachers
- \* MA 114B - Technical Mathematics I
- \* MA 123 - Plane Trigonometry
- \* MA 123D - Mathematical Analysis with Business Applications II
- \* MA 144 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry I
- \* MA 154 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry II
- \* MA 233 - Calculus and Analytic Geometry III
- \* TS 113E - Basic Mathematics
- \* TS 113F - Elementary Algebra

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>03/30/2008 - Basic Math: 6 out of 50 questions were less than 70% pass rate. Elementary Algebra: 2 out of 6 questions were less than 70%. Intermediate Algebra: All questions were below 70%. College Algebra: 3 out of 6 questions were below 70%. Trigonometry: Will be reported only in the Fall with all data accumulated for the previous Fall, Spring and Summer.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p>	<p>03/30/2008 - Basic Math: All basic math is taught by part time instructors. The problems that students did not perform well on will be given to the instructors so they can focus more instruction in those areas.</p> <p>Elementary Algebra: The questions that did not meet the benchmark are topics that are covered late in the semester. This will be shared with all EA instructors and they will be encouraged to change the pace of the course to allow more time for the later topics.</p> <p>Intermediate Algebra: We will focus on the two questions that were lowest. These questions covered completing the square and solving rational equations using the process of clearing the denominator.</p> <p>College Algebra: The problem areas were composition of functions, logarithms and zeros of polynomials. These are common areas for students to have difficulty. We will spend as much time as possible in these areas. We have seen improvement over past semesters even though we have not yet</p>		Pending Follow-Up

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
	met the benchmark.		
<p>10/29/2007 - Question 1 46/64 (71.8%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 2 25/64 (39.1%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 3 38/64 (59.4%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 4 29/64 (45.3%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 5 40/64 (62.5%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 6 45/64 (70.3%) of students scored 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> A score of 2, 3, or 4 indicates that a student has a fair, good or excellent grasp of the problem solving technique being assessed.</p> <p>A score of 1 or 0 on a question indicates that a student shows little or no knowledge of the skill being assessed.</p> <p>These results for Intermediate Algebra are very disappointing. We will compare these results to what is seen in the Fall and decide if we need to change the course outline to better emphasize the objectives or if better review time is needed prior to the final exam.</p>	<p>10/29/2007 - Continue to collect data using the common questions, but introduce two more questions to assess the next outcome.</p>		Pending Follow-Up
<p>10/29/2007 - Unit Circle 82/87 (94.3%) scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 17 57/87 (65.5%) scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 18 62/87 (71.3%) scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 19 59/87 (67.8%) scored 2, 3, or 4.            Question 20 41/87 (47.1%) scored 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p>3 out of 6 questions met the goal of at least 70% of students scoring 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> A score of 2, 3, or 4 indicates that a student has a fair, good or excellent grasp of the problem solving technique being assessed.</p> <p>A score of 1 or 0 on a question indicates that a student shows little or no knowledge of the skill being assessed.</p> <p>We may need to emphasize the topics more in coming semesters. We will compare the results for Fall 2007 before deciding to make changes. Often more review time prior to the exam makes a difference.</p>	<p>10/29/2007 - Continue to collect data using the common questions, but introduce two more questions to assess the next outcome.</p>		Pending Follow-Up
<p>10/29/2007 - 27 out of 30 students (90%) scored above 70%. This exceeded the expected benchmark of 70% of students would score 70 or</p>	<p>10/29/2007 - Continue to collect data using the common final exam, but choose two or more questions to assess</p>		Loop Closed

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
better on the exam.	the next outcome.		
<p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> We were concerned that results for 30 students in Basic Math were available. It is possible that enrollments were down by the time the final exam was given, or that not all instructors submitted test results.</p>			
<p>10/29/2007 - Question 1 67/82 (82%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 2 70/82 (85%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 3 63/82 (77%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 4 66/82 (80%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 5 74/82 (90%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 6 59/82 (72%) scored 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p>All question met the goal of at least 70% of students scoring 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> A score of 2, 3, or 4 indicates that a student has a fair, good or excellent grasp of the problem solving technique being assessed.</p> <p>A score of 1 or 0 on a question indicates that a student shows little or no knowledge of the skill being assessed.</p>	<p>10/29/2007 - Continue to collect data using the common questions, but introduce two more questions to assess the next outcome.</p>		Loop Closed
<p>10/29/2007 - Question 1 93/113 (82.3%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 2 89/113 (78.8%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 3 94/113 (83.2%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 4 80/113 (70.8%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 5 71/113 (62.8%) scored 2, 3, or 4. Question 6 62/113 (54.9%) scored 2, 3, or 4.</p> <p>4 out of 6 questions met the goal of at least 70%.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> A score of 2, 3, or 4 indicates that a student has a fair, good or excellent grasp of the problem solving technique being assessed.</p> <p>A score of 1 or 0 on a question indicates that a student shows little or no knowledge of the skill being assessed.</p> <p>We will compare Fall 2007 results to these before making any changes. More review time prior to the exam could make a difference.</p>	<p>10/29/2007 - Continue to collect data using the common questions, but introduce two more questions to assess the next outcome.</p>		Loop Closed
<p>05/31/2006 - Based on medians and modal scores in Intermediate Algebra classes, questions 2, 4 &amp; 5 are below our goal. The expected criteria was that students would be able to solve such questions with 70% accuracy.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p>	<p>05/31/2006 - Continue for the next two semesters, but make plan for bringing on another outcome based on technology. Based on this data, we are going to evaluate the curriculum and look at the pace of the course.</p>		Pending Follow-Up

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>05/31/2006 - Based on median and modal scores in College Algebra classes, only questions 4 &amp; 5 are below our goal. The expected criteria was that students would be able to solve such questions with 70% accuracy.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> We have started having issues getting our assessment instruments back from part-time and adjunct instructors.</p>	<p>05/31/2006 - We are currently discussing a possible college algebra Math Adjunct meeting for the spring 2007.</p> <p>05/31/2006 - We will make plans to start assessing the technology outcome by replacing one of the common questions.</p>	<p>05/15/2007 - Graphing Calculator questions for College Algebra and Trigonometry will be written to begin assessing in Fall 2007.</p>	Pending Follow-Up
<p>05/31/2006 - Based on median and modal scores for the Trigonometry course, only question 5 is below the goal. The expected criteria was that students would be able to solve such questions with 70% accuracy.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p>	<p>05/31/2006 - We will continue doing what we are doing for one more semester.</p> <p>05/31/2006 - We will look more closely at question number 5 over the next two semesters.</p> <p>05/31/2006 - We want to leave the unit circle on the test, but replace one of the other questions with a specifically graphing calculator question to test the student's technological skills.</p>		Pending Follow-Up

### Outcome: 3-Analytical skills

Student will develop analytical skills to improve problem-solving abilities.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
<p>Two additional questions on the common parts of the final exams that are applications from topics in the class.</p> <p><b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Capstone/Final Project</p> <p><b>How will you use this data?:</b> To determine how well students are applying solving skills to application problems. If the benchmark is not met we will use that information to incorporate more word problems for extra practice.</p>	<p>70% of students will score 2, 3, or 4 on the word problems.</p>	<p>Each semester</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>03/30/2008 - Basic Math: All application problems (word problems) were 80% or better.</p> <p>Elementary Algebra: The new application problems added to the common parts were at 66% and 64%.</p> <p>Intermediate Algebra: The new application problems were at 48% and 55%.</p> <p>College Algebra: The new application problems were at 79% and 86%.</p> <p><b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Not Met</p> <p><b>notes:</b> Basic Math and College Algebra were great for the</p>	<p>03/30/2008 - Elementary Algebra: All instructors will be asked to include word problems with each section in each chapter to maintain student exposure all semester.</p> <p>Intermediate Algebra: Allow more time in chapter 7 and pick up word problems in each chapter that follows.</p>		Pending Follow-Up

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
<p>first time collecting data on this outcome.            Elementary Algebra was a little low, but not far from the benchmark. Intermediate Algebra was very disappointing. The first word problem on the IA test was a distance, rate, time problem that forms a ration equation, so the results are consistent and we need to spend more time with rational equations and with distance problems. Both of these topics occur in chapter 7 of the book so we obviously need more time in that chapter.</p>			

**Outcome: 4-Use technology**

The student will develop skills in using calculators and other technology to enhance understanding of mathematics.

