

MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

May 13, 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 Fleer, Patrick Fodor, Nick Krizmanic, Dave Rigsbee, Gary Shupe- committee members; Marty Otto, Judy Taylor, Carolyn Warren, Cathy Myers-Resource members; Josh Welker-Ex-Officio member; Dr. David Shinn-Resource member.

Absent: Dr. Ray Staats, Phil Conover-Resource members; Chris Duesdieker-SGA student member;

3. Introductions/Welcome

3.1

4. Minutes Approved

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA March 18, 2011 minutes.

Motion: Patrick Fodor

Second: David Rigsbee

Approved

5. Special Guests

5.1 Sharon DeWitt – Sharon has agreed to serve as the fourth member of the committee, filling the position that was not filled in the Senate election. She will be presented to the September Senate meeting for membership approval.

6. Committee Reports

6.1 Training Sub-Committee-Gary Shupe, Nick Krizmanic

No report.

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

Patrick reported that the results have been coming in from the assessment of GEG 3.1

– working effectively in groups:

- Josh will provide a report later in the meeting

English department has decided to do their own internal assessment and is putting together materials to do assessments. Patrick stated that there is some perception within the college that the Assessment Committee wants to run all assessments. The Assessment Committee wanted to oversee the assessments and fine tune the process while we were working through the goals.

- Discussion about whether the next step in the Assessment process would be to turn the assessment over to the department involved, where applicable, to administer the assessment, while the Assessment Committee offers our assistance as needed.
- This would not work for every General Education goal because some goals involve multiple departments; in these assessments, the Assessment Committee will still organize the assessment
- This is an indication that the process is maturing. Departments are beginning to want to take responsibility for their assessments.
- Where multiple departments are involved, if each department is using the same rubric, then artifacts could be collected from each department and assessed at the same time.
- Implementation of this next step depends on:
 - Specificity of the assessment
 - Class (artifact) size – larger number of artifacts would require more assistance from the Committee
- Dr. Shinn requested that the Committee produce a document that would articulate the expectations of the department as well as the expectations of the Committee regarding the assessment of General Education goals. Then Dr. Shinn can take it to the Chairs and Directors. Patrick will compose a draft of the document.
- Program assessment done by individual departments will dovetail with program review expectations; if each department is doing its own assessments then the material will be available when the program review report is written.

Looking ahead to the Fall 2011 assessments:

- Only two classes claiming GEG 3, so it will be a small sampling: CMN 104 and ENG 130. Questions that need to be looked at:
 - Are these the only two classes that have group work?
 - If so few students are working in groups, do we need to remove this goal?
 - It is an important goal
 - It is being done, but for whatever reason, the class does not claim the goal
- Discussion followed about how to implement small group assessment:
 - Should we be assessing group projects rather than interactions of individuals in a group setting?
 - Should the Committee be looking at group work as something the committee does on a broader level?
 - Research should be done to determine if there are instruments already developed that can be used to measure group outcomes rather than “in-class” activities; this topic will be brought up again at the September SCAA meeting.
- With GEG 5.2, Barb has been checking with the English Department and others to determine how the oral presentations will be saved so that they can be assessed. The English Department is working with Josh Brueck to get an internal storage area for storage of speeches. This should be in place by the Fall semester. Val indicated that the speech we should assess is the persuasive speech that students give late in the semester. It was suggested that we ask Val to facilitate the

notification of her faculty regarding which speech to save and how to submit it. With this assessment, it may be necessary for students to put their names on the demographic sheet in order to match it to the speech. We can guarantee confidentiality of the information.

6.3 CTWE Sub-Committee- David Rigsbee, Bill Fleer

Bill reported that 13 programs will be participating in the Assessment Day scheduled for May 17th, including the Nursing program. Betty has submitted a rough draft of one of their assessments and it is a good start.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb Stoll reported that the results of the March CAAP testing have been shared with the Assessment Committee by email and with the faculty at the May Faculty Senate meeting. The Sub-committee met to discuss the next phase of CAAP testing. The next CAAP test would be in March, 2012. We are looking at using the Writing Skills CAAP test which would enable us to tie student test results to the results of the student's COMPASS tests. This would give us the opportunity to assess the improvement of students through their learning experiences at JWCC. The Sub-committee is looking at the feasibility of having two times for students to take the CAAP test, one session in the morning and one in the late afternoon or early evening.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 General Education Matrix update – Barb reported that she has been working with Chairs and Directors to clean up some last minute details. The updated matrix should be ready by Fall.

7.2 Standardize Rubrics from HLC Annual Meeting – Josh discussed a session he attended at the HLC Annual Meeting that dealt with standardized, generic rubrics. He brought back samples for the Committee to look at. The college that put on the session has a similar assessment process to ours. They use a matrix which shows the courses that claim each goal. The faculty were brought together to develop the rubrics. Now each time a goal is assessed, the standardized rubric is used as a starting point with faculty building on the standardized rubric for their individual assessment. They use N/A when the component is not applicable to a particular assessment.

In the Fall, we should put together a sub-committee to work on the rubrics. The sub-committee should include SCAA members and non-members. Their results would be presented to the faculty at Faculty Senate meetings for revisions. Once approved, we would provide the rubrics to the faculty to include in their syllabi.

7.3 Recorder for SCAA meetings – we have not had a recorder since Liz resigned at the end of the Spring 2010 semester. Barb has been taping the meetings and typing the minutes. In the Senate Constitution, it states that each committee will elect a chairperson and recorder from its members. We have already designated how the chairperson is selected (the vice-chair steps into the chair position). Barb suggested that the vice-chair be charged with the responsibility of recording the minutes. It would enable the vice-chair to be more informed about what is going on. In the event

that we do find someone to be our note-taker, the vice-chair could oversee the process to ensure correct recording of the business of the Committee.

Dr. Shinn agreed to check into getting a recording device that could be used by any committee to record their meetings.

Motion: Charge the vice-chair or their designee with the responsibility of recording the minutes.

Motion: Rhonda Basinger

Second: Marty Otto

Approved

8. Other Reports

8.1 Results of GEG 3.1 Classroom assessment

Josh presented the results of the GEG 3.1 assessment. Means were very high. Most students scored a 2 or 3. The sampling was small, only 79 observations. There was no inter-rater reliability to look at. Interesting points from the demographics:

- First-year students scored higher for component 1 than second-year students
- Non-traditional students scored higher for components 2 and 3
- Most students for this assessment were freshmen

Barb will send a feedback form to the three instructors who performed the assessment.

Sharon stated that she thought the assessment went well. It was easy to do, the rubric was easy to follow. The students have been working together in groups all semester, so they were accustomed to working together.

9. Other Items

9.1 Assessment Office – during the summer, the Assessment Office will be moved to the office previous occupied by Dr. Shinn. Assessment will share the space with Professional Development. Kent Hawley will use the area when he is on campus. Portfolios and other materials do not need to be in the office. They can be stored in a secure area. Barb will work with Dr. Shinn to get the materials moved or stored.

9.2 New / Returning members – Patrick Fodor, Gary Shupe and Barb Stoll have been elected to serve two-year terms. Sharon DeWitt will serve a two-year term subject to approval by the Faculty Senate.

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 September 9, 2011, in room C283 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m.

13. Adjournment

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 5/13/11