MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

February 10, 2012

1. **Call to Order**
   1.1 Meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m. by Rhonda Basinger in room C283. Rhonda reported that she has been in contact with Dr. Letts to appoint a replacement for Bonnie Scranton. She has also talked to Mike Elbe regarding a student member from SGA. Mike said he has not found anyone yet, but will keep trying.

2. **Attendance**
   Present: Rhonda Basinger - Chair; Barb Stoll - Vice-Chair; Sharon DeWitt, Bill Fleer, Patrick Fodor, Melissa Knapp, Nick Krizmanic, Gary Shupe - committee members; David Rigsbee, Judy Taylor, Cathy Myers, Carolyn Warren - Resource members; Josh Welker, Dr. Ron Davis - Ex-Officio members.

   Absent: Marty Otto, Dr. David Shinn, Pam Foust - Resource members.

3. **Introductions/Welcome**
   3.1

4. **Minutes Approved**
   4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA December 09, 2011 minutes as amended.
        Motion: Gary Shupe
        Second: Nick Krizmanic
        Approved

5. **Special Guests**
   5.1

6. **Committee Reports**
   6.1 Training Sub-Committee- Nick Krizmanic, Gary Shupe
   Nick provided a handout containing the comments from the participants of the December assessment. Overall, the comments are good. Participants felt the assessment went very well, but a few things need to be addressed, such as minor adjustments to the rubric regarding use of visual aids and citing sources. Another suggestion was to have more consistency with the requirements of the assignment across all the sections of the class. The Language, Literature and Humanities department will be working on these points and will keep us in the loop regarding changes made.

   Gary felt the training was well done, with good examples. He felt that maybe a little more time was used for the training than was needed. One positive result of this assessment is that it has started a meaningful dialog among the Language, Literature and Humanities department. Faculty from the department participated in the

assessment and they were able to see how colleagues implemented the assignment. They concluded that there needs to be consistency with the assignments and consistency regarding expectations from students.

There was a discussion about the Dual Credit class. The Dual Credit scores for content were lower on average than the scores of on-campus students. The Language, Literature and Humanities department will be looking at this.

There was a discussion about the need for the department doing the assessment to get the material before the end of the previous semester so they can meet to ensure that everyone teaching the class providing the artifacts for the assessment understands what is expected regarding the assignment. Once the standardized rubrics are finalized and made available, faculty may have a better idea of what is expected.

Rhonda plans to ask Val to say a few words about the assessment at the March Faculty Senate meeting. The Rubrics Subcommittee will also meet with Val and members of her department to make the adjustments to the rubric.

6.2 Gen Ed Sub-Committee- Melissa Knapp, Patrick Fodor.
Melissa reported that the demographic sheet has been revised for use during the Spring 2012 assessment. One important change was to add a question about delivery method and location where the student took the course. The changes were discussed. Stephanie Phillips has indicated that she would be able to drop the demographic sheet in the document sharing area of the eCompanions for any of the sections. The students would download the document, fill it out, and then upload it back to the eCompanion site.

It was suggested that the student's name be added to the top because it will ensure that the correct demographic is associated with each artifact being assessed.
Motion: add a section for student name at the top of the demographic.
    Motion: Barb Stoll
    Second: Patrick Fodor
    Approved

6.3 CTE Sub-Committee - Bill Fleer, Sharon DeWitt
Bill reported that the he and Joyce met with Barb regarding documenting the changes being implemented in Dev Ed, especially in Dev Ed mathematics. A network storage location is being implemented for storage of the Dev Ed assessment results.

Sharon reported that 13 of the 15 faculty members whose programs were due for assessment in December participated in the December CTE assessment. The two that did not show up had class commitments. One of the two, Truck Driver Training, had already completed their assessment and submitted their report. Twelve programs completed reports or updated assessment material in their network folders. 37 of the 52 programs have completed reports or updated material in the last 12 months. 5 of the 15 new programs have updates completed. There was good assessment work done during the December CTE assessment.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee
Barb reported that the CAAP Testing Sub-Committee has had two meetings since the start of the semester. At the February 9th meeting, a timeline was created for preparations for the CAAP test on March 20:

2/15 – Begin electronic publicity
2/16 – pull list of graduating sophomores
2/17 – label letters and group by instructor
2/20 – give student letters to instructors to deliver
3/1 – order the tests
3/12 – email reminders to students
3/16 – reminder calls to students
3/20 – Administer the tests: 9:15 to 11:00 am and 3:45 to 5:30 pm

Barb asked members to help with the reminder calls on March 16th. She also indicated the need for help during the test times and asked anyone who is available during either or both test times to let her know.

