



	assessment, specifically for the Communication Goal.
<b>Goal: Communication (Dr. Norton)</b>	<p>Most of written communication was to be covered by the Criterion service, supplemented by the assessment of written speeches by the speech faculty.</p> <p>Verbal communication was to be assessed in speech classes. Although as not everyone is required to take speech courses, other avenues of assessment were discussed. Senior seminars for Honors/history majors were proposed as an excellent supplement, although a common rubric would need to be given to the appropriate faculty.</p>
<b>Goal: Ethical Perspectives (Dr. Montgomery)</b>	<p>At a prior meeting, the sub-committee proposed three criteria for the Ethical Perspectives goal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Foster Integrity and Credibility Individually and Institutionally</li> <li>2) Support Principle-Centered Leadership</li> <li>3) Develop Ethical Perspectives relating to New Technology and Knowledge</li> </ol> <p>The sub-committee repeated their earlier suggestions of “course embedded measures” and standardized tests. An anonymous survey of students was suggested as a direct assessment, especially for information relating to plagiarism.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts said that surveying might also be possible through the NSSE, if adding questions might be allowed.</p>
<b>Goal: Scientific Reasoning (Dr. Lasey)</b>	<p>Dr. Lasey showed the sub-committee a tall stack of scientific reasoning quizzes from Fall 07 Biology labs. The sub-committee agreed that these quizzes – with the exception of a few questions – represented an extremely valid assessment of scientific reasoning. The data still needed to be tabulated and analyzed, but it looked promising.</p> <p>Dr. Lasey planned to continue working with Dr. Limperis to create direct measures for the Math Dept.</p>

<b>Additional Work</b>	The meeting schedule for the Gen Ed sub-committee will be: <b>Early March</b> – Reporting on direct measures and F07 Results <b>Early April</b> – Finalize all direct measures <b>April 21</b> – Dinner with Dept. Heads with emphasis on Gen Ed assessment
<b>Adjournment</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Arkansas Tech University  
 Assessment Committee  
 General Education Sub-Committee  
 October 6, 2008  
 Witherspoon 239-B

The Gen Ed Sub-Committee met in the Witherspoon 239-B on Friday, October 6, 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 attended the first meeting as a guest.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Robin Lasey called the meeting to order at 2 p.m.
<b>Report on Goals</b>	<p><b>Communicate effectively</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Speech communication was Dr. Norton’s task last year. Dr. Carey Roberts reported that data had been collected for Spring08 and tabulated by Robert Haynes, the Assessment Committee’s graduate assistant for Summer08.</li> <li>➤ Written Communication was assessed using the ETS Criterion Service. It was suggested that the administration of this service could be extended to more students if the English Department so desired.</li> <li>➤ If other options for assessing writing are to be implemented, they should be selected with attention to minimizing subjectivity and covering as broad a sample of English Comp classes as possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Think critically / Develop ethical perspectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dr. Roach’s reported on the essay prompts administered in Business courses           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 200 essays for Spring08 and even more for Fall08</li> <li>- Critical thinking essay were taken primarily by Business majors, while the ethics essay were completed by Business, Engineering and some other majors.</li> <li>- These prompts were given in courses at all levels, with the Senior and Sophomore courses having a higher percentage of Business majors.</li> <li>- The essays were graded by faculty and several graduate assistants with no difference in the scores given after training.</li> <li>- RESULT: Clear jumps were observed on the perception of quality writing by graders as writers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

moved up the class levels (even though the class level was hidden from the graders).

- These essays need to be given to a wider cross section, but the problems of source bias damaging validity and the time required to grade essays must be addressed.
- Although he had collected data for Fall07 from measures in the Gen Ed HIST and POLS courses, Dr. Roach had yet to receive results from Spring08.
- Turn-it-in.com was discussed for gathering additional information on plagiarism for the Ethics goal, with the members raising as major obstacles that many faculty don't use the site regularly, dishonest students may not plagiarize if they think faculty will use it (for fear of being caught), and the absence of a University policy for reporting plagiarism.

#### **Apply scientific and quantitative reasoning**

- The scientific reasoning quiz data has been collected for Spring08 from sections of all of the Gen Ed science disciplines, with a much larger number of these classes planning to administer the quiz for Fall08.
- The quantitative reasoning data has been collected for Spring08, but has not been analyzed yet.
  - Administered in College Algebra and College Math with different questions, but linked to similar goals.
  - A larger number of these courses will be using the embedded questions this semester.