**Outcome Status:** Current

Means of Assessment			
Assessment Method	Benchmark	Schedule	Active
Question(s) on common part of final exam for College Algebra (MA113) and Trigonometry (MA123)  <b>What will you do with this data?:</b> We hope to determine if students are learning to use the graphing calculators that are required for the courses.	Those questions that require use of a graphing calculator will have 70% of students scoring 2 or better.	Gather data in Fall and Spring and analyze and report data after Spring semester only.	Yes

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
No Observations reported.			

**Outcome: Archive**

**Outcome Status:** Current

Observations			
Observation	Action	Follow-Up	Observation Status
12/31/2006 - The assessment plans & results from the old assessment system can be found under "Related Data." <b>Observation Type:</b> Benchmark Met  <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Mathematics.PDF</a> <a href="#">TS Mathematics.PDF</a>			

# **Attachment C**

## **New Mexico Junior College Institutional Assessment Results Minutes from Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee Meetings**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fall 2007

**Outcome:** Communications  
**Benchmark:** 80% of artifacts will score 3 or higher on all components

**Component 1** Information is expressed in a concise way.  
**Component 2** Information is structured and organized.  
**Component 3** Information is appropriate to audience, purpose, and topic.

**Course / Level:** Freshman

**Team facilitator:** Brenda Pierce  
**Date Artifacts collected:** Fall 2007  
**Date Artifacts scored:** Spring 2008

### Scoring scale

- 5 = Exemplary: Excellent; the paper exceeds all expectations.
- 4 = Proficient: Strong; the essay shows control and skill in the trait under consideration.
- 3 = Moderate: Competent; the strengths outweigh the weaknesses; revisions needed.
- 2 = Developing: Weak; weaknesses outweigh strengths; clear points are isolated.
- 1 = Beginning: Very weak; the essay is simply incoherent; writer shows no control.

### Frequencies and Average:

Total number of Artifacts:	50
At least three 3's or higher:	21
Average:	2.64
Percentage:	42%

### Data Frequency Analysis:

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	
5=	0	0	0	0
4=	9	5	11	11
3=	16	18	23	23
2=	19	23	15	15
1=	6	4	1	1
Average	2.56	2.48	2.56	

**SUMMARY:** BENCHMARK NOT MET. 42% of artifacts scored moderate skill on all components.

**How is Data to be used:** SLOAC

**Action Plan:** SLOAC

**Raw Data -- RECORD**

Artifact #	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Eq.or Gr. (3)
1	2	2	2	0
2	2	3	3	2
3	1	2	2	0
4	3	3	3	3
5	3	3	3	3
6	3	3	3	3
7	3	3	4	3
8	4	3	3	3
9	3	3	3	3
10	4	4	4	3
11	1	1	1	0
12	3	2	3	2
13	4	3	4	3
14	2	1	2	0
15	3	3	3	3
16	4	3	4	3
17	3	2	3	2
18	2	2	2	0
19	2	2	3	1
20	4	3	4	3
21	3	3	3	3
22	3	3	3	3
23	2	2	2	0
24	2	2	3	1
25	2	2	2	0
26	2	2	2	0
27	4	4	4	3
28	3	3	4	3
29	2	3	3	2
30	2	2	2	0
31	1	2	2	0
32	3	2	3	2
33	2	2	2	0
34	3	2	3	2
35	1	1	2	0
36	2	2	2	0
37	2	2	2	0
38	4	4	4	3
39	4	4	4	3
40	2	2	3	1
41	2	2	3	1
42	3	3	3	3
43	3	3	3	3
44	1	1	2	0
45	2	2	3	1

46	1	2	2	0
47	4	4	4	3
48	3	3	4	3
49	2	2	3	1
50	2	2	3	1
51				0
52				0
53				0
54				0
55				0
56				0
57				0
58				0
59				0
60				0
61				0
62				0
63				0
64				0
65				0
Average	2.56	2.48	2.88	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Spring 2008

<b>Outcome:</b>	Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
<b>Benchmark:</b>	80% of artifacts should exhibit at least a moderate skill level on 3 or more of the 4 components
<b>Component 1</b>	Define a problem.
<b>Component 2</b>	Use appropriate technology and information systems.
<b>Component 3</b>	Collect information.
<b>Component 4</b>	Analyze information.
<b>Component 5</b>	Organize information.
<b>Component 6</b>	Apply to a specific situation.
<b>Component 7</b>	Arrive at a logical solution.

<b>Course / Level:</b>	Freshman
<b>Team facilitator:</b>	Kay Goad
<b>Date Artifacts collected:</b>	Spring 2008
<b>Date Artifacts scored:</b>	Spring 2008

### Components Scored (4 out of 7):

<b>Component 1</b>	Define a problem.
<b>Component 3</b>	Collect information.
<b>Component 4</b>	Analyze information.
<b>Component 6</b>	Apply to a specific situation.

### Scoring scale

- 5 = Exemplary: Excellent; the paper exceeds all expectations.
- 4 = Proficient: Strong; the essay shows control and skill in the trait under consideration.
- 3 = Moderate: Competent; the strengths outweigh the weaknesses; revisions needed.
- 2 = Developing: Weak; weaknesses outweigh strengths; clear points are isolated.
- 1 = Beginning: Very weak; the essay is simply incoherent; writer shows no control.

### Frequencies and Average:

Total number of Artifacts:	50
At least three 3's or higher:	31
Average:	2.765
Percentage:	62%

### Data Analysis:

	Component 1	Component 3	Component 4	Component 6
5=	0	1	2	0
4=	7	9	8	5
3=	33	25	21	21
2=	6	13	14	21
1=	4	2	5	3
Average	2.86	2.88	2.76	2.56

**SUMMARY:** DID NOT MEET BENCHMARK. 62% of artifacts scored moderate skill on 3 of 4 components.

**How is Data to be used:** SLOAC

**Action Plan:** SLOAC

**Raw Data -- RECORD**

Artifact#	Component 1	Component 3	Component 4	Component 6	Eq/Gr than 3	
1	3	3	3	4	3	4
2	4	4	4	5	4	4
3	4	4	5	4	4	4
4	3	2	2	3	2	2
5	3	3	3	3	3	4
6	3	3	3	3	2	3
7	3	4	4	4	4	4
8	4	4	4	4	4	4
9	3	3	2	2	2	2
10	3	3	2	2	2	2
11	2	1	2	2	2	0
12	3	3	1	2	2	2
13	3	3	3	3	3	4
14	1	2	1	1	1	0
15	3	4	3	3	3	4
16	3	3	3	3	2	3
17	3	2	1	2	2	1
18	3	4	4	4	3	4
19	1	2	2	2	1	0
20	4	4	3	3	3	4
21	2	2	2	2	2	0
22	3	4	4	4	2	3
23	4	3	4	4	3	4
24	3	3	3	3	3	4
25	3	4	4	4	3	4
26	3	3	3	3	3	4
27	4	4	5	5	3	4
28	3	3	2	2	3	3
29	1	2	1	1	2	0
30	3	3	3	3	3	4
31	3	2	2	2	3	2
32	3	2	2	2	3	2
33	3	3	3	3	2	3
34	3	3	3	3	3	4
35	3	3	3	3	3	4
36	3	3	3	3	4	4
37	3	2	2	2	3	2
38	2	3	3	3	3	3
39	3	3	2	2	2	2
40	4	3	3	3	2	3
41	2	2	2	2	2	0
42	3	3	3	3	2	3
43	3	3	3	3	2	3
44	3	3	3	3	3	4

