

MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

October 08, 2010

1. Call to Order

1.1 Meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m. by Barb Stoll in room C283.

2. Attendance

Present: Barb Stoll-Chair; Rhonda Basinger-Vice-Chair; Dave Rigsbee, Melissa Knapp, Bill Fler, Patrick Fodor, Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic-committee member, Marty Otto, Carolyn Warren, Judy Taylor-Resource members; Josh Welker-Ex-Officio member; and Liz Akers-Recorder.

Absent: Dr. Ray Staats, Dr. David Shinn, Phil Conover-Resource members.

3. Introductions/Welcome

3.1 Barb Stoll introduced Chris Duesdieker, who will be serving as the student member from SGA.

4. Minutes Approved

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA September 10, 2010 minutes.

Motion: Gary Shupe

Second: Bill Fler

Approved

5. Special Guests

5.1 None.

6. Committee Reports

6.1 Training Sub-Committee-Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic

Gary reported that they should be receiving and reviewing rubrics from the areas to be assessed. Randall is working on the rubric for GEG 4.1 – Critical Thinking-PSY/SOC. Patrick is working on the rubric for GEG 1.1 – Diverse Cultures with artifacts coming from Major World Religions. Patrick has artifacts from the first 8-week classes. Gary and Nick will meet with Patrick to begin preparing for the assessment.

6.2 Gen Ed Sub-Committee-Patrick Fodor, Melissa Knapp

Melissa reported the progress with Stephanie in getting the demographics sheet put online. The demographics forms need to be linked to the artifacts. Stephanie stated that surveys must be anonymous. That won't work for us because we need to match the student's artifact with their demographic sheet. What we need is a form for students to fill out, not a survey. If we use an electronic form in Word format, the student could download the form and then place it into their document at the end of their paper. The Sub-Committee will pursue this further.

6.3 CTWE Sub-Committee- David Rigsbee, Bill Fleer

Bill reported that Dev Ed now has a network storage area to use for placing COMPASS scores, results of assessment and reports. Once Joyce returns, they can begin to determine how to organize the storage area.

Bill also reported that not much has been done in the CTWE Network storage area since the previous report. He stated that the information needs to be updated on the CTWE Program Assessment Results report to reflect changes: new programs need to be added and discontinued programs removed or marked as discontinued. Bill will work with Barb to get this updated.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 Demographics form online – discussed during the Gen Ed Sub-Committee report.

7.2 CAAP Testing Subcommittee – Barb reported that the sub-committee had been meeting and drafted a statement of purpose which, if approved, will be presented to faculty at the November Faculty Senate meeting. Included in the statement is information about why the Assessment committee is considering CAAP testing, along with Pros and Cons about implementing CAAP testing at JWCC. Also included are suggestions for how to overcome some of the problems. One major problem relates to getting the students to participate. It will be very important to have the support of the faculty to encourage students to show up for the test and to do their best. Listed in the statement are some incentives being considered to encourage students to participate in the CAAP testing. One incentive being considered is allowing students to wear some recognition item at graduation. Patrick stated that we must check to see if this is allowable. We are considering the first or second week after Spring Break. The two tests being considered for Spring, 2011 are Writing Skills and Critical Thinking. Chris stated that he and other students would have concerns about missing class. Faculty participation is critical with this, so students will be released from their class to take the test, with no penalty for missing the class.

Patrick suggested making it clear that we won't be disrupting the same classes, or scheduling the test on the same day every year.

Discussion about the new student orientation and the validity of the Compass testing and problems with the process: Chris stated that students don't seem to realize that the Compass testing is used for placement. Some students score poorly on the test but do not need to be in the Dev Ed classes. Another problem with the process is the fact that students take the tests at the end of a very long day of orientation and might not do well because of this. Chris suggested having current JWCC students talk to the new students and stress the importance of the placement tests. The committee might want to discuss our concerns with Lee Wibbell, Director of Admissions.

Judy expressed concerns about how the CAAP tests assess writing skills. We may be able to address these concerns when we take a look at the results from the Spring CAAP test on writing skills. There is also a CAAP test on writing essays, which may provide more useful results.

Motion to take the statement of purpose to Faculty Senate and ask for faculty approval to pursue CAAP testing.

Motion: Patrick Fodor

Second: Bill Fleer

Motion accepted.

7.3 CETL and Assessment – Barb suggested that we approach the Professional Development committee and request the use of the December Brown Bag discussion for CAAP testing. The suggested title of our discussion could be: CAAPturing Student Learning Outcomes. Committee members were favorable to doing a brown bag discussion on CAAP testing. Barb will approach Chris and ask if it would be acceptable.

7.4 Problems with updating the General Education Matrix – concerns have been expressed regarding the updating of the matrix. There are two issues here. First, different sections of a given class taught by different instructors do not list the same General Education goals in their syllabus. This should not be at the individual instructor's discretion. Second, many instructors don't seem to understand that claiming a goal for their class means that they have a testable/quantifiable artifact that can be assessed. In the past, some classes claimed a goal, but had no artifact and had to add an assignment solely for the purpose of assessment. We need to draft guidelines for selecting a goal. We should include the statement that for each goal claimed, there must be an assignment that is given as part of the class work by every instructor teaching a section of the class. These guidelines would go to the chairs and directors who should disseminate the information and work with their faculty to determine at the departmental level which goals each class claims to address. David suggested that a committee member come to the Chairs and Directors meeting and discuss this. Barb will work with Patrick to produce a rough draft of these guidelines and bring it back to the next meeting.

7.5 Ad Hoc Committee to revise Gen Ed Goals – before an ad hoc committee is formed, we need to check with the Board to see if it is acceptable for us to suggest revisions. Barb will check into this before we proceed. Dr. Staats has suggested that this be a 2-year process with no changes being made until after the Reaffirmation process is complete.

7.6 Assessment Timeline – Barb presented a draft of the General Education timeline. Since this is a draft, we can take the time to look it over and bring changes to the next meeting. Members were asked to let Barb know if there are any suggestions for changes. Patrick asked if there has been anything done about selecting the classes to be assessed in May. This should be done before the next meeting so we can approve the selection in time to present it to the Faculty in December before the Christmas break. The Gen Ed Subcommittee can review this and bring back a recommendation to the next meeting.

8. Other Reports

8.1 Feedback from May Assessment – Barb reported that she discussed the results of the May assessment of GEG 4.1 with Norm Rodriguez, who provided the artifacts and the training. Norm indicated that he plans to make the following changes to the assignment: Give the assignment to the students earlier in the semester and require students to turn in several drafts/outlines before the final draft of the project is submitted.

Barb met with David Palmer regarding the results of the assessment of GEG 7.1. David said he thought the results were satisfactory and that no changes were needed at this time.

9. Other Items

9.1 Assessment Fair, February 25, 2011 in Normal, Illinois – this may be something worth attending.

10. Announcements

10.1

11. Next meeting notification

11.1 The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on November 12, 2010, in room C283 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m.

12. Adjournment

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:49 a.m.

Submitted by Liz Akers, 10/08/10

Revised by Barb Stoll