

**ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 2014
8:00 A.M. – HARLESS LIBRARY LOGAN CAMPUS**

PRESENT: Kim Hensley, Chair; Cyndee Lowes, Steven White, Melissa Adkins, Verna (Schwalb) Phillips, Sheliah Elkins, Beverly Slone, Guy Lowes, Past Chair, Dr. Debra Teachman, Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services; Pam Alderman, George Morrison, Mindy Saunders, and Ruby Runyon, Recorder
Guest: Anne Cline (Chair, Math Scoring Team)

ABSENT: Nicole Vineyard, Brandon Kirk, Dianna Toler, Miranda Blankenship, Student Representative and Dean, University Transfer (vacant)

CALL TO ORDER / APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Kim Hensley called the meeting of the Assessment Committee to order and determined that there was a quorum.

Kim requested that the minutes from the February 28th, 2014 meeting be reviewed. A motion was made by Cyndee Lowes to accept the minutes as amended. Steven White seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

UPDATES ASSESSMENT DAY – TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014:

Kim reported to the committee members that the number of students who participated in the Assessment Day testing was good. We had an overall participation of 72.9% (105 tested from the selected group of 144 students). An original group of 149 students were selected to test. Of these, five missed; two due to extreme medical conditions and three had completely withdrawn from the College.

Kim confirmed that Mary Nemeth-Pyles was serving as the proctor for the Make-up Day session of the Assessment Exam. A total of five students were being tested as this meeting was being conducted.

Issues still exist with the database script for student selection. Four Salon Management students with 60 credit hours and a confirmed status to graduate were not selected to test. The script needs to be reviewed.

As noted in the February minutes, Kim confirmed that she had phoned ETS in regards to the Assessment Day make-up exam. ETS assured her that no additional costs would be incurred for the make-up exams. The results of the make-up exam would be scored

separately but mechanisms within the ETS database would allow Southern to merge the information from the Assessment Day exam and the make-up exam.

GIFT CARDS:

Kim announced that all students, with the exception of one who declined, who participated in the scheduled Assessment Day testing did receive a \$10.00 Walmart gift card. One hundred and fifty gift cards were purchased for a total of \$1500.00. Of these 150 cards, 104 were awarded that day. Two were reserved for the top two scorers and the remaining balance of cards were distributed by random drawing. Students awarded the random drawing cards were given until April 17th to pick them at their testing campus location. Due to confusion about campus location, one student who tested at Boone but actually had classes at Logan, was yet to be confirmed about where to pick up the awarded gift card. Since a few cards were not picked up by the students by the designated time, a re-drawing will be held.

By unanimous vote, the committee elected to award a \$10.00 Walmart gift card to the five students who did participate in the April 25th, 2014 make-up exam. The motion was made by Sheliah Elkins and seconded by Beverly Slone.

Since the students awarded the gift cards by random drawing had failed to pick up the cards, a redrawing for any remaining cards will take place until all cards are depleted. The two top scorers will be named when final test score information is received by the College.

Ms. Hensley further noted that each student who received a gift card did complete a tracking sheet as required by the State. The form contained the student's S#, name, address, phone number, student signature and the signature of the person distributing the card. Cards awarded for participation were also signed by the test proctor(s).

MATH RUBRIC

Anne Cline, as Chair of the Math Rubric Scoring Team, presented the Assessment Committee with her report which had been attached to the meeting packet. Anne stated that several factors contributed to the Zero/Unscorable category. Because of these factors, for example, no scratch paper included – answer only, no work shown, or unknown if assignment was in-class or homework, a revised rubric and instructions are needed. Also enclosed in the meeting packet were copies of the current Mathematics Holistic Scoring Criteria and the proposal for the revised rubric that would include the Unscorable category with a defined criteria.

Anne brought forth a proposal for the purpose of defining the priorities of two categories/levels of assessment. The proposal will allow Southern to determine what we value in the assessment of our students' mathematical work. With changes

occurring to the Transitional Studies math courses, now is a perfect time to reevaluate a number of things. For example, Student Learner Outcomes may be added to syllabi. However, the process must be faculty-driven and institution-wide.

Samples from various areas of the college disciplines need to be submitted for scoring. For example, more submissions from Nursing/Allied Health and once again obtaining samples from the Business courses.

