

**ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, APRIL 5, 2013
8:00 A.M. – HARLESS LIBRARY LOGAN CAMPUS**

PRESENT: Kim Hensley, Chair; Cyndee Lowes, Mike Redd, Mary Hamilton, Rodney Scaggs, Sheliah Elkins, Kathryn Krasse, William (Bill) Moseley, Beverly Slone, Dianna Toler, Miranda Blankenship, Student Representative, Guy Lowes, Past Chair, Cindy McCoy, Steve Lacek, Harry Langley, Pam Alderman, George Morrison, Alyce Patterson-Diaz, Anne Cline (guest), Sonya Sharpe (student guest) and Ruby Runyon, Recorder

ABSENT: None

CALL TO ORDER / APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Kim Hensley called the meeting to order and determined that there was a quorum. Ms. Hensley requested that the minutes of the March 1st, 2013 meeting be reviewed.

The motion was made by Kathryn Krasse to accept the minutes with corrections. Bill Moseley and Mary Hamilton seconded the motion. The motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS:

Assessment Testing: Ms. Hensley stated that a total of 88 students met the current criteria for selection to participate in the Assessment Day Testing. Of those 88, two were not valid, leaving the total count for taking the test at 86.

Assessment Test Makeup – April 5, 2013: As the meeting began, Kim Hensley noted that only a handful of students were present to participate in the make-up session of the ETS Assessment Test. Chuck Keeney and Martha Maynard were to serve as the proctors.

Assessment Fines and Holds: Kim explained that not enough research has been completed for her to prepare the proposal for the Assessment Fines and Holds. More information needed to be gathered to determine the impact on the students as well as the employees who would be responsible for applying and lifting the fines and holds when applied. What criteria would determine an excused non-participant? What process would determine to whom fines and/or holds would be applied? Once applied, what process would reverse the fines and/or holds and by whose authority?

Assessment Fees: The same scenario applies to the proposal for Assessment Fees which would allow funds to be collected for the purpose of being able to afford testing of all students.

If standardized assessment for all students were possible, an assessment test would need to be selected.

Self-Study, Chapter 6, Criterion Four: The Self-Study section was temporarily placed on hold to allow Dr. Langley to discuss his “Best Practices” document with those present. Once the discussion had concluded, Steve Lacek felt that the information obtained had also served for the agenda topic for the Self Study.

Steve added that Curriculum and Instruction forms were cited as documentation within the Self-Study, therefore, changes should also be documented in department meeting minutes.

Kim asked the committee to look at the handout of Steve Lacek’s email dated 4/3/2013 Chapter Six of the Self-Study report, page 122 Criterion Four Recommendations for Improvement: Item #2 – Review and revise the role of the Assessment Committee to empower it to oversee the College’s assessment of student learning
How do we accomplish this?

- Release time for faculty members
- Additional committee meetings
 - Concern: If this is the only Governance Committee to require this extra commitment, will faculty be willing to serve on this committee?
- Extended meeting times
- Working outside committee meeting times
- Making calls from home (Assessment Day testing)

Members of the 2011-2013 Assessment Committee did have at least one additional meeting and participated in the last three bullet items for the 2013 Assessment Day. Please discuss this matter with your department and colleagues, send your recommendations to Dr. Langley with a copy to Kim and Ruby.

“Description of Best Practices in Educational Achievement and Ongoing Assessment of Student Learning”: Dr. Langley stated that in preparing his document, *Description of Best Practices in Educational Achievement and Ongoing Assessment of Student Learning*, he had referred to Merle Dempsey’s document extracted from the 2007 Higher Learning Commission document, Southern’s policies and procedures, past practices and faculty “word of mouth”. Dr. Langley stated that he was impressed with how active the Assessment Committee was.

Dr. Langley then proceeded to schedule meeting times at each campus in order to meet with faculty to discuss and receive additional feedback on his document, “Description of

Best Practices in Educational Achievement and Ongoing Assessment of Student Learning”:

- Wednesday, April 10th, 9:00-11:00am at Boone and 1:00-3:00pm at Logan
- Monday, April 15th, 11:00am-1:00pm at Wyoming
- Tuesday, April 16th, 8:00 -10:00am at Logan and 11:30am-1:30pm at Williamson

Kim encouraged the committee members to urge their department faculty to drop by one of the sessions if their schedule permitted or to submit written comments directly to Dr. Langley or their Assessment Committee representative.

To review his document with the Assessment Committee, Dr. Langley first discussed how the College mission statement drives the need for change and recommendations to academics. He then asked the members of the Assessment Committee for information on how various courses and programs were assessed. Assessment Committee members discussed at length with Dr. Langley, topics such as entrance/exit exams and common final exams, course syllabi, specialized accreditation for programs, e.g. Nursing and Allied Health. These topics of discussion were being reviewed as to how the institution documented its goals on the course, program, and institutional level.

Course Level:

For example, Dr. Langley discovered that at the course level, faculty use a syllabus that has common goals and objectives (at minimum 80% up to a maximum of 100% with the Transitional Studies courses) and a selected textbook. New courses and their syllabi, reduction or increase of credit hours, changes to courses, etc., are submitted to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee for approval. The committee members disclosed that implementation could be difficult as there were instances of student complaints about instructors who only wished to use their supplemental materials and not the selected textbook. Implementation of these common factors is difficult. There are times when faculty only wish to use their selected supplemental material and/or textbook(s) and do not want to use the common textbook. Students will complain “why buy the book?”