45	2	2	2	2	0
46	2	2	2	2	0
47	3	3	3	2	3
48	3	2	2	2	1
49	1	1	1	1	0
50	3	3	3	3	4
51					0
52					0
53					0
54					0
55					0
56					0
57					0
58					0
59					0
60					0
61					0
62					0
63					0
64					0
65					0
Average	2.86	2.88	2.76	2.56	2.765

**Assessment Meeting**  
**January 10, 2006**  
**Heidel Hall, Rm. 203**  
**10:00AM**

- I. Brenda Pierce called the meeting to order at 10 AM.
- II. Brenda discussed departmental assessment.
  - a. At the beginning of each semester, departments should analyze data from the previous semester and post the results on the intranet. AN Action Plan for improvement should be developed and posted.
  - b. During each semester, departments should collect data, follow through with their Action Plan for improvement, and think about what will be assessed next and how you will assess it.
  - c. At the end of each semester, assessment activities should be chosen for the next semester and posted on the internet;
  - d. This is a never ending cycle that continues on from semester to semester.
- III. Brenda went over the results from the Assessment In-service held in October. (see attached sheet)
- IV. All departments were reminded that results from the analysis of collected data should be posted on the Intranet no later than Feb. 21, 2006. All updates to the departmental assessment plans need to be completed as soon as possible.
- V. A scoring rubric is being developed for the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving portion of assessment. Anyone who would like to help with this process is invited to join the Assessment Committee
- VI. Brenda dismissed the meeting at 10:20 AM.

**New Mexico Junior College  
Outcomes Assessment Committee  
Minutes  
May 5, 2006**

**I. Call to Order**

Kay Goad, chair, called to order the meeting of the Outcomes Assessment committee at 1:30 pm on May 5, 2006

**II. Roll Call**

**Members Present:**

Kay Goad	Mary Shelton	Teresa Crafton
Patsy Lewis	Brenda Pierce	Mickey Best
Renee Wharton	Charlotte Schmitz	August Fons
Mechile Mershon		

**Members Absent:**

Richard Steinhaus	John Gratton	Mary Jane Ward
Robert Bensing	Karen Cummings	Maria Vick
Marilyn Ebler	Lisa Hardison	Beth Hancock
Kelly Holladay	Dallas Hulsey	Regina Organ
Cyndi Stephenson	Shyla McGill	

**Invited Guest:**

Tami Cavitt

**III. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the April 7, 2006 meeting were approved

**IV. Open Issues**

- a. Teresa Crafton, the new Associate Director of Institutional Effectiveness, was introduced. Teresa stated that some of the issues she is focusing on include support and training, "closing the loop", state mandated outcomes for general education and on-line portfolios.
- b. Tami Cavitt, Renee Wharton, Joel Keranen and Mike Williams attend the North Carolina Assessment Symposium. Tami told the committee that the conference was great. She felt that the most important information she brought back with her was that careful collection and tabulation of data was great importance to the institution. The main reason that she went to the conference was to gain a "broad idea of assessment." Renee and Tami both like the idea of on-line portfolios. They think that this will help close the assessment loop. The institution could make Freshman Seminar a mandatory course and have a mandatory course for sophomores called "The Professional Edge." On-line portfolios would start with Freshman Seminar and used through the student's college attendance. This will make data collection much easier for assessment purposes. Mike and Joel

submitted written Information Contribution Forms stating what they learned at the conference.

- c. Renee spoke about the new state mandated outcomes for general education. NMJC is ahead of a lot of other institutions because our outcomes conform to the state mandated outcomes. Renee is a member of the State Assessment Task Force whose main goal is to assess what schools are assessing.
- d. Renee also stated that since the state is mandating outcomes for general education courses, she thinks that NMJC should focus on getting artifacts from general education areas. The committee needs to determine who we want to assess and when do we want to do it, what measurements to use and what standards. Artifact collection needs to be minimally invasive to faculty. Institutional Effectiveness will come in, copy, give to scoring team, compile information and then allow faculty to decide how to evaluate. We should be assessing outcomes that meet the dual purpose for the state and institution. Kay and Renee stated that scoring clusters will be formed by fall for assessment purposes
- e. Kay submitted the updated Critical Thinking rubric. The committee voted to accept it as written.

**V. New Business**

- a. The Outcomes Assessment committee is being reorganized. Kay will continue to act as chair while a co-chair person will be appointed. John Gratton is working on reorganizing the member list. The committee membership will be announced in the fall.
- b. August In-service issues were discussed. Items discussed included:
  - 1. Introduction of Teresa Crafton to faculty
  - 2. No break out sessions
  - 3. Update presentation of the institutional assessment plan
  - 4. Closing of the loop by departments
  - 5. Adjuncts-key on assessment
  - 6. New members for Outcomes Assessment committee
  - 7. How faculty should address students on assessment
  - 8. Template
  - 9. Toolbox for faculty
  - 10. Faculty members to present their plan. Brenda Pierce, Jack McCaw and Mary Shelton were volunteered.
  - 11. Institutional Effectiveness office as a resource
  - 12. Informal meeting 1 or 2 times a month (brown bag lunch) for faculty to gather to talk about assessment.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.

Minutes submitted by Mechile Mershon

Minutes approved by:

# Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>Meeting Time:</b>	<b>Meeting Location:</b>
September 8, 2006	1:30 PM	HH 230
<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Kay Goad, Chair	
<b>RECORDER</b>	Mechile Mershon	
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Teresa Crafton, August Fons, Karen Cummings, Richard Steinhaus, Kay Goad, Mechile Mershon, Brenda Pierce, Mike Williams, Charlotte Schmitz, Maria Vick, Shyla McGill, Mary Jane Ward, Mickey Best, John Gratton	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND</b>	Patsy Lewis, Renee Wharton, Lisa Hardison, Mary Shelton, Marilyn Ebler, Tom Keyes, Kelly Holliday, John Klepper	
<b>NOT PRESENT</b>	Regina Organ, Cyndi Stephenson, David Moghaddam	
<b>GUESTS</b>		

<b>Minutes Approval</b>	<b>Presented by:</b>
Approval of Minutes from May 2006 Meeting	Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The Minutes from the May 2006 meeting were approved.

<b>Open Issues</b>	<b>Presented by:</b>	
Institutional Student Learning Outcomes, gathering artifacts for Critical Thinking and Communication, developing rubric for Self and Community.	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Issues to be decided include where to gather artifacts from and what to do with the results, and developing a rubric for Self and Community.</p> <p>The HLC realizes that the time frame they had established is too short.</p> <p>Our outcomes are already assessing general education.</p> <p>Closing the loop means finding where to get artifacts, use of the data gathered.</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Work will start on these items at the next meeting.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Think about items above	The OAC	Oct. 13, 2006

<b>Open Issues</b>		<b>Presented by:</b>	
<b>Program Student Learning Outcomes</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The suggested reporting dates for the academic year 2006, 2007 were discussed. Teresa Crafton and Kay Goad reported that not all faculty members have access to the assessment plans on the website.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The suggested reporting dates were approved. It was decided that only 2 persons per department will have access to change the assessment plan for their department. This will promote discussion within the departments.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Each department will submit a list of who should have access		Teresa Crafton	ASAP

<b>New Business</b>		<b>Presented by:</b>	
<b>Review OAC Duties and Responsibilities</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Should the committee divide into two sub-committees to address academic AND institutional assessment? Do the by-laws need to be changed? Should administrators be considered as "ex-officio" and not have voting rights?		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	It was decided that the OAC should stay as it is with the same by-laws but have two sub-committees to address the issues of academic and institutional assessment. A proposal will be written and presented to Dr. McCleery. It was decided that the committee needs the support and input of the administrators so they will not be considered as "ex-officio" members.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Proposal to have two sub-committees for the OAC		Kay Goad, Teresa Crafton, John Gratton, Renee Wharton	

