

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee
General Education Sub-Committee
November 3, 2008
Witherspoon 239-B

The Gen Ed sub-committee met in the Witherspoon 239-B on Monday, November 3, 2008, at 2 p.m. Members present were Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Trey Philpotts, and Dr. David Roach. The only member absent was Dr. Brenda Montgomery. Dr. Carey Roberts and Mr. Robert Chenowith attended the meeting as guests.

Call To Order	Dr. Robin Lasey called the meeting to order at 2 p.m.
Approval of the Minutes	After one phrase was eliminated, Dr. Annette Holeyfield moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Jan Jenkins seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Gen Ed Committee	<p>The sub-committee expressed concern about having two committees in charge of the same issue (with this sub-committee and the ad hoc Gen Ed Committee). It was clear that this situation should not continue longer than was necessary.</p> <p>The plan is for this sub-committee to disband after the Gen Ed Committee gets off the ground or at the end of the 08-09 academic year.</p>
Indirect Measures	<p>General Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The members examined these indirect measures for their applicability to Gen Ed assessment. Below is the title of each measure, followed by the applicable goals and any notable discussion.➤ In order for a test section to be useful, there must be a specific sub-score.➤ If information is collected from junior and senior Nursing, Business, Engineering and Education majors, that covers most upper level students at ATU, and therefore is a fairly representative sample of the university. <p>Biology MFAT</p>

- Scientific Reasoning
- A question was raised that since only *senior* Biology majors take this test, would this be an appropriate assessment measure of Gen Ed science courses. As the sub-committee decided to test the *goals* throughout the curriculum, the examination of seniors seemed appropriate.

NCLEX/TEAS

- Communication (Reading/English subscore)
- Scientific Reasoning
- Quantitative Reasoning

Business MFAT

- Quantitative Reasoning
- A “social responsibility and legal” subscore is present, but is too broad for assessing the ethical perspectives goal.

ACHA-NCHA

- Wellness
- 350 students (5% of student population) respond
- National data lags a full year behind the institutional data, delaying the availability of the crucial comparative percentages.

Engineering test

- Quantitative Reasoning
- Ethical Perspectives (possibly)

Tech Fit Usage

- Wellness
- Lots of problems with Tech Fit because students are limited in their use the facilities by hours and classes.
- Dr. Holeyfield will contact Back to Basics and St. Mary's Wellness Center about tracking ATU student usage or memberships (as they offer Tech discounts).

History and Political Science MFAT

- Critical Thinking (Poly Sci)
- Other than the Political Science MFAT's analytical thinking section, the subscores for these tests did not apply.
- Dr. Jenkins will speak with Dr. Michael Tarver to make sure nothing else can be pulled from these MFATs.

	<p>Praxis I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Communication (essay, English usage) Critical Thinking (essay, reading section) Mathematics (mathematics section) <p>Problem: As this test assesses high school level competencies, is it transferable for ATU Gen Ed assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Anecdotal evidence suggests that a significant number of college students fail the Praxis I on their first attempt (and some on subsequent attempts). ➤ It is a pre-professional skills test <u>meant to weed out weaker students.</u> ➤ The percentile scores comparing ATU students with their national counterparts may be the most useful measure for Gen Ed, rather than setting an arbitrary score. <p>SSI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This is a student survey regarding the non-academic offices, but local questions can be added to it (the Assessment Committee added general Gen Ed questions on the last SSI). ➤ Now more specific questions should be added, which could be especially helpful for Ethics and Wellness.
<p>Additional Business</p>	<p>Ethical Perspectives Assessment</p> <p>Previously, this sub-committee sought to assess ethics in terms of outcomes, rather than where the school “inputs” ethics into the curriculum.</p> <p>Where in the curriculum does Tech teach <u>integrity</u> and <u>credibility</u> (professionalism)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Professional Methods/Capstone courses ➤ Student Teaching ➤ Research Methods courses <p>Plagiarism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This sub-committee originally did not pursue this avenue because it wanted to keep ethics assessment positive, but collecting this data may be of some value. ➤ There is no system for reporting and recording incidents of cheating on campus. If one is devised, it must operate from the office of Academic Affairs. ➤ The Gen Ed Committee could ask Dept. Heads to report on their students’ behavior every semester or

	<p>year. This would help Dept. Heads as well, as it would give faculty a reason to report incidents (as they are supposed to do already).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If this could be linked to student T-numbers, multiple offenses could be tracked and such students be barred from registration. <p>Assignments The committee members will divide back into their goal assignments.</p> <p>Dr. Lasey will discuss with Wyatt about how to best collect data and invite him to the next meeting.</p> <p>Next Meeting The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, December 1, 2008, at 2pm in Witherspoon 239-B.</p>
Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.