Summary: Academic Assessment Committee 2015-2016

Current members: Sy Banerjee (chair), Roy Barnes, Linda Knecht, Susan Talley, Mark Allison, Lyndsae Raleigh, Marsha Lesley

In the academic year 2015 Fall- 2016 Winter, the committee identified three areas which needed focused attention. One, regular ongoing review and feedback on assessment plans, new program reviews and implementation reports. Two, despite the volume of business being handled by the committee, there seemed to be gaps in the participation of different departments on campus. The group acknowledged the importance of identifying departments that are irregular in submitting reports or are non-participants in the assessment process. Three: given the large amounts of data produced in the reports and plans, the group considered it important to create an automated process by which information can be categorized, extracted and stored in tables and formats that makes it easy to summarize and synthesize the history of specific departments, programs, and their progress in academic assessment. To accomplish the above, and optimize time and effort for the different activities, the AAC did the following:

a. Instead of inviting department chairs to the AAC meetings to review their program documents, departments and areas were invited to email their assessment plans and implementation reports to the committee, so that the AAC could review and provide feedback. If a particular department wanted to meet with the committee, they could request an in-person meeting. Education requested an in-person meet for their Early Childhood Major Proposal.

b. Instead of doing an assessment conference in March, AAC conducted workshops in November 2015. The workshops invited different departments and explained to them the purpose of assessment and discussed how they could apply best practices towards design and development of learning experiences via programs. Though the primary goal was to reach out to and engage departments who do not regularly participate in assessment activity, majority of the participants turned out to be from the regular participating departments.

c. Several discussions were held on how to compile and make sense of the data generated by the plans and reports. TK-20 appeared to be useful, but presented difficulty and lack of flexibility to users who wanted to present information differently. The committee agreed that Microsoft word and excel remained the easiest and most flexible tools to record and structure the data. The committee also explored alternative soft wares for handling textual and tabular data.

Following are the list of departments who’s plans and reports were reviewed by the committee:

- BSN – Assessment plan
- Computer science assessment plans
- Energy and Sustainable Systems (ESS)
- BSN- Implementation report
- Computer information systems assessment plans
- Chemistry and Biochemistry –
- Clinical Laboratory Science program implementation report
- CSE, Engineering Program
- English (BA – 4 program majors and MA) –
- DNP reports
- Economics
- MS in Computer Science & Information Systems –
- MSN reports
- Education –
- Communication -
- Computer information systems implementation report
- Theatre & Dance -
- Earth and Resource Science; Environmental Science and Planning (ESP);