<b>New Business</b>		<b>Presented by:</b>	
<b>Appointment of chair, co-chair, and recorder</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay told the committee that the structure of the OAC has evolved over the years. Marilyn Dill was hired to lead assessment. When she left and Teresa Crafton was hired, Teresa's job description was completely different. Teresa is here to assist the OAC instead of being the driving force. The committee now needs a co-chair. This will allow for rotation of the chair and co-chair positions. John Gratton opened the floor for nominations for co-chair. Mary Shelton was nominated. Kay will talk to her as soon as possible to see if this is something that she would like to do. Kay was asked to retain her position as chair. Mechile Mershon was asked to retain her position as recorder.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Kay Goad will continue to chair the OAC. Mechile Mershon will continue as recorder. Mary Shelton will be asked if she will be the co-chair of the committee.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Speak with mary shelton about the co-chair position		Kay Goad	ASAP

<b>New Business</b>		<b>Presented by:</b>	
<b>Set Next Meeting Date</b>		<b>Key Goal</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The time of the meetings needs to be changed to allow faculty who teach ACT Academy classes to attend. The meeting scheduled for September 22 needs to be changed due to the mandatory staff and faculty meeting. The committee was asked to think about attending the annual assessment and retention conference to be held in February in Albuquerque.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The next meeting of the OAC will be held on October 13, 2006 at 2:15 PM in HH 230. All future meetings of the OAC will start at 2:15 PM. The meeting was dismissed at 2:40 PM.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Decide on attendance to the assessment and retention conference to be held in Albuquerque in February, 2007	All OAC members.		

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Meeting Minutes

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
10/13/06	2:15 PM	Heidel Hall 230
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	Mechile Mershon	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Kay Goad, Mechile Mershon, Brenda Pierce, John Gratton, Teresa Crafton, Shyla McGill, Richard Steinhaus, Maria Vick, Mary Shelton, Patsy Lewis, Mike Williams, Charlotte Schmitz, Mickey Best	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Tom Keyes, Karen Cummings, Kelly Holladay, Mary Jane Ward, Lisa Hardison, August Fons	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	Marilyn Ebler, John Klepper, David Moghaddam	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Call to Order and approval of the minutes from the previous meeting	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The meeting was called to order by Kay Goad. The new format of the minutes was discussed.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The minutes were approved. It was decided that Kay would contact the committee members who have not attended the meetings.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Contact absent committee members	Kay Goad	Before next meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Review SL OAC duties and responsibilities	Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The Learning Outcome Assessment committee has been divided into two separate committees. Teresa Crafton, John Gratton and Kay Goad met and presented the idea to Dr. McCleery who approved the division. The duties of the two committees were presented.
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Two separate committees now exists. They are the Institutional Outcomes Assessment Committee and the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee.

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Appointment of co-chair		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mary Shelton was nominated for the position of co-chair for the committee. She declined the nomination due to lack of time for commitment.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The issue was put on hold until the next meeting		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Update on faculty access to departmental assessment plans		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Teresa Crafton and Kay Goad visited with department chairs and directors about access to departmental assessment plans.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Changes have been made and the correct faculty now have access.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring evidences for Communication and Critical Thinking		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Scoring teams need to be faculty driven. A stipend could be paid to team members if the money is available. Maybe overload money could be used. How many members and rotation off of a team? Each team will score 50 papers per semester. Who decides who will serve as team members and who will inform and enforce? Will a special rubric have to be designed for oral artifacts?		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	It was decided that scoring teams will consist of 3 members. There will be one scoring team for each outcome. Teams should be made up of 3 members who can evaluate ANY kind of evidence (oral, written, etc.) The teams will be set up on a 3 year plan. One person will rotate off every year. Evaluation will be done every year and changes will be made as necessary. Teresa, John, and Kay will discuss how team members will be appointed and make recommendations will be made to the committee.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Discuss how scoring team members will be chosen and who will enforce and inform. Present recommendations to the team.	John Gratton, Teresa Crafton, Kay Goad	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: NEW BUSINESS</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Evaluation of Self and Community		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Information was handed out to each member that contains rubrics and assessment plan outcomes for Self and Community		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Members will read all materials and be ready to discuss at next meeting.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Read handouts and be ready to discuss at the next meeting	All members	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: ADJOURNMENT</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Reminder of next meeting date and adjournment		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The meetings of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee will be held the first Friday of every month at 2:15 in Heidel Hall 230.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The next meeting will be Friday, November 3, at 2:15. Kay will send out reminders. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Reminders will be sent to committee members about the next meeting.	Kay Goad	Week before next meeting	

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
12/1/06	2:15 PM	Heidel Hall, Room 230
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	Mechile Mershon	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Kay Goad, Teresa Crafton, Brenda Pierce, August Fons, John Gratton, Karen Cummings, Mechile Mershon, Richard Steinhaus, Mary Jane Ward, Patsy Lewis, Mike Williams, Shyla McGill, Charlotte Schmitz ( John Gratton has Kelly Holladay and Mickey Best's proxy)	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Kelly Holladay, Mickey Best, John Klepper, Mary Shelton, Maria Vick, Lisa Hardison	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	Marilyn Ebler, David Moghaddam, Tom Keys (He will be leaving NMJC)	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Call to Order, Roll Call	Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay called the meeting to order at 2:15.

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Approval of Minutes from November Meeting	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The minutes were approved.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Update on Communication Scoring Team</b>		<b>Mike Williams/Teresa Crafton</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay presented the updated "Process for the Evaluation of NMJC's General Education (Institutional) Outcomes" document. Mike stated that the committee's three first choices for scoring team members (Soyna Jimenez, Joe Garcia, and Toni Dunn) accepted their nominations. The English department is gathering artifacts at this time. This will be the last time that only English department artifacts will be used. The scoring team plans to have the artifacts scored by April 1 <sup>st</sup> . Kay stated that the rubric for Communication is already in place but may need to be tweaked to fit the needs of the scoring team.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The scoring team process is working so far! We will need to continue to monitor the progress and make any changes as necessary.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Continue gathering artifacts from the English department	Mike Williams	As soon as possible	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Discussion for evaluating of Self and community</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The committee began writing the outcomes and designing the rubric for Self and Community to be used for the first time in the Fall 2008 semester.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The committee decided that they need to re-evaluate exactly what is to be measured. The term "ethical behavior needs to be defined. The word(s) "demonstrate" and "demonstrate familiarity" will be used. The committee agreed on "Communicate an awareness of a variety of perspectives of ethical issues" to be used as an outcome. The committee also liked "Analyze and reflect on the ethical dimensions of legal, social, or scientific issues." After a lengthy discussion, it was decided that the committee needed to bring suggestions to the next meeting as to wording on the statement that pertains to others. "Contribute to a diverse global community" is what is currently on the Self and Community outcomes. What was the intent? To focus on diversity? Values?		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Ideas for a statement to pertain to "others"	Entire Committee	Be ready to present at next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Set next meeting</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay will send out reminders and the agenda for the next meeting.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	It was decided that the next meeting will be held in the planning room so the statements can be placed on the board as they are being discussed. John Gratton will make arrangements for the use of the room.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Reserve Planning Room	John Gratton	As soon as possible	
2. Send out reminder and agenda for next meeting	Kay Goad	A few days before next meeting	