#### **Demonstrate knowledge of the arts and humanities**

- Fall07 data was collected, but still waiting on Spring08 data to be turned in.

#### **Understand wellness concepts**

- Data was collected for Fall07 and Spring08 from Wellness and PE courses. Weaknesses were addressed by the faculty and scores are expected to be better this semester. Recreation and Parks results were collected by Dr. Roberts, but have not been analyzed yet.
- In order to maximize the usefulness of the indirect measures being collected for this goal (the health survey, Tech Fit usage, etc.), a higher degree of integration is necessary.

<p><b>New Business</b></p>	<p>Last year, the sub-committee identified specific places in the curriculum in which measures could be embedded to assess Gen Ed. This year, the sub-committee will expand the application of last year's measures, find other direct and indirect measures to support those measures, and address weaknesses in the measures themselves.</p> <p><b>Task 1</b>  For the next meeting, the sub-committee divided up a list of exams to check for applicable Gen Ed information:  Dr. Roach – Business MFAT  Dr. Jenkins – Social Science MFAT  Dr. Lasey – Biology MFAT  Dr. Lasey – NCLEX/TEAS (Nursing)  Dr. Philpotts – Praxis I  Dr. Roberts – Engineering MFAT  Dr. Roberts – Praxis II</p> <p><b>Task 2</b>  Everyone will brainstorm for other places where Gen Ed information could be collected.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Gen Ed Committee may wish to scrap this developing system for Gen Ed assessment.</li> <li>➤ Dr. Roberts warned the subcommittee that it was important that everything collected was pertinent, as gathering too much extraneous information will make it impossible to have time for analysis.</li> <li>➤ The authority behind changes to the Gen Ed curriculum should be the Vice President of Academic Affairs, if any change is to be expected at all.</li> <li>➤ There are no common objectives across Gen Ed courses at ATU, making course-embedded questions difficult to design and systemic change near impossible to effect.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Adjournment</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.</p>

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.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Robin Lasey called the meeting to order at 2 p.m.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	After one phrase was eliminated, Dr. Annette Holeyfield moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Jan Jenkins seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
<b>Gen Ed Committee</b>	<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>
<b>Indirect Measures</b>	<p><b>General Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ In order for a test section to be useful, there must be a specific sub-score.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Biology MFAT</b></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><b>Praxis I</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Communication (essay, English usage)</li> <li>➤ Critical Thinking (essay, reading section)</li> <li>➤ Mathematics (mathematics section)</li> </ul> <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"> <li>➤ Anecdotal evidence suggests that a significant number of college students fail the Praxis I on their first attempt (and some on subsequent attempts).</li> <li>➤ It is a pre-professional skills test <b><u>meant to weed out weaker students.</u></b></li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>SSI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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).</li> <li>➤ Now more specific questions should be added, which could be especially helpful for Ethics and Wellness.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Additional Business</b></p>	<p><b>Ethical Perspectives Assessment</b></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"> <li>➤ Professional Methods/Capstone courses</li> <li>➤ Student Teaching</li> <li>➤ Research Methods courses</li> </ul> <p>Plagiarism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ The Gen Ed Committee could ask Dept. Heads to report on their students’ behavior every semester or</li> </ul>

	<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"><li>➤ If this could be linked to student T-numbers, multiple offenses could be tracked and such students be barred from registration.</li></ul> <p><b>Assignments</b> 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><b>Next Meeting</b> The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, December 1, 2008, at 2pm in Witherspoon 239-B.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

Arkansas Tech University  
 Assessment Committee  
 General Education Sub-Committee  
 December 1, 2008  
 Witherspoon 239-B

The Gen Ed sub-committee met in the Witherspoon 239-B on Monday, December 1, 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. Mr. Jason Brown, Dr. Carey Roberts and Mr. Wyatt Watson attended the meeting as guests.

