

# MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

---

**February 11, 2011**

**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, Gary Shupe-committee members, Marty Otto, Carolyn Warren, Judy Taylor, Cathy Myers-Resource members; Chris Duesdieker-SGA student member; Josh Welker-Ex-Officio member; Dr. David Shinn -Resource member.

Absent: Dr. Ray Staats, Phil Conover

**3. Introductions/Welcome**

3.1

**4. Minutes Approved**

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA December 10, 2010 minutes as corrected.

Motion: Patrick Fodor

Second: Nick Krizmanic

Approved

**5. Special Guests**

5.1 Cathy Myers was introduced and welcomed as a new resource member.

**6. Committee Reports**

6.1 Training Sub-Committee-Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic

Gary was unable to participate in the December assessment, so he would defer to Nick for the report. Nick reported that the assessment went well. The only issue we had was that we did not have enough readers for the number of artifacts that were collected. Carolyn asked about the evaluation sheets filled out by the readers. Barb will obtain the results from Liz to present at our March meeting. Judy pointed out that there were different kinds of assignments from the different instructors within the same class. Some were short essays and some were research papers. Patrick stated that the type of assignment should not make a difference. He explained that one of the instructors does not require a research paper, but assigns two shorter papers instead. It was also pointed out that the students were not given the rubric in advance which may have affected the assignments.

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

Patrick presented the rubric to be used for Goal 3.1 – Work in groups effectively. This will be used with BIO 101 during Spring 2011 semester. The instructors of BIO 101 will be asked to observe their students working in groups and fill out score

sheets. Students who are being observed should fill out demographic sheets. Students should be given the rubric in advance of the observation. Providing the rubric to the students would be a training aid to help them learn how to work in groups. Dr. Shinn stated that giving them the rubric may present an artificial situation. The student, knowing they are being assessed, may pretend to have the skills being assessed, but because they are able to pretend, they have demonstrated that they have the ability to work in groups if they so choose. If we give the student the rubric, we should give it to them every semester, not just the semester when we are assessing the goal. It could be attached to the syllabus that is provided to the students every semester. Josh stated that there should be a standardized, master rubric for each goal, from which changes could be made as needed for each assessment using that rubric. The rubric for assessing Critical Thinking in May 2010 was very different from the rubric used to assess Critical Thinking in December 2010.

We should plan to present the rubric we are using at the Faculty Senate meeting when we present the results of the 3.1 assessment. We could then recommend that any class which has a group work component should have the rubric attached to the syllabus.

Suggested changes to the rubric:

In the category “Cooperation / Communication”, in the “Developing” column, add “or does not communicate”. Currently the “Developing” criteria cover students who dominate the discussions. Making this change will provide a guideline for scoring students who do not communicate during group work.

The type of training needed for the scorers was discussed. Three of the four faculty members doing the assessments have participated in numerous previous Gen Ed assessments and should be familiar with the process. The fourth faculty member is new to the assessment process and will need additional training. The training needs with this type of classroom assessment were discussed, including asking that the students be given the rubric in advance of the observation, having students fill out the demographic sheet, and standard instructions for how to score using the rubric and how to fill out the score sheets. Since we are piloting this method of assessment, we will need to request feedback from the participating faculty after the assessment has been performed.

### 6.3 CTWE Sub-Committee- David Rigsbee, Bill Flier

Bill reported that the December 14<sup>th</sup> CTWE assessment was very successful. 13 programs were due to perform assessments. We had good participation. 6 of the 13 posted results. One of the four new programs participating has developed their program goals, outcomes, rubrics and completed their first report. Two other new programs have developed their goals and outcomes. David Rigsbee met with Betty McDonnell and stated that Nursing has made some real progress with their assessment process. They have an outside source that analyzes student test results and provides charts and reports. The Nursing department just needs to report these results in the standard format used to report CTWE assessment. They have lots of data which they use to make decisions. They just need to document and report it.

#### 6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb Stoll reported that the Sub-committee met and decided to on February 22nd as the date to send out the letters to the students and begin the “media blitz” to get the word out to the students. Barb presented the letter to be sent to the students and pointed out that the students will be given a \$5 bill as a thank you for taking the test. The JWCC Foundation will supply gift cards to use as door prizes. The letters will be given to the faculty to hand out to their students in class. Some may need to be mailed. Marcia Avise will be the contact person for student and faculty questions. Since the deadline to request graduation is February 15<sup>th</sup>, after that date, we will be able to generate a list of graduating sophomores. This list will be provided to the faculty along with an informational email explaining the test procedure and asking for faculty support in getting the word out to the students, encouraging students to participate, and allowing students to miss class to take the test. Carolyn reported that we will be ordering more tests than we will probably need, but the unused tests can be returned and we will not be charged for unused tests.

