

Assessment and Planning Committee  
College of Arts and Sciences  
ULM  
Minutes  
March 29, 2007

**Members Present:**

Dr. Dale Magoun, Chair  
Dr. Harold Williamson  
Dr. Anita Sharma  
Dr. Sharon Cruse  
Dr. Terry Jones  
Dr. Charles Holloway  
Dr. Donna A. Rhorer, Secretary

**Members Absent:**

Dr. Pat Hebert  
Dr. Charles Holloway  
Ms. Joni Noble

**Guests:**

Dr. David Hare, Math & Physics  
Trevor Melder, Math & Physics  
Dr. H. O'Neil Brotherton, Chemistry  
Gary Ratcliff, Art  
Dr. Jason Clark, Art  
Judy Bennet, English  
Allison Loftin, Assessment  
Kelli Cole, Assessment

Dr. Magoun opened the meeting and recognized our guests. He noted they were with us to discuss General Education assessment. In particular, we were to decide on the percentage of students we should expect to perform adequately on the assessment instrument used. The controlling statement follows:

\_\_\_\_\_ % of students will score \_\_\_\_\_ or better on the measure

The committee discussed whether or not to standardize the percentage of success for General Education. The committee could recommend this since most disciplines in General Education are in this college. The committee considered the possible range to be 70 to 75 percent and suggested 75% might be the best choice.

Robin Logan will provide information on how many students are in each course.

Next, the committee discussed General Education requirements for Natural/Physical Science. The committee suggested they use a certain number. In Physics 201, for example, 75% is the first number, and it is set; however, the second number is changeable. The department can still change numbers later.

SACS' focus is on the process and they want to know if we are using the results we get. After this semester, we will assess the system, and it is possible we could go to 79%.

Discussion continued:

1. A clear plan should be established by April 5, 2007.
2. The data should be in by May 30, 2007.
3. Instructors do not have to count the question used in assessment toward the course grade; however, they can if they like.
4. SACS will want to see any assessment measure.
5. Regarding essays and oral projects, each sample should have been scored by a person other than the instructor so as to pose no problem with subjectivity.
6. Chemistry 101  
75% of students will score \_\_\_\_\_ on the embedded (specified) questions on the exam. The instructor should use just the questions that apply.
7. Dr. Jones inquired as to how a random sampling of students' answers would be selected.
8. The suggestion was made to attach the General Education questions to each test in a multi-section course. Mr. Ratcliff noted that when sampling majors the process is entirely different.
9. In English, if 75% with a 5% margin of error were assessed then we are talking about testing 1356 students. From that group, 242 students would be assessed.
10. It was also noted that the average section size in English is 25. Therefore, approximately 10 sections of English will be assessed this spring including perhaps two 101 sections, seven 102 sections, and one 103 section. From these sections, papers to be assessed will be randomly selected. Originally, the plan was to have each student submit two essays, but the plan has been revised and will now require each student to submit one essay.

Next, the discussion turned to how to randomize sections for assessment purposes. The following points were noted:

1. English sections will have a starting section, and then count from there to select essays to be scored.
2. If a course is on rotation, that course will be assessed in Fall 2007.
3. If the course is taught once, we'll have to assess it.

Gary Ratcliff presented Art's General Education plans to Allison Loftin. Art will continue to meet and work with Ms. Loftin to develop its plans.

The committee then discussed how the measures were to be graded. Ms. Loftin noted that perhaps department heads can assist their evaluators in encouraging faculty to participate. She added that she will ask for funds to compensate graders, but added that she has no idea if money is available. Dr. Rhorer suggested that the essays from English could be read holistically and graded with a rubric of 1 to 4 questions. Grading this way might speed up the process.

Dr. Magoun and Dr. Hare will randomize the sections to be scored.

When doing departmental assessment, a department will probably have to sample all its majors. The range resulting might be great, and that is fine.

Dr. Creekmore's role in the process was clarified. It was noted that originally two jobs were one. He is in charge of the contact with SACS, and as such, is in charge of the compliance document, which is a huge document. The other job is to develop the QEP (Quality Enhancement Project). Here the campus and the community come together in a project to enhance student learning. The university will implement the plan for five years, and Dr. Creekmore will handle some yearly reports. The Office of Assessment will handle student learning assessment, general education, program assessment, strategic plans, and assessment of non-academic units (support units).

The Assessment and Planning Committee of Arts and Sciences is the only such committee on campus. The College of Business has one point person, and Pharmacy and Health Sciences have external accreditation agencies, which assess them.

Dale will run the numbers, and give these to the General Education representatives. A 5% margin of error will be used.

Meeting adjourned: 4:30

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna A. Rhorer, Secretary

Addition to Minutes of January 25, 2007:

**Member Present:**

Dr. Anita Sharma