Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning
10/4/2016
2:00 p.m.
B108

Committee Members Present: Ginger Berry, Deanita Hicks, Ron Hutto, Rob Semmel, Robin Singleton (Committee Chair), Stacey Walker, Gary Yarbrough
Ex-Officio Members Present: Deborah Parker
Committee Members Absent: Gene Bennett, Brenda Holifield, Tonya Pankey
Ex-Officio Members Absent: June Walters

Agenda Item 1: Approval of 9/9/16 Minutes
The meeting was called to order by the Committee Chair and the minutes of the September 9, 2016 minutes were presented for approval. A motion was made by Ron Hutto to approve the minutes. Gary Yarbrough seconded the motion and the motion carried. The minutes were approved as presented.

Agenda Item 2: Fall 2016 Assessment Expectations
Deborah Parker proposed a sampling scheme to be used for all key performance indicator (KPI) data collection in the assessment process. The sampling structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total enrollment in all sections per semester</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 students or less</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 19 students</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more students</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that this is a minimum number that must be collected, but that an instructor could collect more if he/she wants to do so. However, for any number less than 100% of enrollment, the selected random sampling methodology would have to be used. These percentages are subject to change in the future if it is determined that these sample sizes are inappropriate.

It was further proposed that the sample be a random sample with the sample being determined using Excel’s Rand function. The question was asked about what to do if one of the randomly selected students does not complete the KPI assignment. Should another student be selected? Since the data collection covers multiple semesters, it was proposed that an attempt to make up the KPI will not be necessary.
Mrs. Parker also discussed Fall 2016 data collection for courses that are scheduled to be assessed in this first assessment phase and for those courses that are not scheduled to be assessed in this first phase. Proposed data collection is as follows:

_Courses on the calendar to be assessed in the current year:_
- If a course is being formally assessed, all course outcomes must be assessed. Collect KPIs that address all course outcomes. (One KPI might address more than one outcome.)
- If a course significantly supports any of the program learning outcomes (PLOs) and/or institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), then the KPI demonstrating that should be collected.

_Courses not on the calendar to be assessed in the current year:_
- Collect one common assignment from all sections of a course (capstone assignment or project, comprehensive final exam, presentation, etc.) representative of student performance on the broad course learning outcomes for that course. This performance data will set a benchmark for later assessment of the course.
- If a course significantly supports any of the PLOs and/or ILOs, then the KPI demonstrating that should be collected. _Communication Fluency_ is the ILO to be assessed in 2016-2017.
- If one assignment demonstrates both the student performance in the course and supports the ILO, then that assignment should be used.
- Collect from all ACTS courses first. This will get the process started and elective courses can be added once the ACTS courses have contributed to the assessment of the ILO/PLOs.

**Agenda Item 3: VALUE Rubrics**

**Agenda Item 4: Appointment of Rubric Subcommittees**

Mrs. Parker also proposed that the VALUE rubrics (https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics), which were developed as a campus-based assessment initiative sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, be used as the starting point for the development of the rubrics necessary to assess ANC’s ILOs. It was further proposed that five subcommittees be appointed with each being tasked with developing a rubric for one of the ILOs. Each subcommittee will consist of faculty members and one member from the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL). Faculty members from all three divisions will be represented in the development process.

The subcommittees will use an appropriate VALUE rubric as the starting point and make changes as the subcommittee deems necessary to ensure that the rubric assesses the ILO appropriately. Since faculty members are already being asked to collect data for the ILOs without having the rubrics available, it was stressed that the development of the rubrics needs to be accomplished in a short timeframe. The committee members were presented with a list of proposed members for the rubric development subcommittees. CASL committee members on the subcommittees were asked to schedule the initial meetings and to get the process started. A due date of October 17 was scheduled for the completion of the development process.
A motion was made by Ginger Berry to accept the proposed sample scheme, the data collection structure, and the use of the VALUE rubrics as the starting point for the development of rubrics to assess ANC’s ILOs. Tonya Pankey seconded the motion and with no further discussion, the motion carried.

**Agenda Item 5: Selection of Standard Meeting Schedule**
A selection of a standard meeting day and time for the committee was discussed. It was determined that Wednesday afternoon at 3:15 is a time this semester that members are available. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 19 at 3:15.

**Agenda Item 6: Other Business**
The committee was reminded of the webinar entitled, “Designing Effective Rubrics: How to Align Learning Outcomes, Instructional Activities & Course Assignments.” The webinar is Wednesday, October 5 at 2:00 p.m. and will be shown in the Lecture Hall. It was also noted that the webinar is being recorded and will available for 60 days.

It was suggested that training on how to use the rubrics to assess the ILOs would be helpful.

A motion to adjourn was made by Deanita Hicks and seconded by Rob Semmel. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:45 p.m.