<p><b>Call To Order</b></p>	<p>Dr. Robin Lasey called the meeting to order at 2 p.m.</p>
<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p>	<p>Dr. Philpotts moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. David Roach seconded. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Dr. Roach noted that he thought that the Business MFAT's "social responsibility and legal" sub-score could be used as an indirect measure for the Ethical Perspectives goal, even if some questions don't apply. He chose not to propose a change to this section of the November minutes, as they reflected the sub-committee's consensus view.</p>
<p><b>Update: Gen Ed Assessment</b></p>	<p><b>Understanding Wellness Concepts</b></p> <p>Dr. Annette Holeyfield reported that the off-campus private gyms Back2Basics and St. Mary's Wellness Fitness Center could and would track student usage for ATU.</p>
<p><b>Official Report for the Gen Ed Sub-Committee</b></p>	<p><b>Purpose of the Report</b></p> <p>The Gen Ed sub-committee was intended to facilitate the creation of a Gen Ed assessment plan by subject-matter faculty. In order to achieve this, the goals were divided among the sub-committee membership, each of whom operated with relative autonomy. This necessary organization – combined with a lack of a central reporting mechanism – has thus far prevented an accurate summary of the assessment plan to be created.</p>

As management of the plan is transitioning to a new committee, it has become imperative to write a comprehensive report. Each member of the sub-committee has been requested to write a report for his or her Gen Ed goal. These reports will be combined by Mr. Jason Brown into a draft final report, which will then be sent to the sub-committee members for approval.

**What should be included or answered in the goal reports:**

- What assessment measures are currently being used? (If possible, please include samples)
- Who was involved in the creation of these measures?
- In which courses are these measures being used? (Identified by semester and course section)
- What results have been produced? (Separated by semester and course section)
- Ideas for future assessment measures? (Standardized tests; changes to the current measures)
- Has anything been done yet as a result of the current Gen Ed assessment plan?
- Is there anything else available that might help make your goal's assessment plan clearer for the reader? (Emails; handouts; a summarizing narrative, etc.)

Each goal report is due by February 1, 2009. Completed reports are to be sent directly to Mr. Brown.

**Reporting Division**

Roach – Thinking Critically

Holeyfield – Understanding Wellness Concepts

Montgomery – Develop Ethical Perspectives

Jenkins – Demonstrate Knowledge of the Arts and Humanities

Lasey – Apply Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Philpotts (with Dr. Hanna Norton) – Communicate Effectively

## **Integration of Gen Ed and Banner**

Mr. Wyatt Watson was asked to attend this meeting to discuss ways in which Banner could be used to support Gen Ed assessment.

Mr. Watson stated that there are two types of data to be entered, and each must be approached separately.

### **1) Standardized Test Scores**

- Institutional Research is in the process of entering Praxis scores into Banner, after which Argos could be used to query that data.
- The difficulty will be in deciding what other tests on campus are needed for Gen Ed assessment, as these are worthless for that purpose until their results are in Banner.
- An additional problem is the responsibility for entering the data. Mr. Watson stated that because of the potential conflict of interest in IR being able to enter data and report on it, this responsibility should go to another office. The topic was discussed, ending in Dr. Lasey being selected to make a general motion at the December 17, 2008, meeting.
- The good news is that it is feasible to put this information into Banner and link it to the students, thus making it possible for weak areas and commonalities to be identified.

### **2) Course-Embedded Questions**

- Mr. Watson stated that it is possible to store information from these questions in Banner, but he asked the sub-committee whether it was feasible. His concern was that the best way to collect this data was to add a Gen Ed grade reporting page to Banner Self-Service, where faculty would be presented a class roster that required five scores to be entered for each student.
- Discussion:
  - Several members echoed earlier concerns that many faculty would have a problem with this, yet there were no staff members who could do it for the faculty.
  - Dr. Holeyfield explained that in her department, faculty already do this by sending to her documents with five scores organized by student T-number. They actually want such a Banner page, claiming that it would make things much easier for them.

<b>Transition to the Gen Ed Committee</b>	<p>After the Faculty Senate tabled discussion of the topic last month, the ad hoc Gen Ed Committee met to modify its charge proposal in order to address the Senate's concerns. Dr. Lasey was confident that the new proposal should pass muster at the next Senate meeting.</p> <p>Dr. Lasey stated that the Gen Ed sub-committee and the ad hoc Committee should have a joint meeting to transition control of Gen Ed assessment officially. The Gen Ed sub-committee comprehensive report will be presented at this meeting.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts and Mr. Brown were charged with setting up this meeting for the second week in February 2009.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.