

MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

December 10, 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 Fleer, Patrick Fodor, Nick Krizmanic-committee members, Marty Otto, Carolyn Warren, Judy Taylor-Resource members; Chris Duesdieker-SGA student member; Josh Welker-Ex-Officio member; Dr. David Shinn, Phil Conover-Resource members.

Absent: Gary Shupe, Dr. Ray Staats

3. Introductions/Welcome

3.1

4. Minutes Approved

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA November 12, 2010 minutes as corrected.

Motion: Nick Krizmanic

Second: Chris Duesdieker

Approved

5. Special Guests

5.1 None.

6. Committee Reports

6.1 Training Sub-Committee-Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic

Nick reported that the Sub-Committee is collecting the artifacts and getting the packets ready for the December 14th assessment. They are making refinements to the score sheets. Should have it all ready by Monday.

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

Patrick reported that everything is set for Tuesday. He talked about how to handle the next assessment, Goal 3, working in groups. The Science department has been asked if they would be willing to perform an observation. We looked at the classes that claim the goal and determined the class with the largest potential student population, which is BIO 101. We asked instructors teaching the class if they would have a measurable artifact that could be assessed. They reported that they do not. A suggestion was offered that the instructors observe their students as they work in groups and gather assessment data which would then be given to Josh for analysis.

Marty asked about how students would be taught how to work in a group. Dr. Shinn stated that this is taught through experience and practical application – from actually

working in a group. The assessment will show whether students are picking up the necessary skills, and if not, then there may need to be something added to the curriculum in the first semester that addresses how to work in a group.

Patrick led a discussion about the fact that a General Education goal may be claimed by a class without there being an artifact that goes with it. Once a class is asked to participate in the assessment process, the faculty member who is teaching the class frequently produces an assignment to be used solely for assessment purposes. This process is not an honest assessment, it is artificial. It is not testing what is ordinarily going on in the class. Going back to the guidelines for updating the General Education matrix, no course should claim a General Education goal unless there is an artifact that can be tied to the goal that can be tested. Perhaps the place for teaching and testing the ability to work in groups should be in the Orientation course.

Working in groups is a very important goal, yet not too many classes claim the goal. There are many opportunities for students to work in groups throughout their time at John Wood Community College that are not represented in the General Education matrix.

Phil Conover was asked how a potential employer might be able to determine whether a candidate has learned how to work in a team. He stated that when interviewing someone, there is a series of questions that HR people use to determine the candidate's ability to work as a group. Another method to gather data is to have students in a group rate the other members of their group. Nick stated that in an interview, the candidate may be asked to describe experiences working in groups and the interviewer may be able to determine by the candidate's response what their attitude is toward working in groups.

We must find a group to assess and a valid way to assess them. Once we get results to analyze, then we can determine if there is a problem. Then we can work toward the solution.

The important issue is the teaching of the skills, and that the skills are taught every time in every section of a class. There needs to be something specific and concrete that is tied to the general education goal that is measurable and assessable.

Rhonda suggested adding questions to the CAAP test that relates to working in groups.

With regard to assessing Goal 3, we will be developing a rubric identifying the most important skills necessary for working in groups. Then we will provide the rubric to the instructors teaching BIO 101. They would be asked to observe students working in groups and then fill out the score sheets.

Patrick made a motion that we notify the instructors teaching BIO 101 that we will provide them with a rubric for working in groups and ask them to test GEG 3 in the Spring 2011 semester.

Motion to assess BIO 101 in the Spring 2011 semester.

Motion: Patrick Fodor

Second: David Rigsbee

Motion accepted.

6.3 CTWE Sub-Committee- David Rigsbee, Bill Fleer

Bill reported that CTWE program assessments is coming up next Tuesday and we are anticipating good participation. There are 24 programs that have not completed reports this year. We have several new programs that will be participating in order to be ready to complete reports next year.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb Stoll reported that the date of March 22 was approved by the Faculty Senate. Students would start out in their classrooms at the 9:30 class. The instructors would take attendance and then send the graduating sophomores down to the auditorium. The students who participate would be given a voucher for \$5 for taking the test.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 Assessment Timeline – this is a work in progress and we will need to look at it again in the Spring when we determine the assessment for Fall 2011.

7.2 General Education Matrix update – the matrix will need to go back to the Chairs and Directors in the Spring along with guidelines for updating the General Education matrix. Then they will have the opportunity to reevaluate their courses and determine if any adjustments are necessary.

7.3 MyCompLab – from Pearson / eCollege – Patrick stated that several departments are considering using MyCompLab. Within each MyCompLab sections, there is a built-in assessment – pre and post. We should ask for that information to be printed and submitted to the Assessment Committee for data analysis. Several committee members may be using the MyCompLabs, and should be watching for assessment opportunities.

Members will make a list of questions for Kathy McClintic about MyCompLabs.

8. Other Reports

8.1 None

9. Other Items – assessment opportunities coming up;

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

9.2 HLC Assessment Workshop, February 16 – 18, 2011 in Lisle, Illinois

9.3 HLC Annual Meeting, April 8 – 12, 2011 – Chicago, Illinois – submit your request or let Josh know if you are interested by next Tuesday, 12/14/10.

10. Announcements

10.1

11. Next meeting notification

11.1 The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on February 11, 2011, in room C283 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m.

12. Adjournment

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 12/10/10