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
March 2, 2007	2:30 PM	HH 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	Mechile Mershon	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Kay Goad, Mechile Mershon, Mary Jane Ward, Teresa Crafton, Mary Shelton, Patsy Lewis, Shyla McGill, Richard Steinhaus, Brenda Pierce, Charlotte Schmitz, Kelly Holladay, Maria Vick	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	John Gratton, Mike Williams, Mickey Best, Marilyn Ebler,	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	David Moghaddam, Lisa Hardison, August Fons, Karen Cummings	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Call to Order, Approval of Minutes	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay called the meeting to order at 2:30 PM.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The minutes from the 2/2/07 meeting were approved as written.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: OPEN ISSUES</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Report of Communication Scoring Team	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mike Williams was not at the meeting to present the report. Teresa Crafton told the committee that 2 members of the scoring team reported that the process is taking a long time. Teresa told them to take notes on any problems that they have so they can be addressed by the committee. Mike had reported to Kay that the scoring team was progressing as planned.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	It was decided that the scoring team would be invited to the May meeting to share their experiences and to present a full report to the committee	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Team Selection		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The committee needs to choose faculty to serve as scoring team members Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. One member from each division will serve on the scoring team. A faculty SLOA committee member must be chosen as facilitator for the scoring team.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	For Arts and Humanities: Pete Mladinic with Lynda Newman as alternate For Careers and Technology: Jeff McCool with Jill Henning as alternate For Math and Sciences: Roene Neu with Walt Journigan as alternate Richard Steinhaus will serve as the facilitator for the Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Scoring Team.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
NMHEAR Conference Reports		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Kay Goad, Teresa Crafton, and Mechile Mershon shared with the committee what they had learned at the NMHEAR conference.</p> <p>Teresa stated that the schools that are having the most success with assessment are outside of NM. They have streamlined their processes. IF we decide to use student portfolios in the future, she suggested that we pre-assess the portfolios to cull out the ones that really need to be looked at. Teresa encouraged the committee to look at "Measuring Up". New Mexico scores very low. Mary Jane Warded stated that she felt that community colleges were not judged fairly on completion rates.</p> <p>Mechile Mershon told the committee about attending the double session held by the HLC. She told the committee that 50% of accreditation visits last year required some kind of follow up and of those, 70% were due to accreditation. HLC is saying that it should be mandatory for all faculty, adjunct and full-time, to participate in assessment. Mechile told the committee about retention efforts at Seneca Community College in Canada. Mechile has contacted Seneca for more information.</p> <p>Kay told the committee that advancement should be the goal not assessment. She said that learning outcomes should be explicit. Kay stated that institutions should value the data they collect and be willing to accept that you might be wrong. She attended the ACT College Readiness session and asked about benchmarks for Biology using the COMPASS exam. She will be in touch with the presenter to discuss this more. Kay attended a round table discussion about evaluation processes. Dona Ana Branch is bringing in the same speakers that we brought in to help with their evaluation processes. John Gratton was unable to attend today but will discuss CAI and the pilot program we will be entering in March.</p>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Set Date for Next Meeting		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The April meeting needs to be a sub-committee that will meet to work on the Self and Community rubric.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The April meeting will be held Thursday, April 19 <sup>th</sup> at 1:15 PM. Kay will let the committee know where the meeting will be held. Kay will send out the form with the changes already decided on by the committee.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Schedule room for April Meeting and let committee know location		Kay Goad	1 week before April Meeting
2. Send email to committee with verbiage that has been decided already		Kay Goad	1 week before April Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Adjournment		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
10/5/07	2:30pm	HH 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Charlotte Schmitz, Agustin Dorado, Brenda Pierce, Angila Shook, Mickey Best, Mary Jane Ward, Karen Cummings, Shelby McCorvey, Robin Porter, David Moghaddam, Robert Guthrie	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Ronnie Gray, Charles Adams, August Fons, Kelly Holladay, Terri Holloman, Dr. Gratton	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>		
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Minutes from September 2007 Meeting	Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes were approved as written. Motion Brenda Pierce; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Karen Cummings
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b> <b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Upload Sept 2007 SLOAC minutes into TracDat	K. Goad      By next meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
TracDat	Agustin Dorado
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held on the possibility of TracDat training during January 2008 In-Service.
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	A new version is available and times will possibly be assigned for faculty to attend during in-service. Agustin will coordinate with Dr. Gratton on the training.
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b> <b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Train faculty new version TracDat	To be coordinated by A. Dorado      In Spring 2008

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Critical Thinking Outcome – Scoring Rubric		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Outcome Scoring Rubric was discussed.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was made to accept proposed scoring rubric. Motion: Karen Cummings, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Brenda Pierce		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. None			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Critical Thinking – Set Benchmark		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held on setting benchmark for expected outcomes (or standards).		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was made to set benchmark at 80%. Motion: Mary Jane Ward; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Angila Shook Motion carried at 80% of attending members.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. None			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Communication Outcome - Scoring Rubric		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Communication Outcome Scoring Rubric was discussed.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was made to change wording of the 5 scoring categories on the Communication Rubric to match scoring categories on critical thinking rubric. Motion: Karen Cummings; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Mary Jane Ward.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Wording will be changed on rubric	K. Goad & B. Pierce	By Nov. Meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Communication Outcome - Set benchmark		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held by committee on the 80% benchmark being adequate for three areas		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was made to use 80% on all three areas. Motion: Karen Cumming; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Brenda Pierce		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. None			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Spring 2007 Results – COMMUNICATION OUTCOME		Agustin Dorado	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Action plan will be brought to next months meeting		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Kay Goad and Agustin Dorado will meet		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Prepare Communication scoring team report	K. Goad & A. Dorado	November Meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Self and Community		Charlotte Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Sub-committee was appointed for this area: Karen Cummings, Mickey Best, Robin Porter, Terri Holloman (Charlotte will contact)		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Charlotte Schmitz will set up committee meeting		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Work on Self and Community Rubric	C. Schmitz to organize sub-committee	Report to membership November meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
New Business		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held on the collection of artifacts.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Agustin Dorado will send out memo to faculty and will bring input back to committee		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Memo to Faculty requesting artifacts to score spring 2008 for Communication and Critical Thinking SLOs	A. Dorado	Prior to next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Next meeting November 2, 2007			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Motion was made to adjourn meeting. Motion: Karen Cummings; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Agustin Dorado		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Next meeting will be November 2 <sup>nd</sup>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. None			

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
11/2/07	2:30pm	HH 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Kay Goad, Karen Cummings, Robert Guthrie, Terry Holloman, Robin Porter, Charles Adams, Agustin Dorado, Dr. Gratton, David Moghaddam, Charlotte Schmitz, Mary Jane Ward, De Etta Duff, Ronnie Gray, Brenda Pierce, Angila Shook, Shelby McCorvey	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Mickey Best, Kelly Holladay	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	August Fons	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Approval of October Minutes	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes were approved as written.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion: Brenda Pierce 2nd: Dr. Gratton	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. None		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Critical Thinking – Scoring Team Report		Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Artifacts have been scored and are back in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE).	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Analysis of results to be completed by OIE	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Results for Critical Thinking Outcome to presented to SLOAC	Agustin Dorado	December Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Communication – Scoring Team Report		Brenda Pierce
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Artifacts have been scored and are back in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE).	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Analysis of results to be completed by OIE	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Results for Communication Outcome to presented to SLOAC	Agustin Dorado	December Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Self & Community - Subcommittee work		Charlotte Schmitz
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Charlotte Schmitz handed out survey that was put together by the subcommittee. Statement number six was discussed by the committee.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	A motion was made to reword number six to read "The contribution of each member was valued". Motion: Robert Guthrie; 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Brenda Pierce Pilot will be done in the Spring 2008, the Public Safety Classes were discussed as an option to pilot the survey.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Facilitator for Pilot	Shelby McCorvey	Spring 2008
2. Select class to Pilot (Shelby McCorvey will approach August Fons about Public Safety Piloting	Shelby McCovey	December Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Collection of Artifacts for scoring - Spring 2008		Agustin Dorado	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Agustin reported that he had no response on the memo he had sent to faculty requesting artifacts.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Agustin will send out memo again. It was suggested by Dr. Gratton that artifacts be taken from classes on a five year rotation.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Deans will ask for help with this in the Dean's corners.	Division Deans	December Meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Selection of Communication Scoring Team/Facilitator For Spring 2008		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Brenda Pierce will be the Liaison for the Spring 2008 Communication Team. It was suggested by the committee that the following faculty members be approached to serve on the scoring team: Arts & Humanities – Lynda Newman or Susan Waters Career & Technology – Sue Black or Randy Whicker Math & Science – Richard Steinhaus or Richard Lloyd		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was made to approach the above listed faculty members. Motion: Brenda Pierce; 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Robin Porter		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Approach faculty about serving on committee	Brenda Pierce	December Meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Standardized Report Form for Institutional SLO		Agustin Dorado	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held on the presentation of data to the committee.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Class artifacts were taken from</li> <li>2. Freshman or Sophomore</li> <li>3. Facilitator</li> <li>4. Semester</li> </ol>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Report will be compiled	Agustin Dorado	December meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Adjournment			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	December 7 next meeting		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion to adjourn Motion: Robert Guthrie; 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Karen Cummings		

