Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee
Minutes

Committee/Meeting Name	Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee

Date	11/28/2011	Starting Time	3:30p	Ending Time	4:45p
Location	Library 113			Recorder	Jeremy Mares

Members Present	Kristin McDonald-Willey, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Jeremy Mares, Mark Rowh, Lynae Jacob, Danita McAnally, Michael Kopenits, Aimee Martin, Carol Summers, Denise Hirsch, John Robertson, Monique Dupuis, Shawn Fouts
Guests	
Absent	Deborah Harding, Frank Sobey, Richard Whitaker, Russell Lowery-Hart,

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
I. Approval of Oct 24 Minutes	Motion to Approve – Monique 2nd - Lynae	Correct 10/24 Minutes: Carol Summers was not in attendance, "21st cent(ury) skills" on page 2.
II. Spring 2012 Faculty Schedules	Open discussion amongst all about best time to organize the committee meetings for next semester.	Tentatively set to have the meetings for next semester to be on Thursday, after 2p
III. Personal Responsibility and Social Responsibility Rubric Discussion	Kristin – The THECB gives competency statements that must be followed. AC can customize its' own operational definition. Working in groups should help us hone in on a solid operational definition. Lynae – Can the target student be defined by 24 hours taken instead of 30? Danita – It could be changed in the spring for moving forward, but since the previous artifacts are captured with the 30 hour requirement, we need to stay consistent. Kara – Discussions were held about dropping the requirement to 27, but there wasn't a significant change in the number of artifact submissions. Shawn – I agree with a 24 hour adjustment.	Spring – Discuss the possibility of lowering the hour requirement to 24 instead of 30 hours

Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	Kristin – We may not be able to use the teamwork assessment rubric immediately because quality artifacts are slow to come in. John – Can we consider attendance in community endeavors such as student senate as social responsibility? Danita – There is a difference between direct and indirect assessment. We need to show a change in ability or if an ability has been be acquired and not a simple count of students who show up to a function. Kristin – According to the CSSSE data, AC is comparable to other institutions with institutional involvement, but that being said, it still isn't good. Kara – (Speaking for her own part-time teaching) My classes aren't providing assignments that are geared towards personal/social responsibility in a way that would create assessable artifacts. Danita – With the embedded method, we do not tell teachers what to teach, but we may need to explain to faculty that for assessment we need some tangible proof of a student's proficiency in a given competency. It (the assessment process) can evolve as needed, but we couldn't/shouldn't force that upon faculty. It is an embedded assessment model and the assessment process shouldn't have visibility to the student. Kristin – Faculty is often taxed with their course load and going one extra step can be difficult. For example, we	

	Topics	Discussion, Information Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
		know teamwork occurs, but few assignments for teamwork are coming in. We will have to make some allowances to get enough artifacts. For example, the 30-hour rule is somewhat flexible because we do accept group assignments assuming at least one of the group members satisfied the 30 hour requirement. Kara – Where are other schools in the process? Danita – Few school have made it this far with personal/social responsibility. Shawn – What if we follow the example set by Bruce Moseley – using student labor as a way to aid non-profits in Pro Bono work in the real world? I.E. Website construction/maintenance. Danita – (Expressed that she thought Shawn's idea was good and asked everyone to break into their groups so they would have time to work)	
IV.	**Personal Responsibility and Social Responsibility Rubric Development**	Split into 2 groups: Social Responsibility – John, Michael, Shawn, Carol Personal Responsibility – Mark, Lynae, Aimee, Denise, Monique	Social Responsibility – John will work on finishing up the rubric and will send it to group members before the end of the semester Personal Responsibility – Aimee gave the group notes to Kristin who will compile them and distribute them to group members by the end of the semester.
V.	**Other**	Not Applicable	
VI.	**Next Meeting: 01/23/2011**	Tentative time set for after 2p.m.	**NOTES: COMMITTEE DID NOT MEET AT THIS TIME – POSTPONED PER DR. LOWERY-HART REQUEST AND LEAP POSSIBILITIES**