

###### **Division of Academic Affairs**

 **Meeting of the Assessment Committee**

**Minutes**

 **Tuesday October 22, 2013**

 **12:30PM – 2PM**

 **Clock Tower Conference Room**

**Members Present:**

**Stefanie Forster, Chairperson**

**Claudette Dupee**

**Angela Nadeau**

**Rita Perron**

**Absent:**

**Margaret Wheeler**

**AGENDA**

**1. Call to Order**

*The meeting was called to order by Stefanie Forster at 1:10PM.*

**2. Approval of agenda**

*Approved*

**3. Approval of September 2013 minutes**

*Claudette Dupee made a motion to accept, Rita Perron seconded, and the motion carried. The minutes were accepted.*

**4. New Business**

**5. Old Business**

 **5.1 Review of CCSSE data and discussion on next steps**

*Stefanie believes there may be CCSSE data available online. The committee discussed the CCSSE 2013 data provided by Nicholas Gill made available to committee members in an email from Stefanie 10-21-13. For future requests to Nick, the committee will be specific in its requests. Rita discussed distinguishing between what can’t be changed (students not attending orientation) and what is “fixable” like scheduling problems. Angela Nadeau expressed her concern for understanding the committee’s role – is it to condense the data and summarize for the college community? Claudette brought the topic around to respecting the integrity of the area that the data/summary falls under which Stefanie expounded on by saying that institutional assessment, not departmental assessment, is the committee’s responsibility. The discussion turned to looking at the ILO addressed in the data as “student effort”. The data shows that the students believe they are putting in effort but there is no data from faculty to support or deny that – what would faculty say if asked?*

*After some discussion about engagement/interaction and perceptions/expectations of student effort, the committee chose the following starting point:*

* *In order to craft a faculty survey based on* student effort *from CCSSE, committee members will email to Stefanie by November 5, 2013, any questions that related to* student effort*. Stefanie and Angela will tweak and compile the list for presentation at the next Faculty Senate meeting. Stefanie will also ask Nick for an electronic list of the CCSSE questions to make the task easier. It was noted that some of the CCSSE questions were poorly worded.*

*The committee will discuss at the next meeting when the best time is to do the faculty survey. It may be at the beginning of the next semester rather than more immediately.*

*Stefanie handed out copies of the results of the most recent graduates’ Exit Survey. Angela questioned whose job it is to share this data. Does Nick have a plan for CCSSE data dissemination – for example, a “data lunch”? The committee discussed the ability to view job descriptions so that the committee understands appropriate interaction. The committee considered the process to have the IR person appointed to the assessment committee – recommending to College Council. Stefanie said that having someone appointed when it is not in their job description may not be the right thing to do, however Angela said it seemed neglectful not to have the IR person on the committee. The committee was reminded by the Chair that it cannot assign work to anyone. The committee will look at this topic again for the next Academic Year. Angela asked if the committee has a role in conveying the information and was referred to the by-laws.*

**5.11 Update on Student committee member**

*Claudette asked Deidre Thompson about progress but nothing has been done yet. Claudette suggested to her that a student who is interested could sit in on a meeting to see if they liked it.*

**5.2 Review of Program Learning Outcome materials and next steps**

*PLOs are on the website and in the catalog. The deadline to update the catalog is approximately the end of March. There is no incentive for the faculty to work on PLOs without tying them to the 5 Year NEASC Report. Stefanie will bring them to the November Faculty Senate meeting to request:*

 *BHS/VET – January*

 *HIM/PMT – February*

 *TTO/Career – March*

*The Faculty Senate will be asked if they need documents on how to write PLOs.*

*Stefanie provided handouts regarding PLOs. There will be more discussion about PLO content/mechanics at the next meeting. The committee agreed to keep Angela’s form designed for PLO submission. Angela will clean it up to show at Faculty Senate meeting. When utilized by faculty, it will be sent by email and the approved hard copy kept by Academic Affairs.*

**5.3 Review of Communication Rubric and discussion on next steps**

*Rita commented that the rubric was repetitious. The committee discussed the use of the words “ethical” and “documented” – it is important that the rubric is a standalone document that can be used on different types of papers. The rubric needs to be evaluated for its ability to score the content and the mechanics. Does the rubric address scholarly sources and still appropriately allow, for example, familial or other primary sources as might be used in a sociology paper? The numbers were a concern and the committee felt that there should be descriptors. The word “neat” also needed to be considered – what does that mean?. The following members will tweak and report at the next meeting on the following:*

 *Descriptors – Stefanie*

 *Sources & Professionalism – Angela*

 *Content & Organization - Rita*

*The committee would like to use the rubric with a poorly written paper to see how it works.*

**6. Announcements**

**7. Adjournment**

*1:55 by mutual acknowledgement*