ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

November 13, 2015

(Meeting in second hour of Dean’s meeting on assessment.)

Members present:  Stephanie Dartez, Jennifer Baine, Heather Smith, Dr. Denise Robledo, Dr. Carolyn Langston, Vicki Badgley, Genevieve White, Christy Wilson, Jim Roomsburg, Phillip Ballard, Peg Cole, and Caroline Hammond.  Guest:  Dr. Mickey Best.

Jennifer called the meeting to order at 11:03.

The Committee will work to clarify the assessment committee's purpose in this meeting.  Jennifer handed out notes from published sources.  She pointed out that in general we are using assessment to improve effectiveness at South Ark.

The 2006 student outcome plan was reviewed. Stephanie told the Committee that there are many factors beyond our control, but we resolve to control those things we can control to improve teaching and learning.  We must document the assessment of learning in the classroom.  Our purpose is to assess and improve student learning and document the process.

Dr. Best reported that in 1996, NCA (HLC) first introduced and implemented assessment.  It has evolved since then.

Stephanie reminded members that forms and documents are on the website and the U drive, including faculty assessment reports, tutorial and forms, Assessment Chart Floorplans, and Standard Course Assessment Cycle for Faculty.

From the Course Assessment Cycle Chart, faculty must choose assessment tools that will measure outcomes and then use existing data to select the outcome level.  The collection of data is embedded from what is being done within your course. The goal should be using data, not collecting the data.

Jim Roomsburg reminded members that the value of the data must be greater than the cost of collecting it.

During assessment days, faculty will aggregate the data with everyone who teaches the course.  Then they will determine an action plan for improvement of outcomes.

Christy Wilson asked which outcomes should be linked when we do Weave?  Stephanie Dartez said it doesn't matter as long as the general outcomes are similar.  Genevieve White suggested that the chart be linked or identified in the Cycle Chart.

Denise recommended that the language be changed to make it clear that statistical analysis is not included or required.  Stephanie will change the wording to use "consistent with" rather than "significantly different." Stephanie offered to include some examples in the documents and forms describing implementation.

In the next chart, Course Assessment Process for Faculty, Deans, and The Assessment Committee, data are entered into Weave.  When data is collected for courses taught multiple times per year, faculty will do the analysis after the first term, attach the Excel or other report to Weave, and then aggregate it in the second term.  They will then create the final Weave report in the second semester.  If the course is only taught in the fall, faculty will prepare the Weave report at the end of the fall term.

The Deans will review the assessment reports with faculty participation and provide feedback.

In the last step, the Assessment Committee will form teams to review all the reports with budget requests as well as some reports randomly selected.  Teams will use a rubric to facilitate the assessment.  Caroline Hammond asked who makes up the teams.  Stephanie reminded everyone that members of the Committee make up the teams.

Dr. Robledo expressed concerns that some people are lagging behind the process while others have been doing assessment for years.  She suggested that we need to know which courses have been assessed in the past and which were not.

The teams will review the reports individually and then get together with other team members.   The faculty member will not see the notes made by the individual team member.  The team will formulate a consensus of recommendations that will be forwarded to the faculty.  The faculty member will only see the notes of the entire team.

Vicki Badgley questioned whether faculty should see notes.  Dr. Robledo expressed concerns that notes may  not reflect accurate instructions from untrained members. She also reminded members that all faculty members deserve to get the feedback they require, not just those faculty who have been selected randomly.

Jennifer suggested that the issue be tabled for now.

Next chart depicted roles of deans, Assessment chair, Committee members, and coaches.

The next chart depicted the role of Committee members.

Jim Roomsburg observed that deans have a significant role in guiding faculty in their initial review of the assessment report.  Deans will also help interpret the report received back from the Committee.

Jennifer adjourned the meeting at 12:15.