

Meeting Minutes 11-16-15

Academic Assessment Committee

Meeting was called at 3:05.

The roll call list was misplaced. The following members were excused from attending the meeting: Cliff Anderson (medical reasons). The following members were present – please amend this list as necessary: Martha Kruey, Jason Sikorski, Yvonne Kirby, Jim Mulrooney, Cassandra Broadus-Garcia, Dan Chase, Linda Clark, Reza Ghodsi, Ryan Zimmerman.

Discussion was held on Walk-In Assessment Clinic to occur on the 23rd of November.

Discussion followed about the date and reason for Assessment Retreat. Date of retreat was possibly changed from January 7 & 8 to January 12 and 13. Committee needs three people to reconcile the scores of the assessments. Last time Yvonne, Mel and Carol were reconciling the scores. Yvonne will put out email and doodle poll to determine best dates.

Discussion followed about full rubric to score Interim reports. Committee will be asked to return only comments, not full scores, for future interim reports.

Please review two reports from Construction management for next AAC meeting and give qualitative feedback on interim reports, as the reports should have been full reports. Please score against full report rubric in order to give best feedback to program.

An email from Steve Cohen to Jim Mulrooney and the full Academic Assessment Committee was distributed to the committee for review in order to consider possible responses to all related issues of the assessment schedules at our next meeting.

There is a new interim report form on Taskstream in order to only give feedback, as opposed to a rubric score and qualitative feedback.

Yvonne Kirby gave a presentation on the Multi-State Collaborative program. Discussion occurred on the following related topics:

1. Should we be putting this on our Assessment web site.
2. Excellence in Assessment (group) offers a grant for assessment programs to which we might want to apply; therefore we might want to publish some of our assessment outcomes (as demonstrated on the presentation pages that Yvonne provided) on the Academic Assessment web page.
3. We need to reorganize the Assessment website.
 - a. What would go onto the website?
 - b. Discussion followed about why the assessment scores are declining.
 - i. 0 scores were added to rubrics last year that were not included in previous years. This is one reason that the scores have declined dramatically in the past year.
4. A brief description of the MSC program was provided to the committee.
5. Graduate and international student artifacts were not counted in assessment for MSC program.
6. Not as many faculty members have agreed to participate in the MSC program with artifacts.

7. CCSU is the national norm for MSC scoring against other schools.
8. The details were discussed of when, where and how we should share results with faculty who contributed artifacts to the MSC project, those who scored artifacts during the MSC retreat and to those who will need to participate in the program going forward, particularly with regards to Gen Ed assessment. Yvonne will set up meetings with retreat participants to disseminate the data to faculty members.
9. OIRA has started collecting artifacts from freshman and sophomore students in order to compare beginning to end results.
10. Would it be more beneficial to everyone if the AAC assessed General Education artifacts instead of making each department score their own General Education artifacts (with different rubrics/criteria)?
11. By sharing data and summaries with faculty, we show NEASC that we are working on improving on our assessment and student competency issues.
12. It was suggested that we write a report about the MSC and retreat to attach to the summary tables and scores in order to explain the full assessment process to all CCSU Faculty members so that there is less misunderstanding and more collaboration.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.