Dr. Shinn suggested that the letter be reworded to remove the voucher notation because the Business Office will hand out the \$5 as the students proceed out of the auditorium at the conclusion of the test.

Chris thought that students should be told that they must stay until the end of the test. Dr. Shinn said that ACT tests are highly scripted and this information will be provided to the students prior to the start of the test. Additional logistics of the test were discussed.

### 7. Other Action Items

7.1 General Education Matrix update – the matrix will need to go back to the Chairs and Directors along with guidelines for updating the General Education matrix. This will give the departments an opportunity to reevaluate their courses and determine if any adjustments are necessary. Dr. Shinn suggested that someone from the Assessment Committee come to the March 4<sup>th</sup> Chairs and Directors meeting to discuss this.

7.2 MyCompLab – from Pearson / eCollege – members should forward questions to Dr. Shinn for Kathy McClintic regarding MyCompLabs. Some questions raised earlier included the assessment capabilities of MyCompLabs and which departments might be considering using it.

### 8. Other Reports

8.1 Josh presented results of the December 2010 assessment.

GEG 1.1: There were 173 artifacts collected from PHL 201 courses, and 168 of these artifacts were scored by the faculty on the December Assessment Day. The artifacts were scored on two components: 1) identification of values and diverse cultures, and (2) describe value and diverse cultures. The results show that students scored just above the ‘Acceptable’ rating for Component 1 and just below the ‘Acceptable’ rating for Component 2. Inter-rater reliability was very good for this assessment with 77% agreement for Component 1 and 71% for Component 2. Other findings were that

older students (24 and older) tended to score higher on both components, and students who transferred to JWCC from another institution tended to score lower on Component 1.

GEG 4.1: There were 369 artifacts collected from SOC 101 and PSY 101 courses, and 231 of these artifacts were scored by the faculty on the December Assessment Day. The artifacts were scored on four components: 1) valid reasons to legalize marijuana, 2) valid reasons for it to remain illegal, 3) consequences of legalizing marijuana, and 4) should marijuana be legalized. The average scores for all components were just below the 'Acceptable' rating. The inter-rater reliability was low with agreement ranging from 51% to 57%. Other findings were that students who were older than 24 tended to score higher, as found in the GEG 1.1 assessment. Josh stated that the demographic sheet needs to be updated. He will look at it and make changes before we provide it to the faculty for the next assessment. He suggested that we reinforce to the faculty that the demographic should be stapled to the artifact when it is turned in.

There was a discussion about the difficulty in assessing the General Education Goals because of the vagueness of the wording. An example was the difficulty of measuring student "awareness" in Goal 1.1.

9. **Other Items** – assessment opportunities coming up;

9.1 Assessment Fair, February 25, 2011 in Normal, Illinois – The deadline to sign up is today, so anyone who is interested should let Dr. Shinn know immediately after the meeting.

9.2 HLC Annual Meeting, April 8 – 12, 2011 – Chicago, Illinois – submit your request immediately. Josh is coordinating the attendance

9.3 Dates for March and April SCAA Meetings

The second Friday of March, which is our regular meeting date, falls during Spring Break. Suggestions included moving the meeting up or back a week. Motion to move the meeting date to March 18<sup>th</sup>.

Motion: Patrick Fodor

Second: David Rigsbee

Approved

The April meeting would be April 7<sup>th</sup>. A number of committee members will be unable to attend because of the Higher Learning Commission annual meeting in Chicago. Suggestions included moving the meeting to another day, or having the Vice-Chair run the meeting. Motion to cancel the April meeting.

Motion: David Rigsbee

Second: Patrick Fodor

Approved

Discussion for March meeting: Gary asked about committee members who will be completing their terms this year. We need to try to get new people involved. Committee members completing terms are: Gary Shupe, Patrick Fodor, David Rigsbee and Barb Stoll.

9.4 Chris reported that the SGA will be conducting their annual elections soon. Chris will be continuing as a student next year, but may not be appointed to the Assessment Committee. If Chris will not returning to our committee, he will make sure another student is appointed.

9.5 Dr. Shinn would like to propose to Dr. Staats that a new position be created for a half-time assessment coordinator. His proposal would be to have a faculty member serve part time as assessment coordinator/Chair of the Assessment Committee and part time teaching. This position would have bargaining unit implications. Carolyn thought this could be handled as release time in the same way as for a department chair. Motion to support creation of an assessment coordinator.

Motion: Bill Fleer

Second: Chris Duesdieker

Aproved

## **10. Closed session**

10.1

## **11. Announcements**

11.1

## **12. Next meeting notification**

The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on March 18, 2011, in room C283 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m.

## **13. Adjournment**

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

*Submitted by Barb Stoll 2/11/11*