



Southwestern Oklahoma State University
SWOSU Digital Commons

Assessment Committee Minutes

University Documents

11-7-2001

November 2001

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/assessmentmin>

Recommended Citation

Southwestern Oklahoma State University, "November 2001" (2001). *Assessment Committee Minutes* . 1.
<https://dc.swosu.edu/assessmentmin/1>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the University Documents at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Assessment Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

SOUTHWESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Assessment Committee Meeting

November 7, 2001

3:15 p.m.

Present: C. Foust, Chair; D. Dill, L. Crall, L. Gadberry, R. Al-Jarrah, J. Noble, M. Olson, S. Prince, R. Scott.

Cynthia Foust convened the Assessment Committee meeting in the President's Conference Room at 3:15 p.m. The student representatives were not able to attend and sent their regrets.

The agenda for the meeting contained six items, including:

1. Welcome
2. Review of committee focus / responsibility
3. Review of Computer Placement Testing software—COMPASS
4. Report on a new study to track freshman beginning Fall, 2001
5. Levels of Assessment Implementation review
6. Distribution of the 2000-2001 Assessment Report to regents

1. & 2. Cindy welcomed the new members to the committee, and introduced Jan Noble as the new Director of Assessment. The committee introduced themselves, and reviewed the committee focus from the Faculty Handbook (p. 23). "Recommend policies and procedures for testing and assessment of student academic achievement and student satisfaction."

3. Jan reported on COMPASS. The committee discussed and decided that as part of assessing the University assessment program (*Assessment Plan*, December 1999 Revision, p. 6) we intend to review the ACT COMPASS version of computer placement testing and compare it to Accuplacer, which is currently in use for secondary testing.
 - A. Math and Language Arts faculty will be asked to review the COMPASS English, math, and Reading testing information and make a comparison with Accuplacer for:
 1. Skills
 2. Content
 3. Interpretation of scores
 4. Additional comments that individual departments may have
 - B. Other discussion included:
 1. Cost comparison to Accuplacer. (Software equal in cost)

2. ACT COMPASS may be logical for use since we rely on ACT scores for primary testing as well. Accuplacer is available through ETS, which is in the SAT testing program family.
 3. COMPASS made be more widespread than Accuplacer in the state of Oklahoma. Comparison of scores with other universities may be more sensible.
 4. Shall we make both COMPASS and Accuplacer available?
 5. Other universities may be able to assist with comparison of cut scores, etc.
 6. What are crossover scores between Accuplacer and COMPASS?
 7. May we use one software for one subject (ex. Accuplacer for English) and one for another subject (ex. COMPASS for math) if justified?
 8. Do we need a writing-skills assessment?
 9. Information will be compiled by Jan for Spring 2002 Assessment Committee meeting.
4. Jan also reported on a new study to track Fall 2001 freshman through graduation, transfer to another university, etc. (for up to six years).
- A. General data will include:
 1. SS#
 2. Name
 3. Gender
 4. Race
 5. Non-traditional student ?
 6. ACT subtest scores in English, math, and reading
 7. Remedial courses taken
 - B. Data by semester will include:
 1. Campus (Sayre or Weatherford)
 2. Success of subsequent courses taken after remedial English, math, and reading
 3. Hours enrolled
 4. Major
 5. GPA
 6. Retained at part-time?
 7. Graduated?
 8. Transferred?
 - C. Other discussion:
 1. What courses may be considered as “subsequent courses?”
 - ◆ Example: History courses in the area of reading?
 2. What contact can be made to find out the reason(s) for a student leaving/transferring?
 - a. Personal contact?
 - b. Survey/questionnaire?
5. Review of Levels of Assessment Implementation: Committee considers any assessment as progress: continuing to make progress in implementing assessment campus wide (Level Two). The committee considers Level Three progress demonstrated in above actions such as reviewing CPT software by designated, interested departments that we are assessing our assessment process. Additionally

some departments are at Level Three in continuous improvement of student and program assessment.

6. The 2000-2001 Assessment Report was distributed to committee members.
7. Agenda item added by Dr. Dill: Ideas for the enhancement of student retention—the following points were offered and with a lively discussion by committee.
 - A. Personal contact, including praising students and directing them toward Student Development Services, tutorial services, toward a different major when appropriate, etc. (Emphasis: be caring and helpful.)
 - B. Make software available to assess students learning skills.
 - C. Make a more thorough program available that addresses note-taking and study skills. (This is addressed in the Freshman Orientation class on a limited basis. Possibly a choice of a two-hour credit Freshman Orientation class could be made available, which emphasizes learning skills.)
 - D. Encourage student involvement with the writing lab.
 - E. Make available periodic subject seminars to enhance subject understanding.
 - F. When students are flagged (by ACT scores, etc.) for possible college career difficulty, strongly encourage them to complete a course on learning skills either the summer before their freshman year or during their freshman year.
 - G. The administrative and faculty commitment to student retention was emphasized.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.