



**Assessment Advisory Council
Minutes
November 3, 2011
Babylon Student Center-Mildred Green Room
3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.**

In attendance: Dr. Jean Anastasia, Dr. Robert Beodeker, Nicholas Bosco, Pina Arcomano Britton, Richard Britton, Dr. Donna Ciampa, Jennifer Farquhar, Carissa Forde, Cheryl Gillespie, Dr. Tina Good, Dr. Alex Kasiukov, Dr. Dorothy Laffin, Dr. Christopher McDougal, Dr. Patty Munsch, Dr. Jeffrey Pederson, Dr. Meryl Rogers, Gregory Sarafin, Bridget Young, Dr. Christopher Shults, Dr. Nathaniel Pugh, Dr. Louis Attinasi, Dr. Phil Christensen, Dr. Allen Jacobs, James Lagonegro, Kathy Massimo, Dr. Lanette Raymond, Dr. Catherine Wynne, Joanne Braxton

I Welcome-Philip Christensen, Associate Dean for Curriculum Development, Co-chairperson

Dr. Christensen welcomes all members and shows appreciation for all of the challenging work done thus far.

II Website Update – Christopher Shults, Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness-Chairperson

Dr. Shults begins by updating the council on the work he is doing with Sophia Papadomitiou on the new Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (OPIE) website. All the information going into the OPIE website will include all of the Planning and Assessment information, research, data and reports. It will hold not only hold minutes, agenda's, reports, all of the documentation that has been coming out, but also power points, timelines and cycles, regarding planning and institutional effectiveness (IE). When completed it will be an overall comprehensive site where one could go if they had a question regarding planning and IE, research, accreditation, and IE activity. The council will be notified as soon as the website is ready and we welcome any suggestions, changes or recommendations so that the website will be user friendly and to contain the information that is helpful to the larger audience.

Still to be discussed is which topics might have a separate tab on the website for any sensitive material such as accreditation and periodic review report to be viewed by the internal community where a password would be necessary.

II Periodic Review Report Update-Dr. Phil Christensen Joanne Braxton, College Dean of Enrollment Management

Dr. Christensen welcomes Dean Braxton for joining us then states that Dr. Ciampa and he have been co-chairing the process of researching and writing the Periodic Review Report (PRR) which is a 5 yr or midpoint accreditation report between a team visit and the next decennial visit.

In our case, the last self study was in 2007 and the next visit is in 2017. In the past, the five year report has involved a lot of bookkeeping and reporting but did not seem to carry the weight which it seems to now. It has been made clear to many who have worked as the liaison with Middle States that, Middle States regard the five year report as an accreditation event. This is an initiative which has become very important to the President and the college community as Dr. Shults has previously suggested, and that its implications for all who work and study at the college are significant.

The various parts of the report include a summary of the institutional response to the recommendations and concerns that came up in the 2007 visit. Dr. Christensen states that Dr. Ciampa has worked very hard on that section of the report which is near completion and will be posted as soon as possible. It will be announced through a college brief for all colleagues in the college community to get a chance to review. Next, there will be four follow up postings of that report at four different venues, one at each campus as a forum on December 6, 7, and 13th and the fourth will be an event hosted through the three distance learning classrooms. Dr. Christensen states that one part of that PRR lies heavily with James Lagonegro which deals with enrollment projections and financial trends and projections.

Dr. Christensen welcomes Dean Braxton, College Dean of Enrollment Management and shares that Dean Braxton has worked many years as a consultant in Higher Education and works frequently on Middle State teams. Dean Braxton had shared her thoughts from her recent trip to Philadelphia where she was involved in Assessment and Review of Periodic Review Reports (PRR) of other community colleges throughout our sector (Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey).

Dean Braxton says that she gets calls from Middle States because of her multi-campus experience. She brings her experience from four different segments of Middle States, being a team member, working in a small team follow-up, periodic reviewer, and also sits on the periodic review committee. Her reason for coming today is to give us a clear cut picture of what the expectations are of the Periodic Review Report as a reviewer. She discusses the things we should keep in mind as we move forward. In putting the PRR in place she stressed the importance of having documentation and evidence of the steps we took in responding to the earlier recommendations, the self study report and the team report and to clearly state where the institution is five years later. Once the first reader is finished it goes to the second reader, they check to see if you are on the same page in terms of what your overall assessment is of the PRR. The first reader then writes the report. Dean Braxton states that the PRR used to be more of a summary but has recently changed to be looked at more of as an accreditation visit.

Dean Braxton explains that there are seven segments that the reader must put together from our documents. Starting with the introduction which gives overview of institution, then we should be looking at the responses and recommendations from the previous team visit, the major challenges, opportunities, enrollment and finance trends and projections. There is a separate segment which concentrates on assessment processes and plans. All the accreditation bodies are more on the cutting edge on assessment and looking for concrete information. As stated by the Commissioners – there should be no phrases such as “we are working on”, “we are engaged in”, “we are planning on”, because it is unacceptable and that only concrete information with

evidence and documentation will be accepted. Assessment is not only for Middle States review but is for us- as an institution to be the best that we can be for our students. Every PRR is also reviewed by a person who has financial background in higher education.

As an institution we will have access to those seven areas as Dean Braxton directs the council to pay attention to the “Guidelines for Standards –Self Assessment Templates” and also in the “Learning Goals in Student Affairs” which has a systematic template for system implementation.

Dr. Kasiukov asked if the recommendations from the Middle States visiting team more of a priority than the Self Study Report. Dean Braxton states that the expectations have equal weight. Recommendations we must respond to, suggestions are optional. Dean Braxton suggested focusing our reading to page 25, which is “What Should Institutions Document Regarding Assessment”. Dr. Shults will be putting a link on the website for this document.

Dr. Christensen states the strength of this institution is evident that so much of what we have done over the past three to four years has responded very positively. He states that Dean Braxton has pointed out that Middle States lays out very clearly what their expectations are and they are very useful, cost effective, accurate and truthful.

III Subcommittee Updates- Subcommittee Chairs

Dr. Laffin is chairing the committee on Service Outcomes with Pina Britton- had the opportunity to attend the 2011-25th Anniversary of the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis which is one of the premier assessment councils. She brought back many resources for teaching and learning objectives and will have presentations electronically for others to view. She also shares that the information in “Guidelines for Standards and Self Assessment” had templates that were going to be used.

Christopher Shults shares about the updating of information in Student Affairs who are looking at program learning goals which have been restructured and connected to learning outcomes, while looking into support goals and support outcomes next and will be using the templates that are out there to start assessment in their area.