

**Assessment Taskforce Meeting
December 12, 2008**

Members present: Robin Wiggins, Charles Wiggins, Donna Hood, Kathy Ackerman, Pat Freeman, Kim Gold

The meeting agenda addressed each of the seven objectives established in September. Each of the seven objectives were reviewed to assess the progress accomplished during the fall semester and to establish next steps for the remainder of the academic year.

Objective 1: The group discussed the rubric fair that was held in October and discussed next steps to follow up on the information gathered from the fair. A workshop for professional development day for new faculty was discussed. This workshop would address the basics of assessment rubric. Kim received a request from Jay Coomes, chair of the Professional Development taskforce for faculty for a workshop of this type.

The taskforce discussed revising the Diverse Historical and Cultural Perspectives rubric. The revisions would be made based on recommendations made during the rubric fair. It was noted that this rubric is one of the most difficult to develop because it addresses attitudes rather than cognitive skills or knowledge.

There was discussion regarding ways to remind faculty to use the rubrics specifically the writing and DHCP rubric. These rubrics were chosen as the two rubrics for focus during the 2008-2009 academic year. It was suggested that candy wrappers be developed with a reminder printed on the wrapper. This concept was used previously and members agreed that it was successful last time. Follow up reminders could involve miniature candy with a note attached.

Objective 2: Kim shared that John Quinley had presented the results of the 2007 CCSSE survey to management team and suggested that these results be shared at a campus wide assessment meeting. Other information to be shared included the half sheet developed for the portfolio workshop to facilitate student reflection with portfolio artifacts.

Objective 3: Sharing assessment information with part-time and adjunct employees. It was suggested that the QEP update be sent by email to all adjunct instructors. A question was raised about QEP updates being available from the website. A link with assessment information specifically for adjuncts was discussed.

Objective 4: Kim reported on an service assessment meeting. The next meeting of the service assessment subcommittee will be on January 15th. January 29th Karen Jones, Kimberly Snyder and Johnny Smith will present the Student Services assessment model and information to the subcommittee. The taskforce discussed bringing M. Brechanni to the campus as an alternative to conference attendance. Due to travel and budget restrictions it was felt that bringing an expert to campus was a more cost effective way to provide assessment support for service areas.

Objective 5: Objective number five states that the taskforce will provide support for student portfolios. A web resource for student with information about portfolios and portfolio development was discussed. The portfolio week workshops were felt to be very successful. Having 4 facilitators representing three different academic areas was believed to be beneficial. Also having the workshops in a variety of

locations provided greater awareness of the portfolio focus. Kim mentioned that an evening student had stopped by her office to inquire about portfolios because of the signs posted in the hallway. The student mentioned that as an evening student she often felt left out of the loop. A web resource was seen as a way to provide information to evening students and part-time instructors. Videoing the portfolio workshop to post on Youtube was discussed as a resource for the website. Other ideas included an online portfolio workshop, a resource for electronic portfolios, scan a sample paper with annotations, include a sample composite portfolio with no names, include portfolio samples from various departments. Kim, Charles and Robin volunteered to work on this project.

Objective 6: Continue to focus on Academic dishonesty. Charles Wiggins represented that he was in the process of seeking permission to use Duke University's integrity model. Once permission is granted the Academic Integrity subcommittee will work on adapting the model to fit Isothermal.

Objective 7: The group briefly discussed some of the difficulties in developing a staff evaluation process that fits a wide range of staff positions. There was some discussion of including optional components to make the process more flexible.