Minutes: QEP Student Learning Outcomes/Assessment Subcommittee

January 22, 2015: 1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Attendance: Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Carol Swayze, Tina Johnson, Mari Weller, Kari Neely, Tim Graeff, Kallie Revels, and Sheila Otto.

Michelle called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and the minutes were read and approved with one correction. Kari Neely should have been reported as attending the previous meeting. Michelle announced that she went to the workshop on using e-Portfolios as an assessment tool so she now has a much better handle on that. Michelle has submitted a progress report and it has been posted to the Website. The Provost Office and Dianna are pleased with the progress we have made thus far. We received feedback regarding SLO 3 with the recommendation that we make it more active and the committee approved the new wording. It has been changed from "Students will be able to effectively, precisely, and appropriately communicate" to "Students will communicate in effective, precise, and appropriate manner" so that it is consistent with the wording of the other SLOs.

Michelle reminded us that we have our work cut out for us. Assessment is critical and seems to be one of the biggest problems with many other schools. According to her sources, 66.7% of institutions received recommendations on assessment. We have done a good job thinking about assessment so far, but we must make sure the assessment instruments and measures are appropriate.

The committee reviewed the tabled items from the December meeting regarding characteristics for SLO2 and SLO3. Committee members discussed and voted on their top five characteristics of personal and professional development. The KWC for Personal Development Planning was reviewed. Some schools have very sophisticated plans to help develop the complete students over time. We should possibly use O'Net, etc. along with personal reflection regarding the career choices. USC places the responsibility on the students to sign up for their experiences and then connect it back to the class. They have a Mentors and Connect office. We will need to define "Students who participate…" from QEP Goal 2. PDP has rubrics for IUPY. We should think about a PDP for anyone working on this committee. Committee members went over the Personal Development Rubric (VALUE Rubric) AACU.

Michelle reminded us to keep in mind that we have two goals—identify assessments both direct and indirect. Direct assessments have to do with the student's learning, measures KSAs in a learning activity. We went over the Directions/Guidelines for Identifying and Developing Assessments handout. We must have a baseline (where are we starting) and so we can compare the end. We also need a control which is a class that is not MT Engage, example: pre and post assessments. We had an extensive discussion regarding the UNIV 1010 class and whether we have other freshmen seminar classes that could be MT Engage classes. Other assessment measures include questions from NSEE, Alumni Survey and Senior Survey. We need scales that are valid and reliable. It is better if we can find one that is already validated and reliable. If other schools have successful assessments then we can use those. Think about the artifacts that we want to see.

Subgroups were assigned to work independently and meet during the next month. Michelle will send out group information (rubrics, research, data, and scales).

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.