The meeting began at 4:08 PM. Present were Frank Steck, Shane Drefcinski, David Kraemer, David Krugler, Scott White, Kevin Haertzen, Steve Kleisath, David Van Buren and Deborah Gillespie. Also present was Carmen Faymonville.

Carmen Faymonville, chair of the Department of Humanities, gave a report on the English Placement Exam. Faymonville believes we need a tool to place students into the appropriate class but our placement test is not a useful or effective tool. The examination’s objective questions are written to test students on their knowledge of grammar but often serves only to trick students. She feels the goal of the exam is to derive a statistical profile of students and not to place them into the appropriate course. The exam may be taken online without a proctor. She is very concerned that students can easily cheat. Tim Zauche also noted his concern with online placement tests and offered to write a letter to the chancellor expressing the committee’s concerns. The committee discussed the issue and the consensus was to send a letter of support.

The SAT and ACT tests, taken in conjunction with the writing sample, may make a satisfactory placement tool to use instead of the placement exam. The university would need to study the issue to verify the validity of the SAT and ACT tests as placement tools. Frank Steck suggested that the university examine current students and statistically compare their English Placement Exam results with their scores on the verbal portion of the ACT in order to derive a baseline score. This could be used to help decide on an appropriate score to use for placing students into the remedial course or English 1130.

The committee next discussed its role in the assessment of general education. We discussed the questions we should ask programs concerning their general education offerings. After a long discussion on assessment, we agreed to adopt modified versions of the Assessment Oversight Committee assessment questions. The questions are:

1. What evidence do you have that students achieve your stated general education learning outcomes?
2. What have you learned as a result of the assessment process?
3. What changes, including changes to the learning outcomes themselves, will you make to improve student learning?

The committee agreed to meet again on May 10 to receive a report from Shane Drefcinski.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.
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