

COE Assessment Committee

Minutes for the Feb. 26, 2008, meeting

Present: Corine Meyers-Jennings, Maggie Roberts, Heather Brasell, John Hummel, Lynn Corbin, Steven Lahr, Julie Reffel, Lynn Minor, George Langford, J. D. Thomerson, Sonya Sanderson, Jane Kinney, Lantry Brockmeier, and MiMi Wetherington

Guest: Jane Kinney, SACS Coordinator

The minutes of the November 20, 2008, were approved as submitted.

Sanderson reported that the committee needed to look at the Advanced Candidate Impact on the P-12 Learner assessment.

Kinney spoke about SACS protocol and policies. The bottom line for SACS is for us to report what students are learning, how we know they are learning it, and proof that they learned it. This is SACS Standard 3.3.1 and they will be looking closely at this data. The previous Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, developed assessment policy that stipulates educational agencies will be reviewed at 5-year intervals, which means SACS will be back in 5 years, not 10 as in previous policy. Kinney also reported that the General Education Assessment Committee is paying more attention to the coherence of the assessment plans in Arts and Sciences. They may be looking to education faculty for input to help develop these at a later date. We need to be aware that there is a backlog of substantive change reviews at SACS, so even if the BOR says we must implement immediately, SACS wants a year to review the change. There will be separate SACS assessments for administrative support, educational support, research, and community service. The goals of the various assessment committees is to keep data collection going so it's ready at all times and we don't have to scramble at the five-year intervals. A new, broader definition of undergraduate research is being developed as this is a big push of Gen Ed. The SACS review team will be on campus April 6-10, 2010.

Sanderson and others discussed the disposition assessment developed and implemented first by ECE. Other departments, including HPE use it, too. Candidates self-evaluate and faculty evaluate using the same form at various times during the candidates' programs (First Block, Second Block, etc.). This is followed by interviews with faculty to discuss the results. Mentor teachers are also involved. When problems are identified with multiple faculty reports, concern forms are often generated. Discussion among the committee followed re the form, the potential uses, the process, etc. A point was made to be sure the comment section was available. We should look for a pattern of growth. If anyone wants a form, contact Julie Reffel.

Reffel discussed issues re the advanced program assessments. She also emphasized the need for supervisors and mentor teachers to include comments for each category to support the rating.

Minor raised the issue of "netiquette" for online classes and other electronic communications. There is an instructional module available. A common statement about appropriate language

and etiquette for electronic communication will be developed and started in 2999, 2110, 2120, 2130.

The next meeting will be April 9, 4:00 pm. Topics will be the Fall 2008 dispositions data, the Response to Intervention protocols, and advanced candidate dispositions.