

Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment
November 5, 2007, 8:30am
MINUTES

Members present: Maggie LaMontagne, Judi Repman, Kent Rittschof, Chris Thompson, Delores Liston, Kymberly Harris *ex-officio*: Donna Colson, Randy Carlson, Jennie Rakestraw

1. Minutes

Minutes from the October 1, 2007 meeting were reviewed and approved.

2. Agenda

Agenda items included

1. Rationale and proposal for an assessment committee, and
2. COE graduate dispositions rubric development

3. Rationale and proposal for an assessment committee

Kent distributed the rationale that he and Stephanie Kenney developed. After discussion on the need to proceed with a proposal for the Dec. 3 FEC meeting, the last sentence of the rationale was changed to reflect its use as a cover page for the proposal.

Kent would draft the proposal and distribute via WebCT for editing.

Kent and Kymberly would be present for the FEC meeting to present and discuss the rationale and proposal.

The concern among members about the proliferation of committees in the COE was discussed and it was recommended that someone could bring that issue separately to the FEC

4. COE graduate dispositions rubric development

The rubric draft outline, assembled by Delores Liston, was used to discuss modifications and completion of the rubric. The basis for the outline was the Georgia Framework for Teaching.

The rubric development was discussed and various issues were debated.

The potential application of the rubric was noted as a crucial aspect influencing how we would label and consider the rubric levels. Basic versus unacceptable was debated and most were generally OK with the label Basic. Comparisons and contrasts among graduate programs were made.

Suggestions were made regarding whether assessment would take place at the end of the program or throughout. It was suggested that the rubric could be used formatively throughout, then summatively at the end. Potential overuse and underuse of the rubric were discussed as problems.

Program-specific feedback was discussed as opposed to simply holding a degree. Students might be sent to an advisor if they get a certain level score on the rubric, such as an 8 or less overall or maybe a 1 or less on any single criteria.

The use of a range of scores was considered appropriate as long as programs converted scores to the 1, 2, 3 for unit assessment purposes. The range allows a score of 0 or .9 at the Basic level, for example.

It was suggested that each program come up with a recommendation plan for meaningful use of the rubric -- something that best fits their program.

Suggestions for wording of the descriptions at the Basic and Exemplary levels of the first two rubric rows were made. Consensus was reached with these.

Judi Repman volunteered to draft additional descriptors to be reviewed in January.

The committee decided on the following steps:

1. Finish filling in the rubric and Review in January
2. Draft recommendations to programs for use the rubric
3. Ask programs for feedback on the rubric and committee recommendations
4. Revise rubric and recommendations as needed and make available

Draft suggestion ideas from the meeting so far included:

1. Provide the rubric for all graduate students at the beginning of their program, such as their first course in the program.
 2. Use the rubric at some specified point early in their program in a formative way, possibly as a self-assessment with instructor feedback to students on their self-assessment.
 3. Evaluate formative use of the rubric noting students who earn low scores either overall or on specific rubric criteria.
 3. Provide recommendations for advising, where needed, about disposition deficiencies. This should be completed prior to summative use of the rubric.
 4. Use the rubric at some specified point late in the program in a summative way and report the data for program and unit review.
5. The committee adjourned at approximately 10:00am