**Learning Assessment Committee**

**Minutes**

**January 16, 2015**

**Members Present**: Eileen DeLuca, Richard Worch, Caroline Seefchak, Marty Ambrose, Amy Trogan, Stuart Brown, Eric Seelau, Fernando Mayoral, Joe Van Gaalen, Jane Charles, Sarah Lublink, Barbara Miley, Don Ransford, Crystal Revak, and John Meyer.

Colleen Moore, Ron Smith, and Tom Donaldson were not able to connect the Charlotte Campus; Katie Paschall was not able to connect the Collier Campus. They were present for the meeting.

**Members Absent:** Peggy Romeo (at a conference).

Marty called the meeting to order.

* After a brief discussion of the previous meeting’s minutes, it was noted that there was one small error to be fixed on the second page, line five.
* Stuart Brown motioned to approve minutes from the November 24, 2014, meeting; Amy Trogan seconded the motion.
* Marty discussed the success of Assessment 101, conducted by Eileen DeLuca, and said that it was fabulous, *even with the technology issues.* Those in attendance agreed.
	+ It was mentioned that sending the PPT slides, after the presentation, was very helpful.
	+ There were approximately sixty people in attendance at the training session, which was held the first duty day back form winter break, Monday, January 5, 2015.
	+ Joe van Gaalen was thanked for providing data.
* Marty proposed to the committee that the February meeting of the Learning Assessment Committee be designated as a training meeting for the Gen Ed Rubric Scoring Sessions that take place this semester. There was mutual agreement that this would be an excellent way to utilize out time.
* The upcoming Gen Ed Rubric Scoring Sessions were discussed.
	+ It was first proposed that there would be six people per scoring team.
	+ Dates of the sessions will take place within the time period spanning February 23 until April 2, during which individual scoring teams would set dates and times to convene.
	+ The scoring process would be discussed at the March meeting along with a review of the course-level assessments.
	+ Marty reiterated that we have an exceptional group to be completing this task.
* Eileen discussed rubric calibration and scoring.
* Marty continued reviewing the proposed meeting agenda (note: agenda is the plural for the Latin *agendum*, the singular for agenda that nobody ever uses; therefore, agenda, not agendas, is in collective reference to each agendum for the remaining months of the spring semester.)
	+ In addition to training for Gen. Ed. Rubric Scoring, a new chair for the Learning Assessment Committee will be proposed at the March meeting. The vote for a new Chair will take place at the April meeting.
	+ At the April meeting, assessment results will be discussed for both course level and for gen. ed. assessments.
	+ Also, at the April meeting, a chair will be elected.
	+ During Duty Days, at the end of the semester, a discussion could be scheduled to review progress and to “close the loop.”
		- This will be discussed at a future meeting.
* Joe van Gaalen gave an update on the following items:
	+ Artifacts collected for Gen Ed Assessments in the fall of 2015 were as follows:
		- COM – 780
		- CR – 1000+
		- GSR – 465
		- TIM – just under 600
		- QR – 290
	+ Joe distributed a sheet that further clarifies this data; all information is also available on the LAC Canvas site.
	+ Joe discussed the scoring teams for the Gen Ed Assessment rubrics and provided break-down information by Gen. Ed. competency; that information is on Canvas as well as on the handout given to attendees of the meeting.
	+ The numbers of scorers required, at 75 artifacts per pair, would be as follows
		- COM: 6 (77, 77, 78)
		- CT: 6 (91. 91, 91)
		- GSE: 4 (75, 76)
		- TIM: 4 (86,87
		- QR: 4 (76, 76)
	+ Marty stated that, realistically, it will take at least two sessions.
* Joe reviewed the scoring teams and leaders.
* Eric Seelau questioned the proposed methodology of the rubric scoring sessions; a brief discussed ensued.
* Eileen provided some clarification with the following:
	+ We will be testing to see if the assessments are the right tools – then they will calibrate with the raters
	+ Quantitative data will show reliability
	+ Qualitative data – that about which we discuss – will center on achievement data.
	+ We will need a good amount of information for achievement data across the disciplines
	+ A metachievement study will provide confidence within two raters
* Sarah Lublink asked if, based on the number of scorers required and the numbers of artifacts, we may need more raters.
	+ Joe referred to the data on the charts he had provided
	+ It was recommended that, for this pilot year, two more scorers be added to the competency CT.
* Marty reminded the committee that the decision to use rubrics for general education was made because we wanted to avoid the use of standardized testing. It is more time consuming, but we have collectively asserted that it is better, and it is what we want for this College.
* Eileen discussed AACU recommendations of rubric calibrations.
* Eileen suggested that a sample be done, using CT followed by a discussion of ambiguities in order to come to a convergence.
* Upcoming issues were discussed.
	+ The January Learning Assessment Committee Newsletter
	+ Plans for the next two parts of the Assessment 101 training for spring.
* Don Ransford provided a follow-up to his announcement, at the last meeting, about a Gen. Ed. Assessment Institute that will be conducted in Oklahoma in June. It has been concluded that it would not be worth the Professional Development money at this time.
* Eileen suggested a “Summer Fun Club” for Assessment.
* Richard Worch made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Sarah Lublink seconded the motion.