Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 18, 2022

1. **Opening:** The regular meeting of the Assessment Committee was called to order at 12:03 pm by Justin Tickhill. The meeting was held online via Zoom.
2. **Present:** Dr. Gina Kamwithi, Justin Tickhill, Dr. Kelly Gray, Dr. Howard Walters, Christine Lynch, Christina Barker, Vickie Rose, ~~Barb Keener~~, ~~Kimberly Lybarger~~, Alicia Camak, Amy Burns. Guest in attendance was Carmen Morrison.
3. **Welcome our guest: Carmen Morrison for review of TASK** – Carmen is Assistant Professor/CISS Faculty, Business Program Director. Chair welcomed her to the Assessment meeting and reviewed the roles of the Committee with guest. Lead PARS Review asked for Carmen to guide the committee in this process of what she did and for the committee to follow-up with various questions and feedback after Carmen’s PowerPoint presentation and discussion.

Carmen oversees 38 programs. They are: Management, Marketing, Analytics (very new program), Accounting, Economics, two transfer degrees (one is for CollegeNow students, which meets both high school and college requirements). The other program, approved by ODHE, is for students who want to continue on and receive their four-year degree. This program is heavier on the higher math and science skills. They have a lot of programs they support which makes it difficult to report on with their small department and losing some of the full-time faculty.

Carmen shared her PowerPoint presentation with the committee and discussed in depth the Business and Accounting Program Assessment Reports and College Wide Outcomes. A Member questioned the number of programs. Carmen explained the differences in the programs and how they are more specialized. Some have smaller numbers of graduates and have more advanced math, but there are common courses for the program and it is sustainable. The new Analytics course is part of the COF scholarship program. Member asked how many PARS do they report on and how many program reviews are done. They report on all. Admin stated Ohio Learning Commission requires that every variation of our programs has a PARS.

Carmen shared the main measurement tool they use is Major Fields Test by ETS. This tool is not solely for business and accounting. They do other programs as well, which help institutions meet accreditation requirements. They are accredited by an external accreditation body which is called Accreditor for Business and Accounting Programs (ACBSP). They are up for their 10-year self-study which is due this December and they will be doing a site visit in the spring.

It is very important for the Business department to have good measuring tool to meet the accreditation requirement. Carmen shared the BUSM PAR Report and noted that their problem as a department is that the data from the tool is erratic. It is difficult to come up with a good decisive date that shows student progress compared with the national percentile. After Carmen looked at the numbers in more detail, she concluded the number of institutions participating in the Major Fields test is declining and there is thought that it is impacting the national comparison. She also noted there are not a lot of two-year community colleges to compare to.

Their conclusion as a department is they agree it is important to have a national comparison. However, the performance of students nationally can vary, just as our own performance varies. With the comparison being erratic, it causes difficulty to make conclusive decisions. As a department they are considering two options:

1. Add another data point of student performance, rather than basing all results on national rank.
2. Research and select another measurement, such as Peregrine Global, which solely measures Business majors. ETS Major Fields Test has a declining number of participating institutions.
   * Carmen is attending ACBSP National Conference in June and plans to research what other institutions are using.

Carmen stated the numbers on their PARS report are not a true representation of what they’re doing in their programs. She noted that for the CWO data, since there are so many programs, there are a lot of reports to do. With so many adjuncts teaching and CCP courses, unsure if all are using the CWO equally. CWOs used were Critical Thinking, Info Literacy, Oral & Written Communication, Intercultural Knowledge and Quantitative Literacy. Carmen wanted the Assessment Committee to know that she changed the charts value axis to be either 20 or 24 to match the rubric as this more accurately represents the students’ performance. Admin made note of for future reports. Another item Carmen suggested was to add a trend line to the Excel files.

Questions/Comments from the committee:

Lead PARS reviewer thanked Carmen for sharing the information about CWO and the updates she made with her reports.

Admin stated for programs discontinued, those do not need to be reported on.

Chair asked for more clarification on why the critical thinking skills dropped in the PARS and was there a cost change. Carmen stated that drop on the Major Field Test was from the National Comparison data. PARS is very important to their programs and they look at the data. Her main complaint was the volume of reports and losing full-time faculty.

Member questioned what was the demographic of student being assessed (College faculty or CCP faculty teaching the course). They do not split out the various groups CCP or college level courses. It shouldn’t matter who taught it as all students should be receiving same objectives. It was mentioned, the more courses and instructors we hire the more difficult it is to assess. There was extended discussion on the training of adjuncts and CCP faculty and questions on whether they are receiving proper guidance on COWs. CAO reported that the adjunct training process has been totally redesigned in the last six months. It is an ongoing performance improvement project. and all CCP classes have a site visit annually by Deans and Assistant Deans. Admin is able to assist all faculty.

Member asked Carmen what she took away from these reports and what direction the department is going from there. Carmen said their two main goals as a department are getting quality faculty as they lost two, very experienced high-quality people and the second main goal is to make sure assessment tool and data they are presenting is true representation of their program and students. She will be researching further when she attends a conference in the summer.

Chair recommended for future reporting to add more comments than only listing, no action needed in CWOs. Admin stated that for HLC, she and Carmen will meet to discuss these discrepancies further. Justin thanked Carmen for coming to the meeting.

1. **Minutes**

Minutes from February 4, 2022 were reviewed and accepted as revised with Gina’s additions.

Motion to approve: 1st: Christine Lynch, 2nd: Chris Barker

CAO stated that her expectations are that the minutes are read ahead of time and suggested that members send amendments/corrections to the minutes to Amy and Chair prior to the meeting. Those corrected minutes will then be shared with the committee prior to the meeting. From now on, after Amy has completed the Assessment minutes for a meeting, she will email them to all members of the committee. The 3 full-time faculty were asked to inform Amy of any revisions they may have and then Amy will send an updated set of minutes around prior to the meeting and those minutes will be voted upon at the next meeting.

1. **Review turn in rates for TASK, investigate deficiencies –** Chair reported that almost all TASKS have been turned in. Faculty have been in contact with him or admin if assistance is needed on their reports.
2. **Distribute Task from Bioscience (Jason Tucker) for next meeting** – Chair will be sending these TASK reports to the committee soon**.**

No other items were given for discussion.

For the next meeting, Admin requested the following be added to the agenda: change beginning dates for data, start with 2018 going forward and discuss whether we need to change chart from 25 or 30 for Critical Thinking, drop it back down to 25.

The top should only be 25 no matter what. We need to discuss changing the critical thinking template next year.

1. **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned by Chair at 1:22 pm.

The next meeting will be Friday, March 4, 2022 via Zoom 12 noon – 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy E. Burns, Recorder