SLO/Assessment Committee Meeting
Minutes
February 15, 2012

In attendance: Delana Nivens, Judith Garrison, Nancy Remler, John Kraft, Teresa Winterhalter, Joyce Bergin
Excused: Jonathan Roberts, David Wheeler, Abby Willcox, Christine Moore

The meeting opened with Delana Nivens reminding the committee of its task to compose a rubric to assess students’ abilities to demonstrate information literacy (IL) skills within the context of an academic assignment.

Nancy Remler then asked whether the committee should also compose a rubric to assess students’ abilities to navigate the campus to access information in university offices. Judith Garrison noted that those skills will be assessed by adding questions to the Research Practices Survey (RPS). She then shared with the committee a copy of a sample RPS with notes she’d added showing how questions align with the QEP’s student learning outcomes. As the committee discussed the RPS, Nancy Remler noted that the administration dates of the RPS are August 1-October 13, which will not enable a fall semester collection of data at the end of the term. Judith Garrison agreed to investigate the possibility of negotiating the survey administration dates so that the university could conduct the survey both at the beginning of fall term and at the end.

Joyce Bergin then mentioned we could generate helpful data if we also composed a survey of campus offices to determine whether students are asking appropriate questions of campus personnel to solve problems. The pros and cons of such surveys were discussed, and the committee agreed to investigate that possibility at a later meeting.

The committee examined several models of rubrics for assessing information literacy skills. Some discussion examined the pros and cons of various rubrics. Several committee members liked the model from the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The committee decided to use that rubric as a starting point. Then, examining each criterion and its descriptors one by one, the committee revised the wording so that it best represents the expectations of Armstrong’s students enrolled in the QEP first-year seminars. Upon completion of the revision, John Kraft noted that the rubric also shows great potential for being offered electronically.

Delana Nivens reminded the committee of Jonathan Roberts’ concern about inter-rater reliability if we conduct this evaluation with multiple raters. Some discussion then took place about how the university could address that problem. The idea of conducting a blind evaluation of sample assignments came up. The committee agreed to come back to this matter at a later meeting.

Nancy Remler agreed to type up the proposed rubric and make it available for the full committee for review prior to submitting it to the steering committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00.