

**Instructional Assessments Sub-Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**October 13, 2006**

**Attending:** Mark Usnick, Joe Gandy, Delton Moore, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Mark Rowh, Jill Gibson, Susan Burgoon, Sheryl Mueller, Danita McAnally, Ann Hamblin, Dan Ferguson, and Paul Matney.

**Absent:** Jim Powell, Damaris Schlong, Wendy Poling.

**Introduction of Director of Outcomes Assessments – Kara Larkan-Skinner**

Paul Matney welcomed Kara to Amarillo College and deferred to Danita McAnally to tell us about what Kara will be doing. Danita noted Kara's assignment will be anything that includes outcomes. Danita noted that Kara has the background and abilities for outcomes assessments.

**Approval of Discussion note from August 14, 2006**

No corrections or additions noted. Motion made by Mark Rowh to approve the minutes, seconded by Susan Burgoon motion carried.

**Reports on Progress of each Competency Committees**

A suggestion was made by Danita that the sub-committee should decide the number scale to be use as a standard for each committee. Kara suggested that we let each committee set the standard for each area.

Joe Gandy reported on Mathematics Skills. Joe reported his committee met and agreed on their general education competencies; they modeled their report after the Johnson County Community College report. Upon completion of a minimum of 30 hours taken at AC a student should be able to demonstrate the successful application of higher order analytical and creative cognitive processes. It was agreed that the Mathematics Competency Committee lacked a rubric.

Susan Burgoon reported for Application of Critical Thinking Skills. Using the rubric, these areas will use 3 & 4 as positives for specific disciplines. After much discussion on the number scale, Susan noted her committee may need to revise or make changes. She asked for sample artifacts. She does not have actual student artifacts.

Dan Ferguson reported on Communication Skills. Dan noted that his committee met and they feel they are set – they have their definitions and the scale. They have their standard and description of assignments. They will evaluate writing and speech and a total of 50 artifacts will be assessed for the two areas per semester. Jill noted that oral communication may be difficult to assess since the College no longer records speeches or presentations in classes. This is due to a lack of portable video cameras. The committee proposes to purchase equipment to record to a hard-drive, take to a computer and share or burn to a DVD. If done

by the faculty they would be the ones to let us know the students to be flagged. We will not be doing the student assessment. Paul noted at the present time we have two writing labs but no speech labs. Danita asked the committee how they wanted to get the artifacts. Delton asked are we going to get random sampling. Danita replied we are going to get random sampling, but we will look at the total and review the sampling. Jill noted it would be ideal to video a whole class of student speeches with the purpose of seeing themselves. We need more video instruction. Paul feels that every speech student needs to be seeing themselves as a learning process. Danita thinks we need to quit thinking traditional classes and think about all delivery approaches and all disciplines.

Jill Gibson reported on Aesthetic Awareness. Jill noted that the rubric for assessing Aesthetic Awareness had the points in reverse order. Best should be 3 and not 1. Benchmark is that 70% or more would meet expectations. This assessment of Aesthetic Awareness will be based on writing assignments.

Mark Usnick reported on Technological Literacy. He reported that his team met to discuss the operational definition. They decided all was technology would be computer literacy because they felt computers are the basis for all technology. Computers allowed them to get more specific in the rubric. Danita thinks at a later date that this Committee should come back and discuss whether technology literacy versus computer literacy should be the title of this competency.

Jim Powell was absent and did not give his presentation.

### **Practice Artifacts for this Fall and Collection of Artifacts for Spring for each Competency Committee.**

Danita discussed the artifact collection process. It was agreed that the General Education Competency Committees should collect the practice artifacts and assignments from within their own classes. No need to do fifty – do as many as needed for the committee to be assured that the rubric works as intended. By the end of this semester, each committee will have practice with the artifacts supplied by the committee members. She recommended that each committee member supply one or two artifacts from existing assignments within the committee members' classes and reminded the committee members that they are just testing out the rubric. The intended time line will be by the end of the fall semester.

The committee discussed approaches for having faculty supply assignments to Kara for potential assessment. After faculty supply the assignments which fit per general education competency, Kara will review and determine which students have the met the 30 hour minimum requirement. It was assumed that artifacts could be collected from fall courses. By January, Kara will have the name and course identifiers removed and will supply artifacts to the competency

committees. These competency committees will assess the supplied 50 artifacts and complete all assessments by the second week in May.

The Committee discussed how to get the appeal for assignments and artifacts to the faculty and a draft of an all faculty email was reviewed. Paul reminded the Committee that we do not want a faculty member to feel that they are not required but that it is volunteer basis. Jill feels that they will not send a report that would make them look bad. Danita reminded the Committee that assignments and artifacts need to be from across the institution rather than just one discipline area. Ann Hamblin noted the memo should be stated in a way that it is a volunteer basis. She suggested that the appeal reference the Dr. Jeff Seybert's visit and the training on this Institutional Portfolio Model for General Education Assessment. Susan suggested we attach a sample assignment and rubric. Ann suggested that memo indicate that we desire to capture what it is that we do well at AC for students.

### **PET form training and Assessment of Outcomes by Discipline**

Danita suggested the Committee develop training sessions for PET forms by December. Paul will talk with the division chairs. Disciplines which have a primary focus of offering a major are scheduled to be trained this fall. Ten training sessions will be necessary to accommodate these disciplines. Danita and Kara have developed a basic PowerPoint presentation for these training sessions. The training sessions will walk participants through the process of writing outcomes using the A-B-C-D-E method and result in completed PET forms. Paul suggested we get the committee to commit on the concept then set up the dates.

Susan suggested we set up a shell online WebCT course for instruction on PET forms. Danita feels talking is the best way to brainstorm with a majority of each department's faculty and staff present. Paul will have Danita come to the Vice-President's Council meeting to discuss how many departments will be able to schedule the training sessions this fall. It was discussed whether Committee members would be involved in the training sessions. Danita and Kara will facilitate the process. Paul we will proceed and ask for volunteer departments.

### **Assessment Training**

Kara will attend the IUPUI Assessment Conference on October 29-31, 2006. Texas A&M University is hosting an assessment conference on February 22-23, 2007.

### **Next Meeting**

Next meeting – tentatively set for November 17<sup>th</sup> 1:30 p.m. unless something comes up and it requires postponing until January 2007.

### **Adjournment**

Adjourned at 3:40 p.m.