Discussion revealed that Nursing already completes a Student Learner Outcome (SLO) assessment for both their lecture and clinical classes. SLO's are more specific to disciplines than general education courses. Dr. Teachman discussed a devoted 3-day assessment workshop/meeting that had been held at her former school. She stated they had come together for the purpose of evaluating common goals and Student Learner Outcomes. At which time, priorities could be clearly identified and their value determined. Also the courses were identified that included these priorities. Finally, ways to determine the language was explored so that it was clear and precise what everyone needed to know. This type of workshop could be a possibility for Southern.

It was noted that, especially new faculty need more information on what assessment is. The newer faculty also need to know how assessment affects their job as an instructor.

Another point was to look at the composition of the Rubric Scoring Teams. The membership is composed primarily of in-subject instructors. We need a broader spectrum of membership. Members who know what they are reviewing but not necessarily as an in-subject expert.

Mindy Saunders, Chair of the Mathematics Department, stated that when you review Anne's proposal, it is really assessing five (5) items at different levels. Mindy noted that during the 2014 Math assessment of samples, the order of operations was a pervasive error. If we fully assess this error, we can then "close the loop".

- The problem has been identified and is known.
- It has been written down.
- A plan for correction has been implemented.
- Re-assess the problem.
- Did the plan of correction work?

More discussion ensued about the use of an up-front diagnostic test, such as the Accuplacer, for Transitional Studies classes and the in-house Skills Assessment quiz for Math. These pre-course evaluators could be useful when post exams are also used. The information needs to be documented as well as what happened in the middle along with what worked.

Mindy stated that the beginning assessments of the new math partnership classes (MT 121/MT 121A, MT 123/MT 123A, MT 124/MT 124A and MT 128/MT 128A) can merge

with the work already completed by Anne Cline. All it would need is a menu list cover sheet to allow faculty to indicate the math procedure(s) that applies to the course.

Student Learner Outcomes are needed in the Math courses for the information transfer to other courses in the long-term.

ASSESSMENT TESTING:

Assessment Day 2015:

As the Assessment Committee looks to Assessment Day 2015 and beyond, Kim asked the committee their thoughts on the use of Banner to register the selected students for testing. Run student lists in the fall term. Then use Banner to assign a CRN to each testing session at each location. A roster could be printed and a “grade” assigned. The grade could be credit/no credit, pass/fail or any other available grade mode (chart included in the meeting packet). The CRN for the exam would reflect zero credit hours and appear on the student’s transcript. Since we cannot assess a fee nor offer the opportunity of a free tablet, could this be the nudge for more student involvement for testing? Would the setting of a minimal bar of success help as well?

Pam Alderman expressed concerns for programs with accreditations. Some accreditation bodies would require permission for any additional courses, even assessment testing at zero credit hours, to be added to their curriculum. This registration process could create issues for these programs and throw a red flag.

Discussion continued with the question of assessment testing being added as a CE, Continuing Education, or similar style of registration. As Dr. Teachman pointed out, knowledge within this group of the use of the Banner system to get what we need was very limited. Expertise of IT was not necessary but knowledge of Banner was. She suggested a sub-committee be formed to meet and discuss the issue with Gary Holeman. Members agreed. Kim asked for volunteers. Steven White responded. Kim agreed to attend the meeting as well. (NOTE: Meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, May 6th, 2014.)

Assessment Day/Days, Week, Embedment or Combination:

Kim explained to the committee members that more schools were moving to the form of embedded assessment and totally eliminating standardized assessment testing. Over the years, there have been trends, with the pendulum swinging from one extreme to the other and then back again. Ms. Hensley expressed concerns about a single form of assessment and viewed it as best to use multiple types. Once removed, it is very difficult to re-establish the process. Kim asked the committee to process this information over the summer and be ready in the fall to move forward on the issue of future assessment at Southern.

Steven asked if assessment by other institutions had been explored. Kim stated that she had looked at what some schools did for assessment. Some schools did a carnival-like activity, others appeared to have a large budget for assessment and others did very little. Kim encouraged all members to look for suggestions and ideas of what Southern could do in the future.

Dr. Teachman shared that a true Assessment Day should include the various programs “showing off” what they know, such as posters and presentations by the students in those programs. Members immediately mentioned the Children’s Literature Books that are created in Vicky Evans’ class and Lynn Earnest’s Student Art Show. This method would allow those students not testing, a means to participate in Assessment Day avoiding the need to cancel classes for the entire day.

