

MINUTES – *Senate Committee on Academic Assessment*

August 31, 2012

1. Call to Order

1.1 Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Barb Stoll in room C284.

2. Attendance

Present: Barb Stoll - Chair; Sharon DeWitt, Patrick Fodor, Melissa Knapp - committee members; Rhonda Basinger, Marty Otto, David Rigsbee, Cathy Myers, Dr. David Shinn, Pam Foust, - Resource members; Josh Welker - Ex-Officio members.

Absent: Bill Flear, Gary Shupe – committee members; Carolyn Warren - Resource member; Dr. Ron Davis - Ex-Officio member. Nathan Kurz – Student member.

3. Introductions/Welcome

3.1 Christina Farwell was welcomed as a potential new member to serve one of the two vacant positions on the Assessment Committee. Her name will be presented at the Faculty Senate meeting next week for vote. Beth Reinhardt has also expressed interest in serving. Her name may be presented as well.

4. Minutes Approved

4.1 Motion: Approve the SCAA May 11, 2012 minutes.

Motion: Marty Otto

Second: Sharon DeWitt

Approved

5. Special Guests

5.1

6. Committee Reports

6.1 Training Sub-Committee - Gary Shupe

Gary was unable to attend the meeting. Nick Krizmanic was the second member of this subcommittee, but dropped out in May when his term expired. Christina will be serving with Gary on this subcommittee. The training for the May assessment went well. Gary will present the results of the feedback survey completed by participants of the May assessment.

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

No report.

6.3 CTE Sub-Committee - Sharon DeWitt, Bill Flear

Sharon reported that the May 2012 CTE assessment went well. Of the 52 CTE programs, 28 completed reports in May, bringing the total for the 12-month period to 38. Of the 14 programs not completing reports in the last 12 months, 6 are new

programs. Programs needing to complete reports are in the areas of Agriculture, Nursing, Emergency Medical, Electrical Technology, Early Childhood Education, among others. These programs will be contacted and urged to get reports filed.

6.4 CAAP Testing Sub-Committee

Barb reported that the CAAP test sub-committee plans to meet in the next few weeks and should have a report for the next meeting. Members serving include: Rhonda, Marty, Josh, David Shinn, Carolyn and Barb. If anyone else wants to join the committee or any member no longer wishes to serve, please let Barb know.

6.5 Rubrics Sub-committee – Barb reported that the Rubrics sub-committee will be meeting with Greg Lee to go over the results of the May assessment and determine if the rubric needs to be adjusted. Members serving include: Rhonda, Sharon, Josh and Barb. If anyone else wants to join the committee or any member no longer wishes to serve, please let Barb know. The subcommittee will meet with Greg to determine if anything needs to be changed with the rubric used in May. The committee will meet with the Computer Science people to go over the rubric to be used in December. Once the December assessment rubric is finalized, we will begin working with the department involved in the May 2013 assessment, which will be GEG 6.2 – Information seeking skills.

7. Other Action Items

7.1 Barb showed members how to navigate to the Assessment page on the JWCC Web Site in order to access the Assessment Manual. Reports and information from the March CAAP test and the May Assessment can be found in Appendix A of the Assessment Manual.

8. Other Reports

8.1 Results of May 15, 2012 Assessment of GEG 2.1 – Josh reported.

Josh reported that 87 artifacts were collected and scored from ECO 101 classes, including classroom, OLC and online delivery methods. The artifacts were scored on four components: Definition, Group Responsible, Influence on Economic System, and Tools of Monetary Policy. With this assessment, we had a large portion of the artifacts coming from MACC or Moberly Area Community College students taking the class online through our consortium arrangement.

Means for three of the components were above the acceptable 2.0. The “Influence” component was a little low. Greg has been analyzing the results and will report changes, if any, that might be needed. Josh pointed out that there were a higher number of artifacts rated as poor, even though the averages were high, compared to what we usually see.

Inter-rater reliability was low on this assessment. There was some concern about this. A recommendation was made to include the supplemental material that was provided with the rubric to the scorers during the assessment. The definitions and other material, provided by Greg during the training session, should be included with the

rubric to help others understand the assessment. The Rubrics subcommittee will work with Greg to include this information with the rubric.

Josh found several demographic results statistically significant. The online students seemed to do better than the other two delivery methods for three of the four components.

Discussion regarding to MACC students determined that, for the purposes of assessment, they are our students, taught by our JWCC instructors. We are attempting to achieve this general education goal with all our students, regardless of location or delivery method, so generally MACC students should be included in the assessment results. It would be interesting to see a breakout of MACC students versus our own students. But the general consensus is to continue to include MACC student data in the overall assessment results.

Non-JWCC students may come from other higher learning institutions and even from high schools through dual credit, so the demographic sheet should include an “other” category where the student can identify the institution where they are receiving the majority of their educational experience. It may also be beneficial to have the students list their standing at that institution, such as how many classes have been completed there, and how many have been taken through JWCC.

The assessment implementation form from the May 2012 assessment of GEG 2.1 was discussed. Greg noted that he wants to do some additional analysis and will document any changes that will be implemented.

The assessment implementation form from the December 2011 assessment of GEG 5.2 was also discussed. The Language, Literature and Humanities department did a thorough job of analyzing the results and have documented a number of changes that have been or will be implemented.

The assessment implementation form is working well in documenting how we are using the results of the assessments to improve our programs.

8.2 CAAP Test report – Josh reported that he received the results of the comparison of student CAAP test scores with their COMPASS scores. He distributed a summary sheet, which showed that 46% of our students were in a higher quartile range on the CAAP test than on the COMPASS test, 41% were in the same quartile range, while 12% were in a lower quartile range. The higher degree of difficulty of the CAAP test may explain why some students remained in the same quartile range or dropped to a lower quartile range in the CAAP test when compared to their COMPASS test results.

9. Other Items

9.1

10. Closed session

11. Announcements

11.1 Next meeting notification

The next Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting will be held on Friday, September 28, 2012 from 9:00 – 10:15 a.m. in room C284.

12. Adjournment

The Senate Committee on Academic Assessment meeting adjourned at 9:33 a.m.

Submitted by Barb Stoll 9/15/12