

**Instructional Council Minutes**  
**July 12, 2012**  
**Hood River Campus - Room 311**

Standing Committee Minutes are located on Department Chair Moodle Site

Moodle Link <http://cgccmoodle.com/moodle/course/category.php?id=7>

**Short Announcements:**

**In Attendance:** Brian Greene, John Copp, John Evans, Doris Jepson, Mary Kramer, Diana Lee-Greene, Lynn Lewis, Dave Mason, Brook Maurer, Richard Parker, Dan Ropek, Tim Schell,

**Review Minutes** - John Copp motioned to approve the minutes from 6.1.12 and Dan Ropek seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**Guest(s):** Bill Bohn, Kristin Chatfield, Isaac Lewis, Susan Lewis, Ex-Officio Member

**Facilitator** - Brian Greene

| TOPIC   | DISCUSSION   | ACTION |
|---|--|--------|
| 1) Core Theme "B" Targets - Adopt Targets for Core Theme "B" Measures (Dan Ropek) | 1) Dan R. briefly reviewed what the core themes cover ~ A=access, B=education, C=community. Core Theme B is the instructional component and relates specifically to faculty. The goal is to try and put numbers to things we assess so that reliable/valid data can be collected. The acceptable "standard target" for all core theme measures is 80%. The 5 measures being worked on this summer are:<br>Measure B.3.2 - percentage of instructors who completed course assessment cycle (per the annual course assessment schedule).<br>Measure B.3.3 - percentage of students who meet course outcomes<br>Measure B.3.4 - percentage of students who meet degree/certificate/program outcomes<br>Measure B.4.4 - percentage of faculty and staff demonstrating evidence-based practices |        |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Measure B.4.5 - percentage of new faculty and staff involved in mentoring relationships</p> <p>Discussion ensued about setting 80% as the target for the 5 measures. Susan L. noted that we've been writing targets for an ideal of 80%. Kristin C. said it's okay if the target/goal isn't met since we don't have a baseline set. John C. said there's "no way we'll get 80% of all faculty involved in mentoring." For 80%, we need to define new faculty. Brook M. suggested adding new faculty and defining mentoring.</p> <p><b>Consensus: The 5 measures need to be better defined and include a glossary.</b></p> <p><b>MOTION: Doris Jepson moved to approve as amended the definition changes (set B.4.5 at 3 years, delete staff on B.4.4, include glossary) that the Core Theme group was charged with working on and to redefine clear "workable" definitions. Brook Maurer seconded. One abstention. Motion carried.</b></p>   |  |
| <p>2) Review 2011-12 program, degree and certificate SLO assessment efforts (Identify work group to recommend changes to be implemented for 2012-13 cycle - prior to fall in-service) - Brian Greene</p> | <p>2) Three models were presented. <b>Grace Windsheimer used assignment grades for assessing the CAS-OS program in 2011-12.</b> Their goal was set at 85% in all programs with another review scheduled in 5 years. Four questions were asked in all courses and they looked at specific assignments in specific courses. Grace W. feels the assessment tool is adequate and that definite recommendations regarding program improvements could be made in the next review.</p> <p><b>Diana Lee-Greene used external evaluators in a real world setting for assessing Medical Assisting students.</b> Their assessment plan was given to the external site preceptors. The preceptors decide whether a student passes or doesn't pass and what their grade should be. The target for a pass is 85% based on a scale of 3.0-5.0. Diana L-G. felt the M.A. outcomes assessment worked well with the exception of the grading piece that needs some additional work and informing the M.A. Advisory Committee of how the assessment process works.</p> <p>Brian G. reviewed the AAOT Outcomes Report. <b>The AAOT outcomes</b></p> |  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>assessments were based on aggregated course grades over 3 terms (80% for a C or better, 60% for B or better).</p> <p>Brian G. asked if the three approaches are telling us what we want to know. Dan R. wants to see evidentiary action before we change to a different model. <b>John Evans and Diana Lee-Greene volunteered to suggest improvements to the process by the Sept. 17th IC meeting. Consensus of DCs: Agreed to stick to the schedule to analyze data in the third year. No action taken.</b></p>  |  |
