

## Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Committee/Meeting Name	Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee				
Date	04/26/2012	Starting Time	2:30p	Ending Time	4:25p
Location	Library 113			Recorder	Jeremy Mares
Members Present	Kristin McDonald-Willey, Jeremy Mares, Mark Rowh, Michael Kopenits, Carol Summers, John Robertson, Aimee Martin, Denise Hirsch, Deborah Harding, Monique Dupuis				
Guests					
Absent	Russell Lowery-Hart, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Danita McAnally, Frank Sobey, Shawn Fouts, Richard Whitaker, Lynae Jacob				

Topics	Discussion, Information, Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
<b>I. Approval of March 22, 2012 Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin presents – Please review the minutes from last month.</li> <li>• John - motions</li> <li>• Mark - seconds</li> </ul>	
<b>II. Reminder: Planning and Advancement relocation to West Campus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin – Reminder, we are moving to West Campus, Building A.</li> </ul>	
<b>III. Committee Rotations</b>	<p><b>Kristin Presents: –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As we look at the rotations, it is evident that it is time to allow Mark to move on. Mark will be the president of the Faculty Senate and the senate will actually be making recommendations for filling vacancies on this committee. For those of you set to rotate off, we don't want to guilt anyone into staying, but if you would like to lengthen your term, please let me know.</li> <li>• We have general education competency committee vacancies as well so if you know anyone that would be a good candidate to serve, please encourage them to pursue these vacancies. The one requirement is we need at least one person from health sciences on this committee; all the other areas are covered.</li> </ul>	Dean's Council will send volunteers and recommendations.

## Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information, Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
<b>IV. Quick Update on SACS Discussion; Chats and Stats</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin – The turnout for the Chats and Stats was very good. Recurring themes: west campus wants to be involved in surveys. East campus wants more program-centered information.</li> <li>• Mark – We have obtained employer and employee surveys. Jeremy is placing the surveys in class climate and he can send everything out and then the IR office can do data assessments.</li> <li>• Kristin – On the graduating student survey, we are also looking at adding “What is your program?” to the existing survey that students take when they apply for graduation. We have found that many people aren’t using the institutional data for a variety of reasons (e.g. the data doesn’t seem to apply to their program, they didn’t know it was there, etc...). Our goal based off this questionnaire is to provide more meaningful information to each program/area.</li> </ul>	<p>Chats and Stats information will be compiled into a report.</p>
<b>V. Finalize Rubrics: Personal and Social Responsibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin - Please look over the rubrics to see if there is anything that we need change or if we should move to approve them.</li> <li>• Mark – Did we decide to combine personal and social responsibility?</li> <li>• Kristin – We discussed it, but decided to leave it as is. <b>(Discussion of Personal Responsibility Rubric)</b></li> <li>• Deborah – So this is essentially “ethics.”</li> <li>• Aimee – Look at the differences between the 3,4, and 5 point responses. The 4 point responses don’t make reference to theoretical scenarios. It should be in 4 and 5, but not in 3.</li> <li>• Deborah – How exactly are they different?</li> <li>• Aimee – If they are asked to be theoretical in 3 and 5, they should also be asked that in 4.</li> <li>• John – The issue is around the “accurately identifying...” phrasing</li> <li>• Kristin – A rate of 5 needs to be the best of the best.</li> <li>• Monique – 5 should be “complex”.</li> <li>• Aimee – We are being too wordy in the definitions.</li> <li>• Michael – (Motions to approve personal responsibility rubric; John seconds.)</li> </ul>	<p>Using the word scenarios should be included in all 5 definitions. 5 point should equate to complex dilemmas.</p>

## Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information, Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	<p><b>(Discussion of Social Responsibility Rubric)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question/Discussion: Keep ecology in the rubric?</li> <li>• Kristin – In the last meeting, it was decided that “ecology” would stay to diversify the rubric.</li> <li>• Aimee – The descriptions for where we get artifacts in social responsibility are good and I think we should generalize the personal responsibility rubric the same way. It would aid in consistency.</li> <li>• Deborah – Where could we find good artifacts?</li> <li>• Kristin – This competency is much more easily geared toward 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> year students so it will be challenging.</li> <li>• Deborah – There are lots of good ideas out there, but I don’t have good artifacts to provide. There are many barriers to getting these. What would a good artifact look like that would accomplish these tasks?</li> <li>• John – In economics, you could comment on the federal tax system and use reasoning to defend your position.</li> <li>• Aimee – I have found a few typos and corrections; I will write them on my copy and get the changes made. These are small, nitpicky grammatical issues.</li> <li>• Aimee – (Motion to approve with changes noted)</li> <li>• Deborah – (Seconds motion)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>VI. Update on Teamwork Artifact Testing</b></p>	<p><b>Kristin Presents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin – This year we came up a little short of our target of 100 teamwork artifacts. As a result, the committee assessed a small sample of artifacts that they will re-assess next year to test inter-rater reliability for artifacts that have already been assessed; they will also assess the rest of the teamwork artifacts we received. It will be up to our discretion to just go with what we have collected for teamwork or to attempt to collect the additionally needed artifacts to reach 100 early in the year and dip into next year’s collection. For next year, we will also either need to assess the personal responsibility and social responsibility artifacts based on what we have received or we will need to go a little behind schedule by</li> </ul>	<p>Plan to distribute new, updated Team Member Critique sheet next year.</p>

## Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information, Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	<p>likewise using artifacts collected during 2012-13 for that same year's assessment purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For testing, I looked through the teamwork artifacts and there are 3 kinds – Some are forms filled out by students regarding percentile participation/grading one another, some are on a learning log where students reflect which students will accomplish which tasks and how the students did at accomplishing each task, and then we have the team member critique sheet.</li> <li>• Based on the test, the committee suggested making a few changes to the form to better accomplish the following directives: 1. Get people to justify the scores they give 2. Encourage people to grade themselves.</li> </ul> <p>Result - The amended form is suggested and could use a pilot if you all are willing to use it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimee – (Motion to approve)</li> <li>• Michael – (Second motion)</li> </ul>	
<b>VII. PET Training Discussions</b>	<p><b>Kristin Presents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes were made to the no excuses portion.</li> <li>• If anything needs to be clarified, let me know... (presentation ensues)</li> <li>• The PowerPoint could replace the submission guidelines because it essentially walks a person through the process.</li> <li>• When it comes to simplification – we just use the word “outcome” for everything that we do. The Non-instructional committee suggested that we change “PET” to “assessment plan”.</li> <li>• Requirements – we need outcomes that are direct to prove learning, but they still need to progress through courses and be successful.</li> <li>• When looking at results, we want to have a few years of data so there is some historical record instead of looking back at past PET forms. It also prompts the writer for a better analysis.</li> <li>• The Non-Instructional assessment committee suggested providing examples of budgetary comments that express various levels of detail, that way there are some samples to work from to encourage appropriate, quality responses.</li> </ul>	<p>NEXT YEAR – Have individual PET training sessions by area. The people in attendance can tweak PET forms right then.</p>

## Instructional Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Topics	Discussion, Information, Presenter:	Action to be Taken, Decision, Recommendation, Timeline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John – You could use those comments to provide information on budget concerns that are not part of the current budget...</li> <li>• Deborah – You might want to delineate if something can be added to the current budget or if needed to be added to future budgets.</li> <li>• Kristin –We need to find success stories that providing budget ties could bring forward change. This way it would encourage thoughtful analysis.</li> <li>• Deborah – (Suggests having table discussions with each PET form “personal responsible”)</li> <li>• Monique – We need to have something in front of us to engage in, to hold our interest, otherwise people could be likely to zone out and not pay attention.</li> <li>• Deborah – Having some exercise would be valuable to engage in. It could help snowball ideas through dialogue. Education should be buying into this process, it is vital for many different professions, but educators have been resistant.</li> <li>• Kristin – I think that having a CTL facilitated workshop would really help us get a PET training tailored to each division. Right now is a great time to bring these changes to the institution.</li> </ul>	
<b>VIII. Other</b>	Goodbye to the following committee members who are rotating out: Mark, Aimee, Denise, Richard, and John.	Planning and Advancement will send letter confirmation of time served.
<b>IX. Next Meeting: TBA (will reconvene next semester)</b>		