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
February 1, 2008	2:30 pm	Heidel Hall 125

## AGENDA

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTER:</b>	<b>TIME ALLOTTED:</b>
1. Approval of January 11 <sup>th</sup> minutes	Kay Goad	
2. NMHEAR Attendees	Mary Ann Newell	
3. Institutional-Level Assessment: Scoring Team Reports	Goad/Pierce/McCorvey	
4. Collection of Artifacts Report	Gratton/Goad/Schmitz	
5. Self & Community Rubric	Charlotte Schmitz	
6. Program-level Assessment - February report date	Kay Goad	
7. Course-level Assessment: Faculty Response	Mary Ann Newell	
8. General Education (per HED mandate)	Kay Goad	
9. Scoring Team Results: Spring 2007-Communication Fall 2007-Communication & Critical Thinking	Mary Ann Newell	
10. New Business	Kay Goad	
11. Next Meeting – March 7, 2008		

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
February 1, 2008	2:30pm	Heidel Hall 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Mickey Best, Dr. Gratton, Mary Jane Ward, Kelly Holladay, Angila Shook, Mary Ann Newell, Brenda Pierce, Charlotte Schmitz, Terry Holloman, David Moghaddam, Robert Guthrie	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Robin Porter, Shelby McCorvey, Karen Cummings, Charles Adams	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	August Fons	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 1</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Approval of January 11 <sup>th</sup> minutes		Kay Goad
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes were approved as read	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion: Brenda Pierce 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Kelly Holladay	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Upload January 2008 minutes into TracDat	Kay Goad	Prior to March Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 2</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
NMHEAR Attendees		Mary Ann Newell
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Those attending the NMHEAR in Albuquerque are as follows: Kelly Holladay, Charlotte Schmitz, Robin Porter, Shelby McCorvey, Mary Ann Newell, Agustin Dorado, Dr. Gratton, and Richard Miller	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	None	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. None		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 3</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports/Critical Thinking & Problem Solving		Goad/Pierce/McCorvey	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay Goad reported that she has added definitions to the five skill levels on the scoring rubric.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Discussion was held and two of the definitions will be changed. On the Developing level the word writer will be changed to student. And on Beginning the definition will read "Shows no mastery of critical thinking". Dr. Gratton made motion to accept definitions and Mickey Best seconded.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Change wording of definitions on rubric.		Kay Goad	Prior to use
2. Artifacts to be copied by OIE and delivered to scoring team in February.		Kay Goad	February

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 3</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports/Communications		Goad/Pierce/McCorvey	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Fifty artifacts have been collected, copied, and are ready for distribution.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Brenda Pierce will deliver to scoring team next week.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Deliver artifacts to scoring team		Brenda Pierce	Before next meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 3</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports/Self & Community		Goad/Pierce/McCorvey	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Wording on survey has been changed to reflect discussion in January's meeting. August Fons to distribute when students are ready.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	None		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. None			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 4</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Collection of Artifacts Report		Gratton/Goad/Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay Goad, Charlotte Schmitz, and Dr. Gratton met to develop a system of collecting artifacts. We do not have a process in place at this time. E-mails being sent out to faculty requesting that they volunteer to submit artifacts are not working.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>The new process presented is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During the last month of the fall and spring semesters, a random generation of classes will be conducted by the Vice President for Instruction to select those classes responsible for producing the next semester's artifacts.</li> <li>- The professors of said classes will be notified immediately and informed as to the number of needed artifacts.</li> <li>- By the end of the subsequent semester, the liaison from the SLOAC will collect the artifacts and deliver them to the office of Institutional Effectiveness.</li> <li>- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will conduct a random generation of said artifacts to select fifty items for each scoring committee.</li> <li>- Three copies of each artifact will be delivered to the SLOAC liaison for each scoring committee. The liaison will deliver the copies to the scoring team for evaluation during the next semester.</li> </ul> <p>Motion was made by Terry Holloman to accept the new procedure and seconded by Angila Shook.</p>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Procedure will be sent out to faculty	Kay Goad	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 5</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Self & Community Rubric		Charlotte Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	At this time there is nothing more to report.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. None			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 6</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Program Assessment - Fall 2007 assessment activities		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Results and action plan due by February 18 <sup>th</sup> (postings via Trac Dat)		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Send out reminder to faculty	Kay Goad	Week of Feb. 11th	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 7</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Faculty Response on Course-Level Assessment (TracDat)		Mary Ann Newell	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mary Ann reported to committee there are several faculty members who still need to turn in two courses that are going to be assessed Spring 2008.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Send names of faculty members to deans	Mary Ann	Prior to next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 8</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
General Education (per HED mandate)		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	A summary report addressing NMJC general education is due September 2008 to HED. Dr. Gratton has met with the faculty teaching those courses affected by this mandate. A rotation for course reporting was proposed by Dr. Gratton and will be sent to faculty.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Documentation of GE competencies within each of the areas will be via TracDat		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Send out to faculty course rotation list for reporting purposes	Dr. Gratton	Prior to next meeting.	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 9</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Results		Mary Ann Newell	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Preliminary Results: Scoring Team Results for Communication Spring 2007 is 63%. Scoring Team Results for Critical Thinking Fall 2007 is 40%		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Kay Goad and Mary Ann Newell will meet to put together a formal summary to present the results to the committee. Summary needs to be developed to look at all components.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Generate formal summary reports	Kay Goad & Mary Ann Newell	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 10</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
New Business		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	At this time there was no new business.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS: NONE</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 11</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Adjournment		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Motion was made by Robert Guthrie to adjourn and seconded by Angila Shook.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Next meeting will be Friday, March 7, 2008.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
Distribute February Minutes & March Agenda to SLOAC Members	Kay Goad & DeEtta Duff	Prior to March Meeting	

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
April 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	2:30 pm	Heidel Hall 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	

## AGENDA

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTER:</b>	<b>TIME ALLOTTED:</b>
1. Call to order	Kay Goad	
2. Roll Call	Kay Goad	
3. Approval of Minutes from February meeting	Kay Goad	
4. Institutional SLO – Scoring Team Reports	Goad, Pierce, McCorvey	
5. Institutional SLO – Scoring Team Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Spring 2007: Communication</li> <li>➢ Fall 2007: Communication &amp; Critical Thinking</li> <li>➢ Spring 2008 – Critical Thinking</li> </ul>	Kay Goad & Mary Ann Newell	
6. NMHEAR Conference Reports	Holladay, Schmitz, Porter, McCorvey	
7. New Business – Selection of scoring team members and liaisons		
8. NMHE Assessment Summer Retreat		
9. Next meeting Friday, May 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2008		

## Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
April 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2008	2:30 pm	Heidel Hall 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Dr. Gratton, Dr. Clingman, Charles Adams, Brenda Pierce, Mickey Best, Kay Goad, Kelly Holladay, Mary Ann Newell, Charlotte Schmitz, Terry Holloman, Angila Shook	
<b>PROXIES SUBMITTED:</b>	May Jane Ward, David Moghaddam, Robin Porter, Shelby McCorvey, Jeff McCool	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	Karen Cummings, August Fons, Robert Guthrie	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 3</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Approval of Minutes	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes from the February meeting approved as read.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion: Brenda Pierce 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Mickey Best	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Upload February 2008 minutes into TracDat	Kay Goad	Prior to May Meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 4</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Institutional Scoring Team Reports for Spring 2008	Kay Goad & Brenda Pierce	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving: Team has scored artifacts; Data has been delivered to OIE; OIE has analyzed result; Report is ready for SLOAC to review.</p> <p>Communication: Team has scored artifacts; Data has been delivered to OIE for analysis.</p> <p>Self &amp; Community: Survey not administered yet. No report at this time</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEM</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. CT & PS	SLOAC to review results	Today's meeting
2. Communication	OIE to analyze results	Prior to May's meeting
3. Self	Shelby McCorvey (Liaison) to coordinate with August Fons	By end of the spring semester

