

ASSESSMENT MEETING

June 4, 2007

Present: Debra Backus, Larry Bloom, Sharon Gott, Seyed Mirkhani; Tim Tirrell

Presiding: Sherry Becker-Gorby

Regrets:

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Minutes	The minutes from the May 10, 2007 meeting were reviewed. Two corrections were noted: Change “Boom” to “Bloom” and change “S>” to “S.” The minutes were approved as corrected.	S Becker-Gorby will make changes and note approval date on minutes.
Course Level Assessment: Spring 2007 Pilot Course Reports Update	<p>A progress report was given by the program directors for pilot courses in spring course level assessment project.</p> <p>S. Mirkhani: ACC 121 and ECN 202 are being assessed. S. Mirkhani provided a preliminary summary of results. In addition to listing the outcomes results by section, the committee asked that a total % be listed for all sections combined. A concern was expressed regarding performance of the online group of students as compared to the traditional group. Providing the % for the total sample of students will provide another comparison point. A typo was noted on ACC Question #2 answer "c". The questions used for the assessment were developed by a practitioner faculty (S. Murphy). S. Mirkhani will prepare a preliminary report, share with faculty for review/input and prepare final report.</p> <p>D. Backus: Data is available for EDF 217. She has not obtained the data for SSC 147. She will follow-up with faculty to obtain scoring information.</p> <p>S. Gott: Compiled the data from MTH 95 and 96. There were 2 sections for each course. She noted that the students did get the “order of operations”. Only 1 out of 4 outcomes were met per the preliminary assessment. Data has also been compiled for MTH 96. 75% of the students met the outcome for “Solving linear equations”. S. Gott will apply a scoring rubric to the questions. It was noted that some students were applying concepts correctly, but only made a minor computation</p>	Spring course assessment reports are due on July 1. S. Gott will also email developmental course completion rate charts to SB-G.

	<p>error. Using the rubric will better assure the assessment is focused on the learning of the concept/process rather than strictly computation. S. Got will also include compact tracking data to examine success rates of students as they move from developmental courses to college level courses. S. Gott will email completion rate charts to SB-G.</p> <p>L. Bloom: Data is available for EET 100. The data is not available for PHS 115. He will obtain this data from the instructor. Since the number of students enrolled in these sections is low, no changes will be made to the courses based on the assessment data. Though enrollments are low, it was agreed that the assessment activities should still take place to begin building a culture of assessment. It will also begin to build a data foundation for comparison at a later date.</p> <p>Spring Course assessment reports are due July 1. Reports are to be sent to SB-G.</p>	
<p>Course Assessment Pilot Project: Next steps</p>	<p>Several questions were posed regarding the process. Based on the questions, the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment activities can be conducted throughout the semester or at the close of the semester. The timing is dependent upon the nature of the assessment activity. • Assessment activities do not have to be limited to using test questions. Standard test questions were selected for the pilot to expedite implementation. Other measures/activities can be used. The key is to be certain the activities are being commonly applied across all sections of the course being taught so data can be collected and analyzed for the course regardless of who is teaching it. • A course can be assessed several terms in a row. This is particularly important if initial findings indicate a need for course revision. An assessment cycle needs to be identified to put all courses into an assessment rotation. • More outcomes can be added to the course assessment. Four outcomes were selected for the pilot project, but projects can be expanded to include more outcomes. 	

	<p>The committee decided that the process is a good process, but time consuming. Given the issue of involvement of practitioner faculty and the outstanding issue of contracts for content faculty to serve as lead faculty for course assessment projects, it was decided to work with target courses in the programs. Specific courses that tend to serve as cornerstone courses will be selected. A minimum of two courses in each department will be selected. More can be selected at the program director's recommendation.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain current process • Each program director will identify 2 or more courses for the 2007/2008 academic year. • D. Backus: PSY 200 and an EDF course (to be selected later) • L. Bloom: IMT 100 and EET 105 • S. Gott: MTH 90, MTH 99 and RDG 90 • S. Mirkhani: ECN 201, ACC 121 and BUS 101. May consider adding CIS 114 and CIS 108 (CIS 108 will be in conjunction with D. Backus) 	
Faculty Evaluations	Tabled until July meeting. A working session to focus on review of process will be on the next assessment agenda.	SB-G will forward Faculty Evaluation regulation materials to committee members for review and comment in prep for next assessment meeting.
Course Evaluations	<p>T. Tirrell contact S. Bungard to get approval for C. Grapes to be trained to run the faculty evaluation reports from Access.</p> <p>SB-G followed up with S. Bungard regarding the Scantron. S. Bungard noted that finds are available to purchase. She had done a preliminary web search on the scantron, but found that it will be necessary to set a meeting with a company rep to get details on costs, service options, etc. The assessment committee members are willing to participate in the sessions with reps. SB-G will follow-up with S. Bungard regarding committee interest in helping.</p>	<p>T. Tirrell will work with S. Bungard to get approval for C. Grapes to work on this project.</p> <p>SB-G will follow-up with S. Bungard regarding the Scantron project.</p>

General Education Assessment	SB-G noted that the gen ed subcommittee (D. Backus, T. Tirrell, SB-G) will meet on June 20 to work on the course matrix and review testing information materials.	
Virtual Faculty Lounge: Update	<p>SB-G reported that Academics met to review the VFL. Several corrections were noted. Areas requiring additional information were also identified. Minutes from the meeting were sent to participants and T. Tirrell. Program Directors/coordinators will forward additional items to SB-G by June 11. SB-G will compile the list of additional materials for the VFL.</p> <p>Because the student interns are no longer involved in the project, questions regarding implementation and update need to be addressed. T. Tirrell noted that it is possible to explore having Eastern's IT department as the group to take responsibility for uploading and maintaining the site. T. Tirrell also noted that the next group to assume responsibility for the VFL should be the TLTC since their role is to address technology issues in the academic areas. SB-G will organize the information regarding the VFL changes needed and forward to S. Mirkhani as chair of the TLTC. TLTC will work on the implementation of the site. S. Mirkhani will work with the TLTC to contact IT regarding the possibility of taking on the VFL for uploading and maintaining site.</p>	SB-G will compile list of changes and additions to the site and forward to S. Mirkhani as TLTC chair to work on implementation of site.
Assessment Web link: Update	SB-G met with E. Alt. E. Alt is loading a series of assessment files for an initial stage. Files sent to E. Alt include agendas, minutes and program level assessment plans. Once this is set up with links, E. Alt will work on adding the remaining items. A question was posed as to whether report forms can be loaded in word and PDF formats. SB-G will contact E. Alt to see if this is a possibility. Intention is to have site ready for fall or earlier.	
Other	An additional discussion centered the validity of questions used as measures learning. It was noted that application exercises can be used to assess learning in lieu of multiple choice questions. The issue is to determine if learning is taking place. Format of the assessment can be adapted to best suit the needs of the type of course being taught. Use of rubrics to assess classroom/lab exercises was discussed. It was noted that the multiple choice question format was only selected as a starting point. It was not intended to serve as a one size fits all process for all course assessment activities.	

Next Meeting	The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 2 at 9:00 in the HARCO room.	
--------------	---	--

Respectfully submitted by Sherry Becker-Gorby 6/12/07

Approved: July 2, 2007