**Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Noon, January 23, 2018**

**Team 1 – Carmichael 211**

**Team 2 – Carmichael 106**

**In attendance: (Team 1)** Joy Burnham**,** Matt Curtner-Smith, Judy Giesen, John Myrick, Janie Hubbard, Claire Major, Stephen Tomlinson, Liza Wilson, Shanikia Young, **(Team 2)** James Hardin, Shari Gilbert, Stacy Hughey-Surman, Lisa Matherson, Philip Westbrook, Kathy Wetzel, Steven Yates, Kevin Richards

**Summary of Meetings:**

1. **Team 1 – Dispositions:**
	1. Dr. Giesen explained the objectives for the meeting, including providing sample training exercise for department representatives to use when training other faculty members in their respective departments.
		1. Dr. Burnham asked whether the training is departmental or programmatic specific to which Dr. Giesen clarified the training is for department faculty in certification areas.
		2. Dr. Giesen further explained that after department representatives train their departmental faculty, the plan is to send real samples to these trained faculty members to rate and collect data for reliability purposes.
	2. After explaining the overall objectives, Dr. Giesen reviewed a PowerPoint handout related to ideas for structuring the rater training session for department faculty.
	3. The team members then moved to reviewing each of the philosophy sample papers starting with the undergraduate sample and rating the samples on each of the four dispositions based on the latest revised version of the dispositions rubric. Once everyone finished, Dr. Giesen asked for members to share their ratings with the group. Overall, everyone rated the samples similarly.
		1. Dr. Giesen clarified that only whole number scores (i.e., 1, 2, 3, or 4) were permitted when Dr. Burnham asked whether half scores (i.e., 3.5, 2.5, etc.) could be given.
		2. During the review and rating of the undergraduate, there were concerns raised about the quality of research that should be used at the undergraduate level. The line between scholarship and research was briefly discussed. A footnote clarifying the term *research* for the dispositions rubric for initial certification was added to this rubric.
		3. Overall, the ratings among the members using the dispositions rubrics for each certification level were consistent and similar across the philosophy samples representing each certification level.
	4. **Next steps for Team 1:**
		1. Team members agreed on a February deadline for department representatives on the team to go back and train their department faculty on using the newly revised dispositions rubrics with the three philosophy samples representing each certification level.
		2. The rubrics and samples will be provided to faculty in LiveText.

**Adjourned at 1:25 PM.**

1. **Team 2 – Portfolio:**
	1. The objectives for the meeting were discussed, specifically creating portfolio rubrics for the initial and graduate level programs. Team members agreed that the goal is to have drafts of the rubrics completed by mid-semester.
	2. To brainstorm ideas for the portfolio rubrics, the members reviewed and discussed four handouts—one from INTASC, two (2) from NBPTS, and one from CAEP—to use in developing these rubrics.
	3. Although team members currently agreed to continue using four (4) points, a question arose for Dr. Anna Kozlowski concerning the number of points that should be on a rubric. Drs. Westbrook and Hughey-Surman believed five (5) points is best, proposing that zero points should reflect “No Evidence.”
		1. The members discussed defining “No Evidence” in terms of whether any evidence is actually present or if any evidence was submitted.
		2. Also, the Committee discussed the need to define “Unacceptable.”
	4. Dr. Richards asked about whether the taxonomy verbs can be consistent across the levels.

* 1. The team brainstormed ways to condense the ten (10) INTASC standards.
		1. Dr. Westbrook suggested that the 10 INTASC standards be combined as much as possible within the four (4) categories.
		2. Dr. Wetzel explained that standards were condensed into “knowledge of standards” and “ability to” standards in the past.
	2. Regarding the number of checkpoints, the team agreed that three (3) checkpoints should continue to be used. They also proposed that checkpoints should be linked to progress in a program (i.e., program start, 12 hours in program, and program end) instead of to specific courses.
	3. **Next steps for Team 2:**
		1. Members should review and provide feedback on the Google drive template created by Dr. Matherson and shared with them. The **deadline** to complete this task is by **5:00 PM** on **Friday, February 16, 2018**.

**Adjourned at 1:00 PM.**