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 5</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Institutional Scoring Team Results</b>	<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The executive summaries of results for the following were discussed:  <b>Communications - Spring 2007</b> – Benchmark was missed by 17%.  <b>Communications – Fall 2007</b> – Benchmark met. (83% of artifacts scored moderate skill on all components.)  Possible reasons for the variance in the two communication scores:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Amount of information and instruction given to the faculty member making the assignment.</li> <li>➤ Students may be more experienced in the spring semester. (Artifacts were collected in the spring semester and scored in the fall.)</li> </ul> <i>How is the data to be used:</i>  The collected data will be used to refine the process to evaluate the outcome  <i>Action Plan:</i>  Have Liaison meet with chosen faculty to review rubric before designing the assignment.</p> <p><b>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving – Fall 2007</b> – Benchmark was missed by 40%  <b>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving – Spring 2008</b> – Benchmark was missed by 18%  Discussion was held about the validity of the process. It was suggested that the process be passed on to faculty. Suggestion was made to be on the agenda for Fall In-Service. Kay Goad assigned the assignment for Spring 2008 to fit the rubric and the scores came up. Class was given an open topic.  <i>How is the data to be used:</i>  The collected data will be used to refine the process to evaluate the outcome  <i>Action Plan:</i>  Have Liaison meet with chosen faculty to review rubric before designing the assignment</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>It was suggested that the liaisons share the rubric with the faculty member designing the assignment. Dr. Gratton asked Kay to e-mail him with the request to select courses for the Fall semester. Artifacts will be collected from the selected courses.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. E-mail to Dr. Gratton requesting selection of courses for artifacts.	Kay Goad	Prior to May meeting
2. Assessment process on Fall In-Service Agenda	Dr. Gratton	Fall In-service
3. Artifacts for Self and Community will be reviewed at the May meeting	Kay Goad	May meeting

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 6</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
<b>NMHEAR Conference Reports</b>		<b>K. Holladay and C. Schmitz</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Kelly Holladay reported that all the meetings she attended NMJC was ahead of the game. When report is submitted they want to know how our process is working and that faculty put process together.</p> <p>Charlotte Schmitz reported that we should share the rubric with all faculty so when their course is selected they will be familiar with the rubric.</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Suggestion was made to put rubrics on the online system. It was also suggested that the competencies need to be put into the general objectives of the syllabi.	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 7</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
New Business – Selection of new scoring team members and liaisons for fall 2008		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving</b>  Liaison: Kay Goad  Scoring Team Members for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving  Arts &amp; Humanities: Ruth Wong or Patsy Lewis  Careers &amp; Technology: Homer Youngblood or Delores Thompson  Math &amp; Sciences: Roene Neu (same as spring 2008)</p> <p><b>Communication</b>  Liaison: Terry Hollomon  Scoring Team Members (same as spring 2008)  Arts &amp; Humanities: Lynda Newman  Careers &amp; Technology: Sue Black  Math &amp; Sciences: Richard Steinhaus</p>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion was moved to accept the above listed faculty members as scoring team members and liaisons. Made by: Brenda Pierce; 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Mickey Best		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Notify faculty	Liaisons	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 8</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>NMHE Assessment Summer Retreat</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	A team of four (Kelly Holladay, John Gratton, Kay Goad, Mary Ann Newell) will be sent to the NMHE Assessment Summer retreat in Ruidoso held June 23 <sup>rd</sup> -25 <sup>th</sup> , 2008. They will be working on NMJC's assessment report due January 2009 to NCA.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Other retreats will be held in Chicago & North Carolina. If anyone is interested in attending, please see Mary Ann Newell for travel monies.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Travel arrangements	OIE	Completed	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC: 9</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Adjournment</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Motion was made by Mickey Best to adjourn and seconded by Brenda Pierce.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Next meeting will be Friday, May 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2008.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Distribute April Minutes and May Agenda to SLOAC Members	Kay Goad & De Etta Duff	Prior to May Meeting	

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
May 2, 2008	2:30 pm	Heidel Hall 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Kay Goad	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Mary Jane Ward, Jeff McCool, Terry Holloman, Karen Cummings, Charlotte Schmitz, Kay Goad, Brenda Pierce, Kelly Holladay, Michele Clingman, Robin Porter, Shelby McCorvey, Robert Guthrie, David Moghaddam	
<b>PROXIES SUBMITTED:</b>	Charles Adams, Dr. Gratton, Mickey Best, Mary Ann Newell	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	August Fons, Angila Shook	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Approval of Minutes	Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes from the April meeting were approved as read.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Motion: Brenda Pierce 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Kelly Holladay	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports		Goad, Holloman, McCorvey	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Fall 2008 Scoring team for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving is as follows:</b>  Homer Youngblood  Ruth Wong  Roene Nue  Artifacts from BI 214A Anatomy &amp; Physiology will be collected and scored next fall for Critical Thinking.</p> <p><b>Fall 2008 Scoring team for Communication Skills is as follows:</b>  Linda Newman  Sue Black  Richard Steinhaus  Artifacts from GO 213 American Government will be collected and scored next fall for Communication Skills.</p> <p><b>Self &amp; Community had nothing to report at this time.</b></p>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Liaisons will meet with instructors of courses chosen to provide artifacts before assignments are given to students.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Communication Outcome Scoring Rubric		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Discussion was held on changing the wording on the Communication Outcome Scoring Rubric.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Terri Holliman will critique the instruction over the summer and will bring to the first meeting in the fall.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports – Self & Community		Shelby McCorvey	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Shelby reported that she has 25 artifacts and will get with August Fons and get 25 additional ones.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	This item will be tabled until additional artifacts can be gathered.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Gather additional artifacts	Shelby McCorvey		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Communication Scoring Team Results		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	The results for the Communication artifacts scored in the Spring 2008 were 42%. The benchmark was missed by 32%. Scores seem to be declining.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>A discussion was held on writing assignments for artifacts. It is not the intent of the committee to put more work on faculty when gathering artifacts for scoring It was suggested that the rubrics be passed out to faculty.</p> <p>The gathered data will be used to refine the process. Actions plan: Revise the rubric to add additional competencies.</p> <p>Motion:  Brenda Pierce – 1<sup>st</sup>  Mary Jane Ward – 2nd</p>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Fall 2008 In-service agenda		Kay Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	It was suggested that the rubrics be handed out to faculty at the Fall '08 In-service.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>Terry Holloman will make changes to rubrics and scoring instructions and e-mail to committee by Tuesday afternoon. These will be handed out to faculty for the 2008-2009 semesters.</p> <p>Motion was made:  Mary Jane Ward - 1<sup>st</sup>  Brenda Pierce – 2nd</p>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>SLOAC Summary Report for 2007-08</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Functions of SLOAC:</b>  Review NCA and state guidelines and requirements as related to student academic achievement and learning;</p> <p>Review, update, and disseminate the college's assessment plan;</p> <p>Develop strategies for the implementation of the assessment plan;</p> <p>Develop strategies to ensure shared responsibility for student learning and the assessment of student learning; and</p> <p>Prepare minutes of meeting and disseminate copies to the President and the Vice President for Instruction.</p> <p><b>The following goals for 2007-08 were discussed:</b>  Evaluate results/generate action plan for Communication outcome from Spring 2007</p> <p>Complete rubric and implement plan for Self and Community outcome</p> <p>Monitor progress of Communication &amp; Critical Thinking scoring teams</p> <p>Assess the Assessment plan</p> <p>Input documentation of SLOAC into TracDat</p>		
	<p>The rubric for Self and community had been put on hold.</p> <p>Assessing the assessment plan will be a continual process for the committee.</p> <p>Input documentation of SLOAC into TracDat will be done over the summer.</p> <p>Kay asked for changes and additions to the summary report.</p>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Fall 2008-09 SLOAC Officers</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Charlotte Schmitz will serve as chairman of the committee for 2008-09. Charlotte feels she needs a co-chair. Rotation on the committee is two (2) years.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	A faculty member needs to volunteer to serve as co-chair.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Meeting			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Motion to adjourn was made by Charlotte Schmitz and seconded by Mary Jane Ward,		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Next meeting will be Friday, September 5 <sup>th</sup> @ 2:30pm in HH 125.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

