

Assessment Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 29, 2021

Time: 4:00 pm

Place: Microsoft Teams

I. Call to order

- a. Dr. Scott Larkin called to order the regular meeting of the Assessment committee at 4:00pm on April 29, 2021.

II. Roll Call

- a. **The following committee members were present:** *Zanna Linder, Kelly Roper, Karsten Tidwell, Dr. Scott Larkin, Vincent Dawson, Genevieve White, Christy Wilson, Dr. James Yates, Dr. Justin Geurin, Brooks Walthall, Ray Winiecki, Dr. Stephanie Tully-Dartez*
- b. **The following committee members were excused:** *Caroline Hammond, Dr. Rhonda Lee-Ernest*
- c. **The following committee members were absent:** *none*
- d. **The following guests attended the meeting:** *none*

III. Approval of minutes from last meeting:

- a. Justin Geurin made a motion to approve the minutes of the committee meeting held on March 18, 2021. Christy Wilson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. Chair update-

- a. no updates

V. Old Business-

- a. No report

VI. New Business-

- a. Action
 - i. Final acceptance of the new ARRT assessment rubric
Change the new Rubric form to a fillable PDF

The new Rubric was approved in the March 2021 meeting this change does not need a vote.

- ii. Thank you to all who made the fillable PDF possible from Dr. Stephanie Tully-Dartez

3. ARRT reports reviews

ARRT Team 1- Dr. Stephanie Tully-Dartez

- a. Biggest notation from these reviews is that the reports need to make sense to anyone who is outside of the discipline of the report being reviewed.
- b. Encourage language that will allow people to have discussions about teaching and learning in general for specific areas
- c. The measure needs to be meaningful
- d. Multiple measures for the same outcome is a good strategy
- e. Some targets at 70%- need to revisit target readjustment as a strategy, make this change in next year's review of the assessment manual
- f. Action plans are still not up to standards as far as attaching examples from student work
- g. Complete drop down menus
- h. Need to revisit need for more assessment coaches, evidence suggests
- i. Need to have a portfolio available for others to see of good examples of complete reports

ARRT Team 2- Christy Wilson

- a. Instructors seem to be okay with the assessment methods, performance targets (though some are vague), and the data collection. Some reports need work to improve these areas, but overall, report are established
- b. In the data analysis, instructors need to be reminded to compare data from the previous year and from the different modes of delivery. Plans of Action were established, but not as specific as needed.
- c. The different modes of delivery need to be addressed in the data analysis and the plans of action
- d. Weak areas: Marking the report correctly (i.e. Internal Review when the instructor is finished and the report is finished and ready for the Dean's review).
- e. Selecting the general education outcomes
- f. Addressing the different modes of delivery in the data analysis and plans of action
- g. Suggestions: Hold a workshop where instructors bring their course syllabi and have a round-table discussion and evaluate each other's course learner outcomes and assessment tools used to measure the outcomes
- h. Hold specific trainings to address the three weak areas listed above.

ARRT Team 3- Genevieve White

- a. Course Learner Outcomes: For the most part the CLO's were clearly stated, measurable, were appropriate in number and all but 1 course had a critical thinking outcome identified.
- b. Assessment Methods: As with CLO's, Assessment Methods were clearly stated and provided a direct measure of student learning. There were a few instances where the assessment tools were not attached. Occasionally the evaluation tools didn't match the assessment measure of the outcome.
- c. Plans of Action: Plans of action were sometimes established, mostly the plan was to continue to monitor. Also, rarely did an instructor compare data for previous year and from the different modes of delivery.
- d. Note: About half of the reports reviewed were lacking supported initiatives from each CLO.
- e. Suggestions: Deans request 1 on 1 instruction from Assessment committee member.
- f. After review everyone agreed that all three ARRT team reviews basically had the same results.

3. Spring 2021 Assessment Plans-

- i. We will open computer labs with several Assessment committee members rotating thru to help Faculty with reports on Monday and Tuesday.
- ii. Genevieve White discussed the potential to bring back more Assessment coaches in the future; Dr. Stephanie Tully-Dartez stated that she was willing to look at this as an option because support for Assessment is important, especially for new faculty members.
- iii. Dr. Justin Geurin suggested it is worth considering offering ongoing support throughout each Fall and Spring semester

c. Announcements-

- i. Re-design of the Assessment page on the website- Dr. Justin Geurin stated that work on re-designing the Assessment web page will begin in the Fall and he would like input from the Assessment committee members at our first meeting in the Fall.
- ii. Along with Assessment training session in the computer labs, Dr. Justin Geurin will be available for any Blackboard Ultra training for faculty.

VII. Adjournment-

- a. A motion to adjourn was made by Kelly Roper, and seconded by Justin Geurin. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm

Minutes submitted by: Kelly Roper