

Minutes

Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning

10/21/2016

9:30 a.m.

B108

Committee Members Present: Ginger Berry, Deanita Hicks, Ron Hutto, Tonya Pankey, Robin Singleton (Committee Chair), Gary Yarbrough

Ex-Officio Members Present: June Walters, Deborah Parker

Committee Members Absent: Gene Bennett, Brenda Holifield, Rob Semmel, Stacey Walker

Agenda Item 1: Approval of 10/4/16 Minutes

The meeting was called to order by the Committee Chair and the minutes of the October 4, 2016 meeting were offered for approval. A motion was made by Gary Yarbrough to approve the minutes. Ron Hutto seconded the motion and the motion carried. The minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item 2: Review of ILO Rubrics

Five subcommittees were appointed during the last CASL meeting, one for each of the five institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). These subcommittees included one CASL member and three faculty members. Each of the subcommittees was assigned an ILO and was tasked with developing a rubric to be used in assessing the ILO. The subcommittees were instructed to choose an existing VALUE rubric or a combination of VALUE rubrics to use as a starting point in the development of their assigned rubrics and to adapt the rubric as needed so that they could be used in assessing the College's ILOs.

Each of the rubrics were presented to the committee. The first rubric to be presented was the Information Literacy rubric. The subcommittee chose to use the Information Literacy VALUE rubric, with no changes. It was noted that, while the rubric most likely covered all of the items that needed to be covered, the language difference between the rubric and the ILO with its delineating bullet points may cause confusion when trying to apply the rubric. The committee recommended that the Information Literacy subcommittee incorporate the ILO language into the criteria of the rubric.

Next, Gary Yarbrough presented the rubric for Diversity Awareness. This subcommittee chose to begin with the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric and adapted it to align with the College's Diversity Awareness ILO, including changing the criteria to match the language of the bullets of the ILO. The subcommittee kept the definition for intercultural knowledge and competence as the definition of diversity awareness and used the glossary of the VALUE rubric with slight changes. Additionally, the subcommittee found that the "*Framing Language*" section of the VALUE rubric could be eliminated. A motion was made by Deanita Hicks to approve the Diversity Awareness rubric. Ron Hutto seconded the motion and the motion carried. The Diversity Awareness rubric was approved.

Ginger Berry presented the rubric for Quantitative Reasoning. This subcommittee considered the Quantitative Literacy and Problem Solving VALUE rubrics and decided to use the Problem Solving rubric as their starting point in developing the rubric for the College's ILO. The group believed that it was more

Minutes

versatile than the Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric, which appeared to fit more with just math. Changes in the language of the performance standards of the Problem Solving VALUE rubric were made in order to make them easier to understand. As with the Information Literacy rubric, the CASL members recommended that the criteria for the rubric include more of the language included in the College's ILO. It was also noted that parts of the ILO bullets could be separated in the criteria, if needed for clarification.

Next, the rubric for Critical Thinking was presented by Tonya Pankey. The subcommittee considered the Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Inquiry and Analysis VALUE rubrics to determine which one was best to use as a starting point for developing the College's Critical Thinking rubric. The group chose the Critical Thinking VALUE rubric as their starting point, changed the definition of critical thinking that was included in the rubric, added a criterion from the Inquiry and Analysis VALUE rubric, and made minor changes in the wording of the performance standards. This subcommittee found the "*Framing Language*" section to be useful and would prefer to keep it. CASL members recommended that the ILO language be included in the criteria and made suggestions as to how the two bullet points in the College's ILO could easily be separated into four criteria.

The Communication Fluency rubric was presented by Ron Hutto. This subcommittee began with the Written Communication and Oral Communication VALUE rubrics and combined them into one rubric to try to capture any style of communication that might be done in any class. A description of the modifications was given and possible additional changes were discussed. This subcommittee also found the "*Framing Language*" to be useful.

A meeting was set for Friday, October 28 at 10:00 to review the second drafts of the rubrics.

It was stated that as the rubrics are used, deficiencies in the rubrics and/or the clarifying bullets of the ILOs may surface. Norming sessions with faculty were discussed as a way to identify needed adjustments. As deficiencies and needed changes are discovered, updates to the rubrics and ILO descriptive bullets will be considered.

Agenda Item 3: Other Business

On behalf of some faculty members, Gary Yarbrough asked about using objective assignments, such as multiple choice tests, to gather data for institutional learning outcomes assessment. This is an important question in light of the fact that many instructors give multiple choice tests. Gary discussed how data gathered on these tests could be mapped back to a rubric. While it was agreed that much thought would have to be given to the design of the multiple choice tests and the linkages to the rubric, the committee is willing to consider multiple choice tests as a viable option to assess ILOs if it is determined that they contribute positively to the process.

The Committee Chair distributed a list of courses that are scheduled to be assessed in Phase 1 of Cycle 1.

A motion to adjourn was made by Ginger Berry and seconded by Ron Hutto. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m.