# SLOAC

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
September 5, 2008	2:30pm	Heidel Hall 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Charlotte Schmitz	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Charlotte Schmitz, Mechile Clingman, Kelly Holladay, Jeff McCool, Mary Ann Newell, John Rice, Mary Jane Ward, Charley Adams, Kay Goad, Terry Holloman, Angila Shook, John Gratton, Robin Porter, Richard Steinhaus,	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	De Etta Duff, August Fons, Shelby McCorvey, Dallas Hulsey, Karen Cummings, Mickey Best, Lynda Newman,	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	David Moghaddam	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports: Critical Thinking	K. Goad	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay reported to the group that Ruth Wong and Homer Youngblood will not be scoring artifacts this semester because of the lag in collecting artifacts. They will have artifacts to score in the spring	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Contact Ruth and Homer	Kay Goad	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports: Communication		T. Holloman	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Terri asked for input from the committee on deciding if a person serving on the committee can also serve as a scoring team member.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	It was decided that there was not a need for a motion and members of the committee can also serve as a scoring team member.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Scoring Team Reports: Self and Community		S. McCorvey & C Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Artifacts from Joe Garcia and Dallas Hulsey will be collected for scoring this semester		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Scoring team will be from with the SLOAC. Volunteers are as follows: Terry Holloman, Mary Jane Ward, Charlotte Schmitz, Mickey Best, Karen Cummings.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Contact Mickey Best and Karen Cummings about the scoring committee.	C. Schmitz	Before next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
NCA Report		M. A. Newell	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Mary Ann reported on the status of the NCA/HLC report.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>			
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Goals for SLOAC this semester		C. Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Charlotte will be e-mailing department chairs for the responses that were requested from faculty on implementing an action plan for Critical Thinking and Communication.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Responses will be used in revising the Assessment of Student Learning Handbook.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. E-mail to department chairs requesting responses from faculty	C. Schmitz		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Subcommittee to revise and update the Assessment of Student Learning Handbook		C. Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Asked for volunteers to be on committee to revise and update the Assessment of Student Learning Handbook. Most recent handbook dated Spring 2004.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	The following committee members volunteered: Charlotte Schmitz, Mary Ann Newell, Dr. Gratton, Kay Goad, and Robin Porter		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Will schedule meeting for volunteers	C. Schmitz	By next meeting	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Comments about In-Service		C. Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Charlotte asked for input from committee on in-service. It was suggested that assessment be kept out in front of faculty and ask for input from them. Assessment was not discussed with new faculty during in-service. It was suggested that the department chairs sit down with new faculty and explain the assessment process.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Go back in front of faculty in the spring in-service with some of the suggestions they made. Suggestion was made to schedule new faculty for assessment training during Spring In-service.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Schedule time during in-service for assessment	C. Schmitz	Before spring semester begins	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Adjournment			
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Next meeting will be October 3 <sup>rd</sup> @ 2:30pm in HH 125		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Meeting adjourned.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1. Minutes from September meeting e-mailed to members of committee.	C. Schmitz	Before next meeting	
2. Agenda for October meeting to members of committee.	C. Schmitz	Before next meeting	

# Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

## MINUTES

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	<b>MEETING TIME:</b>	<b>MEETING LOCATION:</b>
October 3, 2008	2:30 pm	HH 125
<b>MEETING CALLED BY:</b>	Charlotte Schmitz	
<b>RECORDER:</b>	De Etta Duff	
<b>ATTENDEES:</b>	Charles Adams, Angila Shook, Dallas Hulseley, Mickey Best, August Fons, Jeff McCool, Richard Steinhaus, Robin Porter, Shelby McCorvey, Kay Goad, Terri Holloman, Charlotte Schmitz, De Etta Duff	
<b>UNABLE TO ATTEND (EXCUSED ABSENCE):</b>	Kelly Holladay, Mechile Clingman, Mary Ann Crane, John Rice, Mary Jane Ward, Karen Cummings, Lynda Newman, John Gratton,	
<b>NOT PRESENT:</b>	David Moghaddam	
<b>GUESTS:</b>		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>
Approval of Minutes from September Meeting	Charlotte Schmitz
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Minutes were approved as read. Motion by Dallas Hulseley, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Robin Porter.
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>	<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
Self and Community	Charlotte Schmitz	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Critical Thinking artifacts have been collected.	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
1. Scoring team will score artifacts		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>In service, October 17</b>		<b>Charlotte Schmitz</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	HLC report will be shared with faculty. New faculty will be trained in Student Learning Outcomes. Charlotte will go before faculty with outcome assessment needs.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	New faculty will be allowed to stay behind and ask questions of the committee. If you are on the committee please stay behind to answer questions.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>HLC Report</b>		<b>Kay Goad</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Kay reported that they had received good feed back from the faculty on the Institutional Outcomes Action Plan. There were several common responses to modify the process. Dallas Hulsey suggested that faculty adopt a critical thinking and communication handbook. A discussion was held on the possibility of faculty adopting this policy. There are numerous resources for students to use.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	A suggestion was made to ask for time during in-service to have a round table discussion on the importance of adopting a guide for communication and critical thinking.		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
1.			

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Subcommittee to revise SLO Handbook</b>		<b>Charlotte Schmitz</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Committee will meet after the meeting today to start process.		

<b>AGENDA TOPIC:</b>		<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	
<b>Adjournment</b>		<b>Charlotte Schmitz</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Meeting was adjourned. Motion made by Dallas Hulsey; 2 <sup>nd</sup> Angila Shook.		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Next meeting will be November 7, 2008		

# **Attachment D**

## **New Mexico Junior College Assessment Action Plan**



*Promoting Success through Learning*

1 Thunderbird Circle  
Hobbs, New Mexico 88240  
575-392-4510 • 1-800-657-6260  
[nmjc.edu](http://nmjc.edu)

<b>Institutional Assessment PROCESS suggestions</b>	<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>
Data may not be useful yet. Instructions to scoring team, lack of standardization between scorers in reading rubrics.	Sharing rubrics and updating faculty	Sharing rubrics and updating faculty
Assignment difficulty could cause results within one outcome to vary.	"Round table" discussions on what faculty are doing within their curriculum to support the institutional values"	"Round table" discussions on what faculty are doing within their curriculum to support the institutional values"
Scoring team might have more strength in one area and could influence the scores for that semester.	Build a "tool box" or collection of possible enrichment activities.	Build a "tool box" or collection of possible enrichment activities.
Results will vary based on level students. Collecting artifacts from freshman level students once and sophomore level students next.	Provide students access to faculty via writing lab. Promote the writing lab and make it visible by advertising	Training on how to use rubrics for all levels of assessment.
Compare same assignment from same class for multiple semesters with same scoring team.	Encourage faculty to require second draft papers.	
Wait for more data to see a pattern.	Prior to giving a writing assignment encourage faculty to share with students the importance of giving best writing no matter what course. (Outline expectations)	
Sample a larger group, 3% of student population.	Place materials on the website that directly address communication skills in reading, writing and speaking. It should be created by NMJC with our needs in mind ("local flavor").	
Focus on sophomore class in Fall...	Renew the goal of making classes have a formal writing and / or public speaking component.	
	Training in cultural diversity issues, specifically related to generation (youth and their love of technology).	