| <p>3) Proposal for 2012-13 course SLO assessment (Adopt proposal - including the form and pilot schedule; call for volunteers</p> | <p>3) Richard Parker presented the Course Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment process that he, Lynn L. and Susan L. worked on. The course SLO's are the agreed upon second phase of our three-year plan. It's important to know if students learn the expected outcomes. The two drivers are: regularly taught courses (every 3 years) and instructors (at least one evaluation per year). It was noted that our form was based on materials from Grays Harbor College. <b>A schedule of when courses are taught needs to be created.</b> Most instructors would do a couple of assessments per year. Instructors need to be given information about what they need to do, why, and when it needs to be done. Dan R. commented that the form needs to be standardized (like a menu), scaled, multiple choice, measurable. Susan L. noted that it's important for instructors to know where to map course outcomes. Course mapping shows how everything relates/connects: courses &gt; programs &gt; outcomes &gt; degrees &gt; institution. Tim S. commended Susan, Lynn and Richard for their work and coming up with something that the N.W. Commission on Accreditation will like.</p> <p><b>Consensus: each department chair will develop a schedule of evaluations for fall and submit to their Director by Sept. 1<sup>st</sup>.</b></p> <p><b>MOTION: Brian Greene moved to approve the following: Part A, delete #2, leave #3 for academic year 2012-13, #5 reworded and required (question reworded to how will you know your students were successful in achieving each outcome?). The preamble to the Student Learning Outcomes will be reviewed by Dan Ropek and possibly revised. Tim Schell seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.</b></p> |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4) IC Meetings for 2012-13 - Brian Greene</p> <p>5) Website Overhaul - Paula Ascher</p> <p>6) Faculty In-service Task Force (Identify 2-3 Task Force participants - Mary Kramer</p> <p>7) Directors Re-organization - Dave M.</p> | <p>4) Brian G. set the IC meetings for 2012-13 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of each month with the exception of September's meeting which is Mon., Sept. 17<sup>th</sup>, 10am-1pm, TDC Board Room.</p> <p>5) Paula A. is now the Instructional Services representative on the web core team. The team is responsible for overseeing the development of our "virtual campus" in conjunction with Insite, a web publishing company. Paula introduced Isaac Lewis, CGCC's Online Services Specialist (Web Development Project Manager in real world) who gave an overview of our website. The web core team, created in 2011, has 8 department representatives. There are 32 projects scheduled to be completed over the next two years. Isaac briefly reviewed the features of the website (cgcc.us). Projects this summer focus on the faculty and staff portal pages and the academics section (for students to see what's being offered). DC's need to coordinate with their directors regarding names of five instructors to participate in a two-hour interview next month. Selection of instructors will default to Directors after July 13<sup>th</sup> for providing the five names to Paula Ascher. Paula will send an email to the selected instructors to explain what is needed. Any website questions? Contact Isaac at 541-506-6097.</p> <p>6) Dave M. and Mary K. will work on an agenda for the fall faculty in-service. One focus will be on professional development (PD) and to explore what PD opportunities would look like for fall in-service with work completed by Aug. 1st. The task force participants are Paula Ascher, Lynn Lewis, Diana Lee-Greene, and Brook Maurer.</p> <p>7) Dave M. noted an organization change - transitioning supervision of science and math classes to Mary Kramer as part of a STEM-oriented program. This would be part of a new program called Embedded Technologies. Over the next year, the process will start with how to fund a new program and its impact on other departments in terms of staffing, budget, etc.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|                |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|
| 8) Other Items | <p>8) Bill Bohn distributed information about an August off-site Planning Focus Group and possible faculty participation.</p> <p>Faculty Evaluation Process: John C. said the Bargaining Team tentatively agreed to the proposed changes in the Faculty Evaluation process. John will send the final document to DCs. Brook M. would like a clearer definition of "good standing" when talking to new instructors. The list in the contract (including the definition of good standing) needs to be reviewed by DCs. He will use the current contract for reviewing the list before the Sept. 17<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p> |  |
|----------------|--|--|

Next IC meeting: Monday, Sept. 17<sup>th</sup> , 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m., The Dalles Campus, Board Room (1.162).

Meeting adjourned.