Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 19, 2021

1. **Opening:** The regular meeting of the Assessment Committee was called to order at 12:08 p.m. on Friday, February 19, 2021 by Justin Tickhill. This meeting was held online via ZOOM.
2. **Present:** Dr. Gina Kamwithi, Justin Tickhill, Dr. Kelly Gray, Christine Lynch, Christina Barker, Deb Hysell, ~~Leesa Cox~~, absent due to student issue, Daniel Wagner, ~~Barb Keener,~~ ~~Kimberly Lybarger~~, Paula Waldruff, ~~Alicia Camak,~~ Dr. Min Lu
3. **Minutes**

Minutes from February 5th were reviewed with a minor adjustment noted. Motion to approve: 1st: Chris Barker , 2nd: Christine Lynch.

Other: Welcome to Dr. Lu and Leesa Cox will be coming off the committee once she steps into her new role of Assistant Dean on March 8th.

1. **TASK review for 19/20 Program Assessment Reports: Radiology, Criminal Justice, Cyber Security**

**RADS Review –** Justin Tickhill noted his personal comments on the report, previously emailed to the committee. There will be a meeting later on with RADS faculty to discuss their assessment report together.

Major note to mention: student data with names was included on the report. This is not a best practice as this document is shared on the college website. Gina does redact any information like this before posting.

The report was not exactly what the team expected.

SLO 1
Justin questioned why the benchmarks were shown as 100%. Meaning, 100% of the students were to achieve the benchmark. Gina stated that RADS was instructed to NOT do double work and use the same measure as those required by their accreditor.

There was however a question that a lot of different outcomes were taken from the same assessment, this could cause issues. It leaves students vulnerable if they are being assessed on one assignment that they could possibly miss.

Chris Barker asked where the data was being pulled from – spring 2020? If it’s all from spring, this may be why it doesn’t look quite like it should.

SLO 2

Adjunct did not do one assignment and this was concerning to the committee.

Christine Lynch shared that faculty can pull assignments from Canvas if they were not submitted by adjunct. She would like to know why this assignment was not completed.

Gina raised the question if the adjunct did not do assignment, what are consequences. When they are hired are they being mentored by full-time faculty? Has the Dean done an assessment or student assessment? These are questions we need to ask programs when they come for their review. What is the reasoning behind the missing assignment and what will accreditors say if they find out students did not do their planned assignment.

It was noted that there is not enough mentoring for adjunct and full-time faculty. It was questioned that we may not want to include the “throwing under the bus” type of language when something does not get done by an adjunct faculty member.

SLO 3

Outcome: The student demonstrates effective oral communication skills

Justin really liked the Action Plan that was included. It is good to see progress throughout the program and intentionally refining when learning cycles are insufficient. They were very clear on how they would help to increase the 13/19 benchmark that was not met.

Chris Barker noted that only one activity was used for the criteria, asked why another one wasn’t used.

Per HLC requirements, if a full-time faculty identifies a problem, there needs to be a consequence. This particular adjunct mentioned in the report no longer works for the College.

Justin suggested that we check with Dorie if she is aware about this being on the document. In the past, Dorie did one document and Ellen did the particular document that is being reviewed. Address this first.

Under the written communication outcome, Justin did not like the use of a CWO as a PAR. There was further discussion. There are good arguments on each side. Assessment needs to be subjective. It is OK if CWO is in PARS if it’s thoughtful and contextualized.

Gina reminded the team that they can ask very pointed questions when they meat with faculty to review their report.

SLO 4

Work Ethics Outcome: Specific names should not be included in the document. Areas listed were a lot of very straight forward soft skills.

Integrity rests on 3 things: program review, curriculum review and assessment. This committee is a balance of doing PARS.

1. **Discuss scheduled program in-person reviews – Criminal Justice and Cyber Security**

Gina presented a few highlights for these programs.

Cyber Security

Criminal Justice – David took his data seriously. They had some low numbers from deployment.

Law Enforcement – Program outcomes were listed at the bottom. They have overlap with CWOs and PARS. Gina reminded the committee to look at all information before reviewing the analysis and find out what questions come to mind immediately.

There is not enough information given about the assignment. They need to provide what was done with the 13% of the students who were unsuccessful.

Gina will share her analysis with the Assessment Committee for Cyber Security and Criminal Justice prior to the March 5th meeting. Both programs are scheduled for review on that date with each being 30 minutes. They will be given the opportunity to be a part of each other’s review if they decide to do so.

1. **Discuss changes to Curriculog system**
2. **Adjournment**

Christine moved to adjourn at 1:15 pm, Gina seconded.

The next meeting will be Friday, March 5, 2021 12 noon – 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy E. Burns