

**Assessment Committee**

**Thursday, January 28, 2016**

**12:30 – 2:00 in the Clocktower**

**Present:**

**Stefanie Bourque, Chair Joy Locher, Recorder**

**Claudette Dupee**

**Dianne Fallon**

**Rita Perron**

**Maria Niswonger**

**Annette Tanguay**

**Absent:**

**Margaret Wheeler**

 **Approved Minutes**

1. Call to Order

*Stefanie*

1. Approval of agenda

*Motion by Annette, seconded by Maria, passed*

1. Approval of November 2015 minutes

 *Motion by Maria, seconded by Annette, passed*

1. New Business
2. Old Business
	1. Plan communication project phase 2

*The committee tentatively planned to postpone the next meeting for February 18th to February 23rd. Maria will check her schedule and send a note and then Joy will book.*

*The committee is looking for more targeted sample and more samples than the last time. The committee is looking for validation of previous results. After a discussion of ways to assess student learning across programs rather than in individual programs, the committee decided on targeting 200-level online classes across programs/departments for assessment of communication skills.*

*The committee directed Stefanie to seek to obtain at least 25 research oriented samples, but to also ask Nick Gill for the enrollment in online classes with the goal of samples to be 10%.*

*The committee’s goal is to be done in April to present to the College Council in May.*

* 1. Discussion on quantitative rubric

*The present quantitative rubric was discussed using information the QuIRK rubric used by Bridgewater State. The committee talked about the use of peripheral or central potential relevancy to QR. There was discussion of “weasel” words like “few, many”.*

*The committee was concerned about the present QR (rev 10/15) being too math specific and not probable to be used by math instructors or others. The committee decided to make the QR rubric more broad – peripheral relevancy being determined by using statistics in a general way and central relevancy in data analysis.*

*The committee agreed that a two phased process was necessary. Stefanie will simplify the committee’s QR rubric. The committee recommended using less mathematical terms and including the use of more mechanical methods like tables and graphs.*

* 1. Review the ILO rubric on Information Literacy

*The sample “Elder Abuse” was a common reference for the discussion as all but one member had read it. There was discussion about its application when it fell between two categories. Also discussed was the rubric section “Uses a wide variety of print and electronic sources, including books, periodical articles, and online documents, appropriate to stated research topic.” The committee decided to change “including” to “such as”. Stefanie will edit this as well as make the edit to remove the second “appropriate” in the category Find and Evaluate/Acceptable. During conversation, there was a reminder to members that this rubric is a teaching tool and not generally used by students.*

*There was a discussion about the lack of use of “quotation marks’ in samplings. There was discussion about what patch writing was and detecting it. There was also discussion about what an annotated bibliography is and that it had been specifically requested in the sample. The committee had questions about the use of NoodleBib’s citations – NoodleBib is only as good as the information put into it.*

*The committee talked about ways to use the rubric effectively. It was suggested to read the rubric first, internalize the rubric, then read the paper with the rubric.*

*The committee agreed that in the last row of the rubric, the words “including in-text citations and bibliography’ will be in every column. Stefanie will make the edit.*

*There was discussion regarding the types of assignments the rubric can be used on. Ask: “Does it have the potential to use a wider variety of sources?” The answer should be obvious in the sample.*

1. Announcements
2. Adjournment