Another area of difficult implementation is dual credit courses; qualified High School teachers teaching a college-level course at the high school. Teachers want to use their high school textbooks and although the college syllabus is provided, there is no assurance that the college course common goals and objectives are presented in the dual credit class. Kathryn Krasse stated that she had taught a dual credit course at one of the local high schools. Because Ms. Krasse did not hold an education degree, a teacher with a teaching degree was needed in her class. The high school wanted to use the high school textbook issued by the Board of Education, therefore, those students enrolled in the dual-credit course ended up having two instructors as well as two textbooks.

On a positive note, there are courses that terminate with a common final which is administered by a college faculty member or college approved proctor. In some cases, high school principals and/or faculty have deemed that two grades be issued, one for the high school portion and a second grade be recorded for the higher standards of the college-level course.

Melinda Saunders, chair of the Mathematics Department, has tried several approaches to insure the integrity of the math dual credit courses. She has required that the Math common final be proctored by a College employee (which might require the student to come to campus to take the exam, if missed during the classroom appointed time). Ms. Saunders has done comparisons between the high school final grade and the score of the college-level common final grade. Those dealing with dual credit courses find that the principals want the students to finish the dual credit courses with “A’s and B’s” so as not to damage their GPA eligibility for the PROMISE scholarship program. Therefore, the suggestion has been made to issue two grades for the dual credit student. One grade is the high school level grade which might be an “A” or “B” and the other grade based on higher standards for the college-level grade.

Student representative, Miranda Blankenship, stated that when she had been enrolled in a dual credit course, she received two grades. One for her high school transcript and the other was her earned college-level grade.

Program Level:

For the Nursing, Respiratory Care, and Dental Hygiene Programs, an accreditation body provides goals with measurable objectives for those students enrolled to obtain a specialized accreditation. The need for this specialized accreditation will then map out the entire curriculum, both clinical and classroom. Nursing uses ATI to assess every student in every Nursing course and cumulating with a National Board Certification Exam.

Other programs, such as the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science, are very broad and do not require specialized accreditation but do support institutional goals. For these programs, one goal might be for the student to speak and/or write effectively or to complete a technical component, such as CS 102. In the past, these goals were documented by matrices.

The Business Department utilizes in-house developed entrance/exit exams for their Accounting and General Business programs. The entrance exam is scheduled at the beginning of the first semester with the exit exam scheduled outside-of-class during the student’s final semester. The Business Administration Program utilizes a national exam.

Institutional Level:

Most Southern students are evaluated by the ETS Profile exam administered to a select-by-criteria group of students during the college’s Assessment Day in the spring term. Other means of institutional assessment include scoring of writing and math samples by the Writing Scoring Team and the Math Rubric Team. These samples are submitted from various instructors’ classes. Accuplacer Testing, ACT Scores and the occasional SAT scores are pre-assessment tools used as a guide for course placement.

He plans to distribute the “Best Practices” document electronically and has asked to hold discussion groups on various campuses. Policy describes assessment activities that are done or not done. Documents show that assessment is done, how it is done and infrastructure exists but we fail in closing the loop indicating the impacts on teaching and the improvement to or how to improve the teaching process.

Dr. Langley needs and encourages comments from the Assessment Committee members, individually or as a committee. He has requested that the Assessment Committee members arrange the campus meetings, working with Nancy Fala for scheduling purposes. Committee members can be present at the campus meetings, if they so choose. To include with this discussion, recommendations from the Self-Study for the Assessment Committee to assume more responsibility for the institution’s assessment. One example is the Assessment Academy.

Dr. Langley discussed the use and/or lack of assessment data from the Curriculum and Instruction forms. He urged the Assessment Committee members to discuss in their department meetings the need for more detailed and documented information on these forms when submitted. Dr. Langley used these as examples of listing specific data: conducted a survey and determined this change was necessary, or based on the Program Review for, request for change based on faculty comments or student feedback.

The one comment for the document itself was on page 9 to move the flow chart in the middle of the diagram to the left side allowing the reader to review the material from left to right.

New Business:

Math Rubric: Kim Hensley asked for the committee’s indulgence in conducting new business before old as our guest had to attend another meeting. She then introduced Dr. Anne Cline as the Chair of the Math Scoring Team for Assessment Day. Dr. Cline stated that she felt that the Math Scoring Team was a sub-committee of the Assessment Committee. Dr. Cline explained to the members that she was of the opinion that the math assessment needed to be done differently. For years, samples had been obtained from various places, particularly the Math courses. Her questions were: Once samples are obtained and scored, where do they go? What do we do with the results? Where did these samples come from? Dr. Cline intends to propose that we look at various ways to assess our new in-coming students and assess them all along the way, not just on one day out of the academic year. A handout of the outcomes from the scored papers by the 2013 Math Rubric Assessment Team and a copy of the Mathematics Diagnostics Quiz used by most of the Natural Sciences courses was presented to the committee members. Since Dr. Cline has served on the Math Rubric Team for several years, the outcomes based on our current assessment mode lets us know just how broken the process is.

Other: Kim reminded the current Assessment Committee members that their current terms of service were expiring. Elections for members for the next two-year cycle would need to be held during their respective department meetings later that day. She asked that the current member email her and copy in Ruby with the name of the representative from their department. This information would be needed by Emma Baisden to complete the list of Governance committee memberships.

Kim also reminded the committee that the Higher Learning Commission representatives would be meeting with the Assessment Committee during their site visit. She stated that she realized that this could pose a conflict with their classroom schedules.

ADJOURNMENT: Mike Redd made the motion to dismiss and Rodney Scaggs seconded the motion. As the meeting was adjourned, Kim Hensley thanked these two long-serving Assessment Committee members for their service and wished them well on their upcoming retirement at the end of the academic year. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. The committee was adjourned at 9:56am.

Kim Hensley, Chair

Ruby Runyon, Recorder