Meeting was convened at 3:30 PM in the Administration Building Conference Room

Members Present: Dzindolet, Kingsley, Kinslow, Miller, Sutherland, Swinney, Warren

Members Absent: Groves, Wartley

1. Assessment Status.

The committee discussed concerns about Cameron's assessment status. In summer 2004, Cameron must submit a report to the Higher Learning Commission to show that we have substantially moved the institution to Level III assessment. The deans have been told that they are responsible for getting each of their programs to Level III. During June 2003, the deans (in conjunction with Sutherland) will meet with each of their departments to discuss each program's plans for achieving Level III. Any members of the IAC who will be available may attend.

Sutherland has also visited with the department chairs and given them notes and handouts he has used in the past with the Council of Chairs. Those handouts include benchmark institutions appropriate for Cameron. Many of them have open admission policies and a high percentage of military students. In addition to using those institutions on the list, departments might also want to look at Northwest Missouri State and Midwestern State for benchmarking purposes. Programs should also consult national organizations' standards and objectives in order to establish benchmarking. Note: it is somewhat hazardous to benchmark portfolios against those of other institutions.

2. Portfolio Workshop.

Because portfolios are extremely useful assessment tools, Anita Hernandez (Education Department) will lead a portfolio assessment workshop during Fall 2003.

3. Performance Funding.

A portion of the funding that Cameron receives through the Board of Higher Regents is now performance funding. Variables now considered in determining funding include retention and graduation rates. In addition, student performance on the English CAAP test will be used as part of the formula.


The CAAP test in critical thinking was not administered this year, in part because of concerns that students are not taking the test seriously. The Office of Assessment and Planning needs to find a better place to administer that exam.

5. In-House Exams.

Given current budget constraints, programs may be encouraged to develop in-house exams rather than purchasing national tests.

6. Assessment Website.

The Office of Assessment and Planning website has been recently revised and upgraded. It now includes materials intended to help programs with their assessment
efforts, including information on writing outcomes objectives and benchmarking.

7. Future Meetings.
   The IAC will make an effort to meet on a monthly basis during AY 2003-2004. Sutherlin will circulate a draft calendar.