Assessment Committee Minutes

Committee/Meeting Name	Assessment Committee Notes				
Date	4/5/13	Starting Time	1 PM	Ending Time	3 PM
Location	Badger Den in CUB on WSC			Recorder	
Members Present or Members who Contributed to Discussion	**Instructional Assessment Committee** - Carol Summers, Cara Crowley, Brandon Moore. Deborah Harding & Lynae Jacob (Not Present, but contributed via e-mail) **Non-Instructional Assessment Committee** - Melissa Wilson, Leslie Shelton, Mark Hanna **Ex Officio Member** – Kristin McDonald-Willey				
Guests	**Dean** - Mark Rowh **IR Staff** - Melanie Castro **Support Staff** – Diane Brice				
Absent	**Inst Assess. Comm.** – Becky Burton, Donald Abel, Michael Kopenits, Monique Dupuis, Russell Lowery-Hart **NI Assess. Comm.** – Bob Austin, Daniel Esquivel, Janet Barton, Joe Wyatt, Steve Chance **Other Invited Attendees** – Renee Vincent, Tamara Clunis, Jerry Moller, Lyndy Wilkinson, Kim Davis, Patsy Lemaster, Danita McAnally				

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
I. Discussion Items – **PET Forms** **and** **General** **Education** **Assessment**	Kristin – Discussion topics: **TOPIC I – PET FORM UPDATES** PET comparison data presented. AC has made improvements since previous year. • Instructional PET Form Results from Last Year: 97% submitted (missing 2); 34% of forms evaluated by committee and rest by Assessment's Coordinator; Faculty did not receive PET evaluation (response form) until very late in year (April); 7 revisions to PET forms made based on PET Response Form. • Instructional PET Form Results from This Year: 100% submitted (1st time ever?); 100% evaluated by committee; Faculty received PET evaluation in December or January; 14 revisions to PET forms made based on PET response form.	**TOPIC I – PET FORM UPDATES** o **ACTION I (by conclusion of 2012-2013)** – **Kristin** will send budget information to President's Cabinet. o **ACTION II (by conclusion of 2012-2013)** – **Kristin** will begin current reports and preparation for Dean's Council Review, but will still collect revisions until May before sending Mindy Weathersbee the data to be archived. Rationale - The Dean's Council usually does not review the previous year's PET information until the fall.

Assessment Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline

I. Discussion Items –
PET Forms
and
General
Education
Assessment
Continued…
	• NI PET Form Results from Last Year:
	90% submitted (missing 3); 52% of forms evaluated by committee and rest by Assessment's Coordinator; Faculty did not receive PET evaluation (response form) until very late in year (April); 3 revisions to PET forms made based on PET Response Form.
	• NI PET Form Results from This Year:
	90% submitted (missing 3 – 2 of which different than previous year); 100% evaluated by committee; Admin/Staff received PET evaluation in December or January; 10 revisions made based on PET response form.
	
	TOPIC II - SACSCOC 3.5.1 – College-level Competencies Proposal
	New THECB requirements may prompt change in order to lessen faculty workload and use existing assessment methods.
	    o Proposal to use new AC core curriculum assessment method as primary assessment method for 3.5.1.
	    o Move current institution-wide general education assessment method to a secondary method to help cover the AAS degrees. Results will be 1 or 2 institutional committee of 3-5 people evaluating artifacts every year versus 6 committees evaluating artifacts every year. For example, year 1 evaluate communication, year 2 critical thinking, etc.
		TOPIC II - SACSCOC 3.5.1 – College-level Competencies Proposal
		o **ACTION I (<mark>By fall 2013</mark>)** –**Kristin** will tentatively plan to move current general education assessment methods to a secondary method and make core curriculum assessment the primary assessment method for SACSCOC 3.5.1
		    o Decision - Those in attendance unanimously agreed that as long as the SACSCOC 3.5.1 requirements were met that lessening the burden on faculty and keeping assessment as centralized within the departments themselves (as possible) would be a good thing.
		    o Recommendation – Assure core curriculum assessment fulfills 3.5.1 and make sure no other assessment methods for AAS already exist.

