

TR Assessment Meeting Summary- 11/05/2015

Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:33 PM

(APPROVED - 01/12/2016)

Attendees: Geoff Martin, Mike Davis, Dianne Torres, Cari Hennessy, Susan Marcus, Diego Baez, Joshua Jones, Helen Valdez, Leah Page, Derek Lazarski, Ana King

1. October meeting summary approval (pg 2)

Minutes approved, with the additions of the attendees and group member lists

2. IGNITE #6 - Leah Page "Accessing Student Comprehension via Group Text" (5 slides/5 minutes)

Professor Page uses an app called "groupme." All students belong to the chat thread, which includes creating study groups, asking about answers to questions or about her class, or taking pictures of work. She says that instead of emailing her questions, students will ask each other.

3. Program-Level Learning Outcomes – update and Assessment Roadshow (pg 3)

We are being asked to look into what outcomes exist at our school for each program (i.e. degrees like AA, AS, AGS, etc.). Where there are no SLOs for those programs, we want to create workshops for faculty on how to create those things. We will use the current course SLOs to help us map programmatic SLOs so they all align. A workshop, titled "P-SLOs: From Theory to Practice," will take place during the week of January 11 to assist faculty and administration with this project.

4. "Report on GenEd. Study of Written Communication"

a. Solicit edits/recommendations from committee, vote of approval for dissemination

In the Key Findings section, the Average Score for Each Criterion statistics were changed slightly. A few of the bullet points throughout the presentation will be rewritten for clarity. The suggestion was made that outside of an assessment activity, reading a variety of papers was an enriching activity.

It was discussed that all readers (full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and administration) should be acknowledged.

"No matter their discipline, every instructor must also teach reading and writing."

b. faculty PD discussions on writing across the college

5. Review Working Group Three's recommendations for faculty PD on Assessment

- o Responses to the presentation were generally very positive, and people noted that they gained important insights about how assessment, accreditation, and the committee work at Truman. The presentation itself was a thorough, straightforward overview of the Assessment Committee and accreditation at Truman. We were curious as to what you wanted the audience to pull from your presentation and what you wanted to learn from your survey, as these would help us better assess the survey results.
- o While there were many positive responses and a few good suggestions, some of the survey responses were vague. We thought this could be addressed by reducing the number of questions and length of the questions in each of the six numbered parts of the survey (some numbers had three or four questions, while others had long, detailed questions). We also mentioned possible using a scale system (1-5) with a space for short answers, giving you both quantitative and qualitative assessments.
- o It seems as though adjuncts, on the whole, would like more discussion and professional development opportunities regarding assessment, possibly throughout the semester. You had a slide on formative and summative assessments, but these could each be an hour-long presentation/workshop. (Because of this, some attendees commented that the title of the presentation was misleading.) Our group mentioned that the TAP process and the Faculty Development Seminar had great training on assessment; perhaps we could pull from these entities to develop similar training opportunities for our adjuncts.

6. Planning for GenEd. Study of Oral Communication

a. Parameters / possibilities of the study

Initially, we should create a survey for faculty asking if they use presentation assignments in their classes, and then taking a general survey of those assignment and classes.

How will foreign languages be included?

It was offered to have another collective reading for oral communication, as with the written communication project, but also to give the normed rubric to faculty and have them use it to assess their students in-class.

We should be cautioned between using "speech" and "oral presentation" interchangeably.

b. Oral Comm. Rubric (pg 4)

The rubric was crafted by being compared to the written communication instrument. We may need an inventory of presentation assignments prior to finalizing the rubric.

c. Sample / survey discussion

7. College Success Survey (announcement)

- Diego spoke briefly about the CS101 survey that he distributed to all faculty in late September. The initial survey responses are proving very valuable, but he would like to gather a greater number of responses. Assessment committee members are asked to request that their department colleagues complete the survey

8. Faculty-only discussion