

Minutes of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Meeting
Assessment and Evaluation Committee
Thursday April 4, 2012
11:00 a.m. – Noon

Members Present

Dr. Calvin Brown
Dr. Osman Bannaga
Mr. Gary Bourgeois
Mrs. Manisha Mishra
Mrs. Genesis Player
Dr. Patricia Wilson

Dr. Brown called the meeting to order. Members present went through the minutes from the previous meeting. Mrs. Player made a motion to accept the minutes and Dr. Bannaga seconded it.

Dr. Brown discussed the Assessment Tracking and Retention draft. He also discussed the assessment and evaluation of the SLOs (draft).

He discussed about Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) Critical thinking Test instead of Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). The members present agreed to remove CLA and incorporate CAAP since it will be cost effective and more appropriate for our needs.

Mrs. Player said that the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) cost would be shared between QEP and First Year Enrichment since the cost has to be built into the budget.

The cost and assessments were discussed at length.

Course Matrix talks about a book report which will be common across the curriculum which will be assessed by a common rubric.

Metacognitive Awareness Reading Strategies Inventory (MARS) is a survey and we will get permission to use it, and no cost might be associated with it. Dr. Brown said he will know more after he speaks to them directly. We will be using the 1.0 version.

Dr. Wilson said that North-Western refers to the 2.0 version of MARS. All present felt that 1.0 version was more appropriate with our needs.

Mrs. Player said that if no cost is associated with MARS, we will have to specifically mention it in the narrative.

Dr. Brown said that a research paper should also be added as an assignment to assess critical thinking.

He also wanted us to clarify whether we wanted web based or paper based surveys.

Members wanted to know how the surveys would be scored. Dr. Brown clarified that Learning and Study Strategies (LASSI) and MARSI were self-scoring.

While discussing the narrative, Dr. Brown said that he looked at all the right segments that are required to be in it and tried to match it to them. Once he completes the product, all the members can tweak it.

Mrs. Player said she will have a working document for the consultant at the end of the week.

Dr. Brown handed over the five-year plan draft. He wanted everyone to look over this and make changes if required. He said it is almost identical every year other than the assessment factor.

Dr. Brown said that he wanted us to look at whether the students will feel like they are being over-tested because of the numerous pre- and post-tests we are suggesting.

Mrs. Player said that though pre- and post-tests are important, the overall change is most important. The rubrics are going to be very important.

The members said that they will look at the five year plan in detail and get back with corrections if necessary.

Dr. Brown said that the tools for assessing reading comprehension were derived from the questions in NSSE and FSSE.

Mrs. Player said that 2012-2013 is the pilot for our QEP. QEP actually begins from 2013 and lasts till 2018.

Dr. Brown discussed the Assessment Methods/Analysis and Evaluation. The assessment methods are tied to the SLOs. He said that if anyone has anything to add/delete/change, they can provide him the feedback. He also said that we need to identify course embedded assessment and rubrics. We should have two standardized and two course embedded assessments.

The Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) test was shared by Mrs. Mishra.

Dr. Wilson said that this could be a good addition to our course embedded assessment.

This test would be added onto the assessments. We can use this for reading comprehension and critical thinking. This assessment would be used in the remedial courses only.

Several rubrics were then discussed to show the impact on reading through metacognition.

Mrs. Player said that we need to allow the faculty to be involved in developing the rubrics. She mentioned that faculty involvement is very essential. They have been involved in selecting the topic and now should be involved in implementation of the topic.

Faculty outcome is part of the institutional outcome.

The meeting was then adjourned.