Assessment Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
II. Graduate Student Survey Round Table Discussions	**PART A – Current Graduate Student Survey Process** ○ Diane Brice (Registrar) – Diane discussed the current graduate student survey process. Students are sent notifications of graduation deadline dates and advisors also work with students to remind them of graduation deadline dates. Almost all students who apply for graduation <u>prior to</u> their graduation do so online and as a result complete the graduate student survey. However, students who opt to complete the paper application or are automatically awarded degrees <u>after</u> meeting graduation requirements (the Registrar's Office runs an audit to assure every eligible student does receive their award designation), do not complete the application. ○ Kristin – The current college-wide survey results (all student responses) were used for accreditation purposes, but departments have never before received a breakdown of individual departmental results or departmental comments. Today we are going to discuss what kind of data departments might find useful in the future and how departments would like old data dispersed. **PART B – Round Table Groups** Each group given question sheet where they were asked to note current questions that were needed and the reason they were needed (a=accreditation, i=improvement, o=other), provide edits to current questions, and list any new questions they would like included on the survey.	 **PART B – Round Table Groups** ○ **ACTION I (Completed) –** Each group highlighted or noted questions they would like to keep, edited questions, or noted new needed questions.

Assessment Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
II. Graduate Student Survey Round Table Discussions Continued…	Group I – Melissa Wilson (Recorder), Leslie Shelton, Diane Brice, and Mark Hanna Group II – Mark Rowh (Recorder), Carol Summers, Cara Crowley, and Brandon Moore Group III – Deborah Harding and Lynae Jacob completed work outside of meeting and e-mailed comments Group IV – Kristin McDonald-Willey and Melanie Castro answered committee questions and collected materials	
III. Change Implementation Discussion	**Kristin** – Collected survey information from everyone in attendance or via e-mail and said that she would compile the information and attempt to complete a new survey draft. Once the final survey is drafted, when would we like to swap surveys and collect new survey data? **Diane** – Diane said that if we needed a clean break she could postpone opening the new graduation applications until April 19th.	o **ACTION I (Completed) – Kristin** will contact Lee Colaw and Terri Kleffman to see if they could possibly help us beat the deadline. Follow up- Terri Kleffman said that they likely could not work within this time table due to out-of-pocket staff and the short notice, but that we should send him the drafted questions as soon as they are available. We will try to make the deadline, but if not, we will just implement the new survey as soon as possible.

Assessment Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline

III. Disbursement of Results and Posting of Results	**Kristin** – Who should receive program-level results and comments? The program-level results are currently compiled based on submitted data for students who were actually eligible to graduate. The comments section, however, is not currently filtered and is for all students who completed an application regardless of whether or not they could graduate.
	Committee Response – KPI should be sufficient for program-level results.
		o **Action I (Next Dean's Council Meeting)** – **Mark** will ask the Dean's Council the following questions:
		  o The comments are currently compiled for everyone who completed an application. Would the deans only like the comments for those who actually graduated or are all comments okay? They can have everyone's comments now or can wait to receive filtered comments.
		  o Who should receive the comments? Deans? Department Heads? Etc. Consideration – Not all comments positive toward faculty/staff
		  o How many years' worth (if any) of comments would they like to receive?
		o **Action II (April 9th)** – **Kristin** asked Bob Austin and April Sessler how they would like information specific to their results distributed. <u>Response</u> **–** Bob requested he be sent the file with comments fields and said he would filter through the report for results specific to his area.

Assessment Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
III. Outcome of Meeting	**RESULTS OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS** All parties involved felt the survey should be shortened. o The Non-Instructional group felt the survey should be under 20 questions. Although the group did not mark through many questions (as a suggested for deletion), the group did make many edits to reflect updated AC lingo. o The Instructional group made some edits and suggested finding a way for students to identify the most beneficial services (when given option bank) rather than being required to answer over 30 questions about individual services for questions found under section 10 and 11. o Deborah Harding sent in some edits and noted the survey should be shortened. o Lynae Jacob noted the survey should be shortened. **RESULTS OF DRAFT** **Kristin** drafted "possible" new survey questions based on committee comments (around 20 total questions) and sent the information to the committee for their review, comments, etc.	o **ACTION I (Completed)** – Committee members who were in attendance were sent the first draft of reworked questions on 4/8/13. Committee members were asked to offer feedback within a few days.
IV. Future Meetings	**To be Determined**	