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Present: T. McGahee, M. Miller, J. Benjamin, L. Dawe

Dr. McGahee had been asked by Dr. Allen Dennis, Chair of the Faculty Assembly to call this first meeting of the Academic Assessment committee. The committee convened at 9 am in the Nursing Conference room.

The first item of business was to nominate a chair. Dr. Matt Miller was nominated. He agreed, with unanimous approval, to chair the committee for the 2009-2010 academic year.

The Committee looked over the assessment rubric and the schedule of programs to be reviewed in the 2009-10 academic year.

- Biology/Geology (B.A./B.S.)
- BIS
- Business Administration
- English
- Mathematical Science
  - Industrial Mathematics (B.S.)
  - Mathematics and Computer Science (B.S.)
- Visual and Performing Arts
  - Fine Arts (B.A.)
  - Music Education (B.A.)

The next item covered was scheduling meeting times for the remainder of the semester. All agreed they would like to review the Assessment Reports from the Program Reviews before the end of the year. Friday appeared to be the best day for everyone. Chair Miller will get back to everyone with the best dates.

Next meeting scheduled for September 25 for a presentation on the new TracDat software.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Lloyd A. Dawe
Academic Assessment Committee  
September 25, 2009  
Minutes

Present: T. McGahee, M. Miller, J. Benjamin, Z. Li, L. Dawe,

The Committee met at 1 pm in the nursing conference room.

Dr. Dawe reviewed the new TracDat system including how to access reports by the Academic Assessment Committee. A rubric to assist members in their review of reports was handed out and discussed.

The committee discussed the need to evaluate unit level assessment activities of General Education. Dr. Dawe identified where reports on general education could be found in TracDat.

Members were informed that they would receive a notice of the availability of reports as they are completed sometime in October. The next meeting would be scheduled for November at which time members would convene with completed rubrics to guide discussion of assessment activities in departments.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lloyd A. Dawe
Present: M. Miller (Chair), T. McGahee, Z. Li, L. Dawe (ex officio), and G. Beady

Dr. Miller opened the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

Dr. Miller stated the meeting would cover discussion and review of the Biology/Geology, English, and Math programs.

Discussion and recommendations for the Biology/Geology program included:

Dr. Miller started with saying the goals/outcomes were stated and were measurable. Dr. Dawe commented that the outcomes were not formatted toward the students.

T. McGahee commented most of the outcomes were met and should the question be asked as to whether the Biology program should challenge itself more.

English:

The majority of the committee agreed that they should be given a score of four for most of the categories.

T. McGahee questioned the difference between general vs. working knowledge.

Dr. Dawe made the suggestion to add a blank copy of the Exit Survey to the Related Documents section within the Assessment Methods section of TracDat. The committee asked Dr. Dawe to bring a computer to the next meeting to illustrate.

T. McGahee commented that there are 17 courses currently not linked to the Program Goals on the Curriculum Map and suggested linking them.

Written Communication – General Education

The committee agreed to rate the Outcomes with all 4’s, Measurement – rated with all 4’s and Actions and Findings – 4’s.

Suggestions/Discussion included:

English 201 is not assessed – should it be assessed?
Attach the rubric.
The findings did not include a table. Dr. Dawe suggested including information from the GEORGE database through the Institutional Effectiveness website.
Math & Computer Science –

The committee agreed the department was meeting or exceeding the guidelines for most of the items detailed.
the difference between working knowledge and real world knowledge is not clearly stated.
Other findings included: no targets are set, and no copy of assessment instrument or questions

The category of problems in the assessment to student learning outcomes needed to be

Is rubric being used for oral presentations?

Targets are missing – say not but don’t tell what it is- it would be good if tables were linked to the results supporting findings that are indicative of trends

Action – no target to tie it to

Industrial Math ---

The committee though there was evidence that the department was meeting or exceeding the guidelines for most of the items detailed.

There was some concern regarding the inclusion of multiple objectives stated as one outcome. This leads to problems with assessment. It was suggested that the department consider splitting such objectives so that they are separate outcomes.

General Education – Math –

The committee rated 3s for most of the rubric with the exception of the outcomes (which need to be formulated as “Students will” and the need for realistic targets

Good curriculum map, but there is a need to identify actions and findings

It would help if a data file of the raw data was linked to the results.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m.
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
December 4, 2009
Minutes

Present: M. Miller (Chair), T. McGahee, Z. Li, L., J. Benjamin, K.Wates, L. Dawe (ex officio) and G. Beady

Dr. Miller opened the meeting at 1:08 p.m.

The committee began with reviewing Fine Arts:

Dr. Miller said he was impressed on how systematic information was put together in all areas. Jack Benjamin stated that TracDat really helped in completing the review; as well as preparing for and recently receiving the NSAM accreditation approval. He continued to say that he is trying to find a way to evaluate the program more efficiently without doing every class?

Dr. Miller– all 3s, everything looks nicely
Dr. Miller – target graduate school, how does it work as a target
Dr. Benjamin stated the department is trying to determine if the students are prepared for graduate school. He discussed conducting a survey of the Fine Arts graduates. Dr. Dawe said the survey could be coordinated with the alumni survey or alumni contact information can be obtained from the Alumni office.

After discussions, Dr. Dawe commented that the Fine Arts had done a great job. Dr. Miller added that he was amazed how well the review had come together given that each area is so different from each other.

Business Administration Review:

Overall the review was very positive. The only suggestions were to ensure appropriate actions and follow-ups based upon the assessment data.

Language Literature and Cultures:
Dr. Dawe said assessment mislabeled – pre-post test, really is a course embedded assessment and is not a direct measure. Charts are nice

K. Wates commented about every outcome/targets being met and that no department can do everything well. Thayer agreed with asking if there is any challenge.

Dr. Miller. Stated that overall it is very good.

Concluding the meeting, Dr. Miller told everyone he will try to get letters out to the departments and that the committee would start meeting again in mid February 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 2:07 p.m.