6.5 Rubrics Sub-committee – Barb reported that the Rubrics Sub-committee met with Greg Lee last Thursday, February 2nd to go over his rubric and the general procedure for the assessment. The rubric for GEG 2.1 was included in documents sent out by Rhonda prior to the meeting. We will be assessing an essay question from a test given in ECO 101. The delivery methods include structured, on-line and OLC.

Gary suggested that we convey to Greg the need provide a detailed explanation of what should be included in a poor, good and excellent essay. Greg did the training the last time we assessed this goal and he plans to provide an example of each level of achievement and one or two to mock score. Carolyn suggested taking the rubric back to Greg and recommending that he split the rubric into more categories for the actual assessment in May.

The Rubrics Subcommittee plans to meet with Val and Language, Literature and Humanities department to go over the rubric from the December 2011 assessment and make changes based on the feedback from the scorers. We will document how they plan to use the results of the assessment.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 4-Column Form for documentation of changes resulting from assessment process – Rhonda suggested that we use a 4-column form similar to the one used for CTE assessment to document the results of the general education assessments. This would give us a document for each assessment performed that would show how we are using the results of the assessment. We could also ask the departments to fill one out from previous assessments in order to provide more complete documentation of how we use the results of each assessment. This form has worked well for CTE assessment, so we can try it for general education assessment and adjust it down the road if necessary.

Motion: Use the 4-column form to document results of each assessment and changes implemented as a result of the assessment.
    Motion: Patrick Fodor
    Second: Barb Stoll
    Approved

8. **Other Reports**
    8.1 December assessment results – Josh Welker.
    Josh provided a report of the results of the December assessment.
    Goal 3.1 had very few students being assessed – only 20 – so it may be difficult to get much meaningful information from it. The means were all high. The demographic analysis didn't provide much useful information either because the sample size was too small to make any comparisons.

    For Goal 5.2, 192 speeches were assessed for three components: Content, Organization and Delivery. The means were all around 2 which is typical. Josh pointed out that for the Content component, about one third of the students scored poorly with a score of 1 out of 3, which may be an item of concern. Organization and Delivery had a little less than one third of the students score poorly with a score of 1 out of 3, which may also be an item of concern. The inter rater reliability was good, which indicates that the training was good and/or the work done on the rubric was effective. Analysis of the demographic information revealed that full-time students scored higher in Content than the part–time students; non-traditional students scored higher in Organization and Delivery than traditional students; Dual Credit students scored much lower in Content than on-campus JWCC students. Josh has gone over these results with Val and her department and they plan think it might be a difference with the actual assignment. They plan to work on getting the assignment standardized across all delivery methods and instructors.

    The Rubrics Subcommittee will meet with Val and her department to document these changes on the 4-column form.

    There was a discussion about who the "Transfer" students were. Josh explained that in this case it refers to students who have transferred to JWCC from another institution. Typically in past assessments, transfer students did not do as well as students who obtained all their classes through JWCC.

9. **Other Items**
    9.1 Updated Assessment Manual on Web – Barb Stoll
    Barb reported that the Assessment Manual was updated over the Christmas break, with documentation from previous assessments added. The Assessment Manual is now delivered electronically from the Assessment page of the JWCC Web site. Minor revisions were made to the main part of the document. Appendix A and B were added. Appendix A contains the following information regarding every assessment performed since 2005:
        • Description of the assessment
        • Rubric(s) used

4

- Results (compiled by Director of Institutional Effectiveness)
- Feedback from participants

Appendix B contains supporting documents, such as the demographic sheet, matrix, timeline for assessment of general education goals, etc.

Barb demonstrated the use of links to move to the desired sections of the document. It was recommended that descriptive text be added on the Assessment Web page next to the links to the three sections of the Assessment Manual.

Josh was asked to upload the minutes from previous SCAA meetings to the Assessment page. Once they are in place, there could be a link added from the Faculty Senate page to our SCAA minutes. Josh also suggested requesting a link to the Assessment page through the Academics dropdown list as well as the About dropdown list, which would make it easier to locate assessment material.

We currently do not have a section in the Assessment Manual for CTE assessment. Josh suggested that we may want to compile an annual report which would include information about what assessment activities were performed for each CTE program in the past twelve months.

9.2 Assessment Webinar – next Thursday from 12:00 to 1:00 pm. Rhonda will send the information out to members. Josh has already signed up for it, so let him know if you are interested.

10. Closed session

11. Announcements

11.1

12. Next meeting notification
The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on March 16, 2012 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m. in room C283.

13. Adjournment
The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 2/28/12