Types of Assessment Exams:

Kim discussed with the committee members some of the types of Assessment Exams available, such as ETS Proficiency Profile (our current test), Accuplacer Diagnostic (an associate of Accuplacer Testing), and the possibility of development of an in-house exam. The production of an in-house exam could provide the most economical way for Southern to test and assess the students not meeting the criteria for standardized testing. In essence, the in-house test could provide essential value-added information.

Assessment Workers:

Another positive for the Banner registration of test participants would be the determination of the number of proctors needed for each testing session and campus location. With that known, other faculty could be assigned to other assessment activities such as Program Reviewers, Test Writers for in-house placement exams, and as reviewers for the Math and Writing Scoring Teams.

Assessment Fines and Holds:

Over the summer, Kim asked the committee to consider possible action(s) to take in regards to Assessment Fines, Holds, and Fees. Do we want them? If so, how do we deal with them?

As expressed in several meetings, currently any hold placed on a student’s account can only be removed by the person who initially entered it in Banner. This process seems burdensome.

Assessment Fees:

From prior discussions, the committee is aware that the process to have additional fees levied on the student is long. Approval must be obtained from the institution, by the Board of Governors and finally at the State level. The committee has further discussed that due to limited budgets, a fee may be necessary to perform assessment for accreditation purposes, particularly if the goal for all students to be tested is to be reached.

As with the assessments fines and holds, the committee is aware of the potential negative effect on the student. As budgets become tighter, enrollment decreases and as performance-based budgeting looms closer on the horizon, every graduate is needed. The desire of the committee is no harm to the student but without accreditation, classes from a non-accredited institution is the ultimate harm.

STUDENT LEARNER OUTCOMES TO SYLLABI:

Syllabi need to be reviewed. Those syllabi without Student Learner Outcomes need to be revised to include them.

ASSESSMENT ADDITIONS:

Competency Based Learning:

The question was asked, "What are we assessing?" Assessment of General Education is the acquisition of student knowledge gained in one course so that the knowledge can be transferred to another course or life situation. For many of our Career and Technical Programs, a board exam exists that determines the issuance of a licensure for the technical skills. But the General Education skills must be assessed by the College.

Capstones:

For some programs, particularly in the Business Department, capstone courses are already in place. These courses are expected to be completed competently by the student during their final term. Should more capstone courses exist? How do we identify these courses and remain within the 60 credit-hour program limit? Capstone courses would be harder to determine within the University Transfer Division.

Embedded Assessments:

As discussed earlier, some institutions use embedded assessment which can be difficult to prove. Testing alone does not always provide the best overall picture either. A combination of multiple measures, both embedded and standardized testing, is the probably the best approach.

ASSESSMENT INFORMATION FROM DEPARTMENTS:

Kim hopes that in the future, the committee members will have an opportunity to experience a Flash-5 presentation. Members would have 5 minutes to tell about 5 different assessment activities that are currently conducted in their departments. Someone suggested this as an activity for Faculty Convocation in August. Dr. Teachman could not commit to it as an agenda item due to the numerous items that had already been placed on the agenda for the August 2014 meeting.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT LEARNING WORKSHOP:

Mindy Saunders spoke briefly about the Student Engagement Learning Workshop. Attached in the meeting packet was an invitation. The workshop will be held on the Boone Campus on Monday and Tuesday, May 19th and 20th, 2014.

Mindy explained that she and others from Southern had attended a similar training in Charleston. Ms. Saunders stated that she had been implementing some of the practices into her MT 130, College Algebra, class and her students were actually excited about class and showing up early. Mindy expressed her hopes that everyone would attend and take advantage of the training being offered by the state-sponsored presenters.

LIVETEXT:

Ms. Hensley expressed her hopes for the use of LiveText to create a portal for assessment information documentation. Her hopes is that this tool will allow Southern the means to better "close the loop".

Dr. Teachman confirmed the approval of the budget modification for the purchase of LiveText for Southern.

ADJOURNMENT:

Cyndee Lowes made the motion to dismiss and Sheliah Elkins seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote. The committee adjourned at 9:20am.

Kim Hensley, Chair

Ruby Runyon, Recorder

OFFICIAL

Approved 09/12/2014