MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

April 13, 2012

1. **Call to Order**
   1.1 Meeting was called to order at 8:45 a.m. by Rhonda Basinger in room C283.

2. **Attendance**
   Present: Rhonda Basinger - Chair; Barb Stoll - Vice-Chair; Sharon DeWitt, Patrick Fodor , Gary Shupe - committee members; Marty Otto, David Rigsbee, Judy Taylor, Cathy Myers, Carolyn Warren - Resource members; Dr. Ron Davis - Ex-Officio member; Nathan Kurz – Student member.

   Absent: Bill Fleer, Nick Krizmanic, Melissa Knapp, – committee members; Dr. David Shinn, Pam Foust - Resource members; Josh Welker, Rachel Williams - Ex-Officio members.

3. **Introductions/Welcome**
   3.1

4. **Minutes Approved**
   4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA March 16, 2012 minutes as amended.
   >   Motion: Marty Otto
   >   Second: Patrick Fodor
   >   Approved

5. **Special Guests**
   5.1

6. **Committee Reports**
   6.1 Training Sub-Committee- Nick Krizmanic, Gary Shupe
   Nick was unable to attend. Gary had no report.

   6.2 Gen Ed Sub-Committee- Melissa Knapp, Patrick Fodor.
   Melissa was unable to attend. She emailed Rhonda that she has talked to Robin Martin about the Pizza Bash on Assessment Day. She needs to know the number of readers.

   6.3 CTE Sub-Committee - Bill Fleer, Sharon DeWitt
   Bill was unable to attend. Sharon reported that the CTE programs who will be participating in the May assessment have been emailed a reminder about the assessment. Another reminder will go out as we get closer to the end of the semester.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb reported that attendance was low for the CAAP test on March 20th. 49 of the 234 graduating sophomores actually showed up and took the test. The Sub-committee has discussed the turnout and will try to determine what we need to do differently to improve participation in the CAAP test next Spring, 2013. The committee is wondering if having two test times might have been the problem. For the first test, we asked instructors to send the students down to take the test. For this test, we may have lost that connection between the instructor and the student at the 9:30 to 10:45 time frame.

We are still planning to do the test in March of 2013, then we will evaluate the results and determine if the these results and participation provides us with meaningful data, or if we should consider other assessment instruments.

There was a discussion about how to find out from the students why the attendance was low. It was suggested that we send out an email asking students why they did not participate.

Nathan stated that when he takes the test in March of 2013, he would prefer to take the test during the day and during class time. Once class is over, most students have jobs they must go to, or may leave the campus and not want to return later for the test.

Dr. Davis suggested looking into administering the test to smaller groups on different days and maybe in different locations. The committee will include this suggestion in future discussions.

Other suggestions included:
- Ask instructors to give some sort of extra credit for students who do take the test. This should be discussed in Senate to see if the faculty would be willing to give some sort of incentive.
- Give the test two different days, maybe Tuesday and Wednesday, at the prime time which would be between 9:30 and 2:00
- Offer the test earlier in the semester to catch students who are finishing up around midterm

6.5 Rubrics Sub-committee – Barb reported that the Rubrics Sub-committee met with Val and discussed whether the rubric needed to be adjusted based on the December assessment. Val felt that the rubric was okay, but the problem lies in the interpretation of the assignment by the faculty. She has met with the dual credit instructor at Notre Dame to discuss shortcomings that have been identified and to make sure the dual credit class has enough rigor in it to match the classes taught on campus. She will have a similar meeting with members of her department to further discuss the assessment and to how to ensure consistency and rigor in the assignment. Val will document the results of these meetings on the assessment implementation form which will be placed in the electronic assessment manual on the Web site. The completed form will be placed in Appendix A, after the short explanation of what

assessment was done, the rubric used for the assessment, the report from Josh containing the results and feedback from participating faculty.

We will be meeting with Greg Lee to discuss removing the two unused components and breaking the remaining component into subcomponents to make the assessment scoring more precise.

7. Other Action Items
   7.1

8. Other Reports
   8.1

9. **Other Items**
   9.1 Committee members for the coming year. Rhonda reported that she and Nick will be stepping down as members of the Assessment Committee. Melissa and Bill have agreed to continue for another 2-year term. This leaves us with two vacancies. We need to ask people if they might be willing to serve.

   We have several new faculty members coming on board: Carolyn's replacement in Early Childhood Development and Lynne Weller's replacement in Language, Literature and Humanities. We may want to invite them to serve on the Assessment Committee.

   9.2 Webinar – Cathy participated in a Webinar recently. Rhonda suggested that we might want to make this type of material available in the assessment office/resource room for faculty to view. This Webinar should be readily available on a Web site. They should be archived and available in the future. This would be another way to build our assessment resources. Cathy will send the link to the web site.

   9.3 Departmental Assessment – Val sent an email to Carolyn and Rhonda asking about the process for performing departmental assessments each year. She asked Carolyn whether there were provisions in the Collective Bargaining Agreement that could pay her faculty for participating department assessment. There are provisions for this, such as the payment to faculty on the Assessment Day at the end of each semester. Dr. Shinn asked Val to write up and submit a proposal indicating how many would be participating and estimating how much time would be needed. He indicated that there should not be any problem with this. We do have a budget for assessment activities.

   9.4 Assessment Coordinator – Rhonda will be bringing this position up at the Faculty Senate meeting this afternoon. There was discussion about whether we want a vote of endorsement from Senate members. The consensus was to bring to a vote that the Faculty Senate endorses the position of Assessment Coordinator. Rhonda stated that the Senate Executive Committee seemed to be in favor of this.

9.5 Nathan announced that he was elected as Student Trustee. He would like to bring up a discussion at the next SGA meeting about the next CAAP test. He would include the following discussion points:

- What the CAAP test is and why it is important to the school
- When is a good time for students to take the test
- Would students prefer getting a gas card/cash or extra credit in their class

Barb will discuss this with Nathan, and will make sure he is notified of the next meeting of the CAAP Testing Sub-committee.

9.6 Meeting days next semester – Barb asked members to consider switching our meeting day to the last Friday of the month. Since Faculty Senate meets on the first Friday, this would position us to relay important information to Senate members the next Friday following our meeting. Currently, it is three or four weeks between our meeting and the next Senate meeting. Also, this would eliminate the conflict we frequently have with Midterm Break. And we will no longer be meeting on the Friday of Finals week. We can discuss this further at our May meeting.

10. Closed session

11. Announcements
11.1

12. Next meeting notification
The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on May 11, 2012 from 8:45 – 10:00 a.m. in room C283.

13. Adjournment
The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 4/25/12