

COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

MINUTES

Date: October 18, 2019

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Chair: Gary Yarbrough

Recorder: Jessica Tippy

In Attendance

Ginger Berry, Brent Carroll, Deanita Hicks, Brenda Holifield, Dr. Keith McClanahan, Robin Singleton, June Walters, Melissa Watkins, Shauna Winchester, and Dr. Gary Yarbrough

Non-members: Joseph Jones and Rob Semmel

Establishment of Quorum/Welcome & Announcements

Dr. Yarbrough called the meeting to order and a quorum was established.

The AAACL Fall conference will be November 7th and registration is currently open. Ms. Singleton stated that conference registrations will be paid by Assessment and to send the invoice to her for payment. Ms. Walters commented that criterion 4B is the most commonly cited and that PLOs/ILOs were cited in the 2011 reaccreditation visit. Work Team members for Criterion 4 have been asked to attend the conference.

Dr. McClanahan announced that the assurance dates for 2021-2022 have been selected. The dates are in October/November of Fall 2021 and February/March of Spring 2022.

Ms. Singleton discussed the feedback results from the September 13th Assessment training. Copies of the results were distributed.

Election of Chairperson

With no recommendations for new chair, the election of a new chairperson is postponed to next meeting.

Approval of Prior Minutes

Ms. Singleton made a motion to accept the minutes from May 15, 2019 as written with Ms. Watkins seconding.

Motion carried.

Ms. Holifield made a motion to accept the minutes from September 18, 2019 as written with Ms. Winchester seconding.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

MINUTES

Motion carried.

Member Terms

Ms. Walters stated that the Assessment Committee structure in policy needs to be reviewed to include more faculty. Ms. Holifield recommended increasing department faculty to 3 to have more contribution to the committee and Ms. Berry recommended that 3 faculty would allow a 3-year rotation to have individuals on longer. Dr. Yarbrough recommended adding individuals for co-curricular assessment which would change the committee structure but recommended that all changes be done at once. Discussion to continue at next meeting.

Information Literacy Report: A&P I and II Considerations

Ms. Hicks reported that Ms. Rayder stated that students in A & P I/II were demonstrating skill above the minimum expectation for the course based on the accepted rubric. Dr. Yarbrough stated that the committee's next step would be to accept the report or to have someone else score the data. Ms. Holifield asked if a cross-department evaluation would be appropriate and there were no concerns. A norming session for the Critical Thinking rubric will be on November 15th at 3 p.m. Ms. Singleton will reach out to faculty before then. The committee will reconsider the process for evaluating ILO data at the next meeting.

Proficiency Profile/Capstone Assessments

Mr. Carroll discussed that the assessment concepts for the welding program are based on the American Welding Society (AWS) standards which OSHA refers to for their welding standards. For example, there are 3 AWS pipe welding tests: G6, G5, and G4. When students are testing they begin at G6 level. Smaller skill based assessments are built into the courses to track progress to ensure students are learning the concepts. Once the students have completed the program they test to become qualified welders which demonstrates they have passed the AWS test. The only difference between qualified and certified welders is an official card from AWS. When asked about the steps to become a certified AWS training facility in order to issue cards; there is a \$20,000 application fee and AWS performs a site visit of the facility.

Mr. Semmel discussed that the Steel Technology program does not have a capstone course per se. Part of course assessment is based on student performance demonstrating student mastery of course concepts. Ms. Holifield inquired if industries review the students that complete the program's internship but it was stated that not all students go into the internship and there is not a standard way of following up with graduates to survey employment trends past

COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

MINUTES

graduation. Ms. Singleton commented that Ms. Shedd may have ideas on employer evaluations of students.

Mr. Jones had to leave suddenly and did not return to the meeting to present the Computer Information Systems capstone to the committee.

Ms. Singleton reported on the results of the Proficiency Profile Report for 2019 graduates. Dr. Yarbrough questioned why 0% of graduates were reported as not proficient when the tested students did answer a percentage of the questions correctly. Ms. Singleton stated that she assumed that even though questions were answered correctly, the number still did not meet the proficient standard. Ms. Holfield questioned why 5 students were excluded from the data and it was stated that there may have not been enough data from those. Ms. Singleton stated that not many schools in our area use the Proficiency Profile and that we may want to look into another type of capstone exam. Ms. Berry noted that it is not a high-stakes test which affects how students do. When asking about the CAAP test as a replacement Ms. Walters stated in the past that students would get low scores throughout the state.

Division Subcommittee Assessment Reports

Ms. Hicks presented the following changes to division rubrics.

- Oral/Written Responses
 - A not applicable column was added as not everything in the rubric is addressed in every course.
 - The evaluation of sources was removed.
- Fine Arts PLO – applies to Art/Music Appreciation courses
 - Changes made by Holt, Michael, and Luca
 - Dr. McClanahan suggested the last column be divided to match the zero and not applicable column of the previous rubric.

Ms. Singleton noted that the intent was for all PLOs in a program to be assessed during the current five-year assessment cycle. It was questioned whether this is appropriate for the Associate of Arts degree since it was not determined that the degree needs PLOs in addition to the ILOs until the first assessment cycle was well underway. It was decided that the Arts and Sciences division will continue to work on the PLO rubrics and assess what they believe to be appropriate in the current cycle.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

MINUTES

Ms. Holfield presented the revised ADN end-of-program SLO's that are now linked to QSEN standards needed for NLN CNEA accreditation. Current SLO's 5 and 6 were combined into the new 5. The next step is to rebuild CLO's based on the revised outcomes.

Assessment Day Ideas

Ms. Singleton requested members to bring ideas to the next meeting about Assessment Day.

Other Business

At the last meeting it was decided to have committee meetings on the third Wednesday of every month, however several conflicts were brought to Dr. Yarbrough's attention. At this time the committee will work around those dates and meet when it can.

Next meeting date: November 13th @ 3 p.m.

The meeting was dismissed at approximately 11:00 a.m.