

MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

March 18, 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; Melissa Knapp, Bill Fler, Patrick Fodor, Nick Krizmanic, Gary Shupe-committee members, Marty Otto, Judy Taylor, Cathy Myers-Resource members; Chris Duesdieker-SGA student member; Josh Welker-Ex-Officio member; Dr. David Shinn -Resource member.

Absent: Dave Rigsbee, Carolyn Warren, Dr. Ray Staats, Phil Conover

3. Introductions/Welcome

3.1

4. Minutes Approved

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA February 11, 2011 minutes.

Motion: Gary Shupe

Second: Bill Fler

Approved

5. Special Guests

5.1

6. Committee Reports

6.1 Training Sub-Committee-Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic

No report.

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

Rubrics and materials have gone out to the BIO 101 instructors who will be doing the observation of their students as they work in groups during a class session in April.

Barb Stoll did the training for the instructors regarding completing the assessment.

Instructions included:

- provide the rubrics to the students in advance of the observation
- have students fill out the demographic sheet
- correctly fill out the score sheets
- send the completed score sheets and demographic sheets to Josh Welker in Institutional Research

Josh will compile the results and they should be available by our first meeting in the Fall Semester.

6.3 CTWE Sub-Committee- David Rigsbee, Bill Fleer

Bill reported we will have our CTWE assessment, coming up on May 17, 2011. Barb will send out notices to programs who participated last May, as well as any program that has not filled out a report yet, including new programs.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb Stoll reported that the Sub-committee met and worked out a timeline for the day of the test, which is next Tuesday. We could use more help, so if anyone is teaching during the morning of the 22nd and is available, let Barb know.

Timeline: 7:00 to 8:30 a.m. – set up auditorium, move tables and chairs, if needed
8:30 a.m. – Dr. Shinn will meet with all proctors, test administrators and anyone who will be helping
9:00 to 9:45 a.m. – register students and get them seated
9:45 a.m. – instructions to students and begin the test
10:35 a.m. – gather materials, award door prizes, dismiss students to the auditorium to receive \$5.

Questions and discussion followed about the logistics for administering the CAAP test. Regarding how many students to expect, 214 letters were sent out. Instructors have commented that their students are planning to take the test and are talking about receive the \$5. Chris said most of the students he spoke with are in class and may not want to miss the class. Dr. Shinn stated that there have been some students call in and ask if they are required to take the test. We don't really know how many to expect. Dr. Shinn provided lists of student names and phone numbers and asked members to call the students and remind them about the test. Members each took a sheet or two to call the students. A script was provided for what to say to the student and what type of message to leave if the student does not answer.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 General Education Matrix update – Barb attended the Chairs and Directors meeting March 4th and asked them to take another look at their courses and which goals they claim. A deadline of March 31st was suggested to get the updates back to Barb. Also provided to the Chairs and Directors were the guidelines for completing the matrix and guidelines we use when selecting a course to assess.

7.2 Standardize Rubrics – At our last meeting we discussed developing generic rubrics for all the Gen Ed goals and then asking the instructors to attach the rubrics to their syllabi for the goals that they claim for each class. We would develop the rubrics for our eight goals. We have noticed in the past that for some of the goals, one standard rubric would not work for every class claiming the goal. An example of Goal 4.1 – Critical Thinking was used. When we assessed this goal, we broke it down into three sections: mathematics, science and verbal/logic, with a different rubric for each. When we revise our goals and outcomes, we may want to break this Goal into three learning outcomes instead of one.

This initiative will allow the rubrics to be used as a teaching opportunity. Goal 3.1 is a great example of this. If the students are given the rubric, they will be able to see what behaviors are considered effective and appropriate when working in groups.

By attaching the rubrics to the syllabi every semester, the students will get this educational opportunity every semester, not just when we assess a particular goal. This would provide consistency from semester to semester.

These generic rubrics will also provide a starting place for instructors who can modify the rubrics to meet their individual needs. It might get much needed dialog started about the rubrics.

Members stated that once they began using rubrics, assignments improved. The rubrics need to be made available to the faculty. They could be stored in an accessible network location, and/or provided with the Master Syllabus.

Motion: Standardized rubrics should be developed and then published for use by faculty and a recommendation should be made to faculty to attach the rubrics to their syllabi for the goals that they claim in their syllabi.

Motion: Patrick Fodor
Second: Nick Krizmanic
Approved

7.3 Nominations for Election of SCAA Members

Members whose terms are expiring are:

Patrick Fodor
David Rigsbee
Gary Shupe
Barb Stoll

Patrick and Gary have agreed to be nominated for another 2-year term. Barb will probably return. So we will need at least one more nomination. We are limited in the number of regular members we can have, but we are not limited in the number of resource members we can have. Regular members are elected by senate vote and serve a 2-year term. Resource members are not locked into 2-year terms. There was a question about the eligibility of Associate Faculty for regular membership on Senate committees. Barb will check and see what the requirements are for full membership.

8. Other Reports

8.1 Evaluation of December Assessment by Readers

The results of the feedback forms filled out by the readers which were typed up by Liz Akers were emailed out to members prior to the meeting.

GEG 1.1: Comments indicated that the rubric was good and easy to use. The use of examples aided in scoring. Diversity of the assignments was commented on. Patrick explained that different instructors give different assignments. Also, there were different time frames and delivery methods. Some of the classes were eight-week

classes so the term papers were produced in a shorter amount of time. Assignments included research papers, personal interviews, and reflection papers. The term papers were the easiest to score. The short opinion papers were more difficult to assess and didn't seem to match the rubric. The lack of commonality with assignments creates a problem that may not be resolvable. On the one hand, you have academic freedom to choose the type of assignments and on the other hand, you have the desire for assignments that are alike. The next time we assess this goal, we will provide the rubric to the students and faculty in advance and see if we have improved results.

This will potentially continue to be a problem with the assessment of classroom artifacts. This differs from the CAAP test which tests whether the student's entire educational experience at John Wood has provided them with the desired education. We are not targeting any one class. For this reason, it is good to have multiple measures.

GEG 4.1: Comments indicated that students were given too much information and it was difficult to determine if the students understood the material or were just repeating the material that was provided. Another concern was whether the students might have done better if they knew the assignment would be part of their grade for the class. Some instructors chose to grade the assignments while others did not. For this assessment, students received the rubric prior to completing the assignment.

The grading issue has come up before. Some instructors in the past have made the assignment a part of the student's grade, others have given the students extra credit for doing the assignment while others have let the students know that it will not be included as part of the student's grade.

The general consensus with the discussion is that we need to get the rubric and the information to the instructors well in advance so they can prepare for the assessment. This would help get the "buy-in" needed by each department for the success of the assessment. We should encourage faculty to include the assignment as part of the students' grades.

9. **Other Items** – assessment opportunities coming up;
 - 9.1 HLC Annual Meeting, April 8 – 12, 2011 – Chicago, Illinois – if anyone is interested in attending, submit your request immediately to Josh Welker.
 - 9.2 Update on Assessment Coordinator – Dr. Shinn stated that he found out that there is a minimum number of hours that a faculty member must be teaching in order to remain in the bargaining unit, so this would limit the number of hours that can be devoted to the job of assessment coordinator. This could be changed through negotiations with the collective bargaining unit.

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 May 13, 2011, in room C283 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m.

13. Adjournment

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:53 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 3/18/11