

TCC Instruction Committee Minutes

Date: Dec. 9, 2014

Time: 2PM

Location: Norfolk, District Green Bldg Room 502

In Attendance: Michael Blankenship (C), David Brandt (C), Jennifer Ferguson (B), Heather Fitzgerald (B), Dr. Barbara Blake Gonzalez (C), Amanda Leo (B), Steve Litherland (N), Don Mendonsa (C), Kerry Ragno (N), Don Remy (C), Calvin Scheidt (B), Lara Tedrow (N)

I. Roll call

Meeting was called to order at 2:05pm. Introductions took place.

II. Approval of minutes from last meeting

There was confirmation that the word “assignment” was correct in section VI of the November meeting minutes. The two typographical errors to be corrected were: (1) Deletion of the word “Non-voting” after Ex-Officio in the faculty representation chart. The term “Non-voting” should have been removed to accurately reflect proposed changes to the bylaws. (2) Correction of the disciplines represented for “Public Services” and “Industrial Technologies” domains.

Engineering disciplines were added in error to “Public Services” domain, instead of “Industrial Technologies” domain as agreed upon in the accompanying verbiage of the November minutes. There was a motion, which was seconded, to approve the November minutes pending the correction of the above typographical errors.

Corrected chart is to look as follows:

<u>No. of Reprs.</u>	<u>Domain</u>	<u>Discipline Represented</u>
1-2	English	ENG/Developmental
1	Communication	CST (Speech), ESL
1-2	Humanities/ Fine Arts/Art and Design	ART, CRF, CST (Theatre), DAN, HUM, IDS, Languages (CHI, FRE, GER, JPN, RUS, SPA), MUS, PHI, PHT, REL
1	Natural Sciences	BIO, CHM, GOL, NAS, PHY
1-2	Mathematics	MTH/Developmental
1-2	Social Sciences	ECO, GEO, HIS, PLS, PSY, SOC, SSC
1	Health Professions	DIT, DMS, EMS, HIM, HLT, MDA, MDL, NUR, OCT, PSG, PTH, RAD, RTH
1	Information Systems	GIS, ITD, ITE, ITN, ITP, CSC
1	Public Services	ADJ, ASL/INT, CHD, EDU, FNS, FST, HMS, MEN, PED, PBS
1-2	Industrial Technologies	AIR, ARC , AUT, ARO, BLD, CAD, CIV, DSL, EGR, ELE, ENE, ENV, ESR, ETR, IND, INS, MAC, MAR, MEC, SAF, TRK, WEL

1	Business Management	ACC, ACQ, AST, BUS, FIN, HRI, HRT, LGL, MKT, REA
Academic Administrators		
2	Academic Deans	1 Transfer programs, 1 Career & Technical programs
Learning Resources		
1	Full-time Librarian	
PAPC Appointees		
0-3	PAPC appointees (teaching faculty)	
Ex-Officio Members (Non-voting)		
	Associate Vice President for College Transfer Education	
	Associate Vice President for Career/Technical Education	
1	Associate Vice President for Libraries	
1	Past Chair of Instruction Committee	
16-24 Voting Members (Total)		

III. Open issues

1. November Motion Update

2. Committee Timeline Overview for Charges

Charge 1- Current and ongoing

A librarian will conduct a demonstration of LibGuides for the Committee at the January 2015 meeting. LibGuides is the proposed online platform to house assignments that assess general education competencies.

Charge 2- Current and ongoing

Feedback from the Spring 2014 Learning Institute was minimal and not valid to suggest changes to rubrics. There is no January Convocation, so the Instruction Committee does not have to plan for participation. The team discussed the option of surveys, both paper and online, to collect faculty feedback regarding the rubrics. Assessment coaches may be the best source of accurate rubric feedback at this time.

Charge 3- Multiple reviews are in progress for the Official Course Outlines. February was an anticipated date that course outlines will be discussed by the Instruction Committee. It was questioned as to how the Curriculum Committee will be involved with these outlines. The Chair will collect the current reviews and distribute to the committee in February for recommendations for the process and timeline for review of official course outlines.

3. Office of Academic Affairs Involvement

Steve and Barbara are to meet with Dr. DeMarte on Thursday, December 11th to talk about Instruction Committee's mission, vision, and charges.

IV. New business

4. Jennifer Ferguson-General Education Presentation

Jennifer Ferguson, General Education Assessment Coach, presented a general education faculty assessor training to the Committee. Faculty can be involved by submitting student works for

assessment, becoming assessors of work products submitted, or becoming Assessment Coaches (which is more involved and requires working closely with other faculty). Current assessors will come together on 12/18 for a group assessment session. Assessment data will be used for SACS reports. This data will also be used to make changes and “close the loop” in student learning. General education competencies and course learning outcomes should be considered together. TCC’s i-INCURR website has the complete General Education Assessment Plan as well as course outlines, syllabi templates, and competency rubrics. Content on i-INCURR is available to all faculty and staff.

5. General Education Assignment Resource Charge

a) Development process, ideas, design of repository

The Committee discussed an online repository for assignment resources. TCC should be a leader in the VCCS. Appalachian State University’s Assessable Artifact website was briefly explored <http://generaleducation.appstate.edu/program-assessment>.

There was some initial opposition to the charge for creating an online repository for sample assignments, best practices, etc. After some discussion, the big picture was made clearer as the team considered an example scenario. The example was: TCC’s goal is to have students be employable. If this is the goal, how can it be made sure that this happens? Employers’ rate candidates based on qualifications. Student learning is assessed by general education competencies.

Amanda mentioned the acronym GEARS (General Education Assignment Resource System) as a potential name. The Committee listed sample assignments, templates for i-INCURR, and professional development resources as potential content that could be included. Format and design of the repository was mentioned as well as site/resource accessibility (should there be SIS login?). Lisa mentioned that copyright will be involved with building an online resource. The creative commons attribution license was referred to.

b) Sample assignments and rubrics

Rubrics and sample assignments were handed out to Instruction Committee members. Committee members were encouraged to review assignments and rubrics before the next meeting. Jennifer reminded the Committee that work products are being scored according to how well competencies are met, using the rubric as a guide. Assessors are not grading assignments for content and must consider the competency in a global sense, beyond the lens of course-specific material. When assessing, each work product has three assessors, 2 primary and 1 tie-breaker if conflicting scores are returned. Scoring is time-sensitive and assessors must go with instinct. It was mentioned that faculty should receive some sort of credit for taking part in assessment. The question was posed as to whether the roles of assessors could be connected to professional development. Jennifer mentioned the need to simplify rubric verbiage to clarify the assessment process of student works. A few faculty on the Committee were interested in submitting assignments for the repository. To start with, the online repository could include assignments included in the General Education Assessment Plan. At the January meeting, committee members will be asked to provide feedback and review of the assignments, rubrics and any other issues pertinent to the General Education Assessment Plan.

c) Discussion of issues

Barbara facilitated a general discussion regarding the issues surrounding faculty involvement with general education assessment and contribution to an online repository. Committee

members acknowledged their own various levels of experience with assessment and it was suspected that faculty would have a range of experience too. Several questions were shared regarding faculty involvement with assessment. These questions included:

-Is our current assessment of general education similar to the public school model of SOLs? -

-Will assessment results be connected to faculty performance evaluations? Faculty may be concerned their instruction style is being assessed.

-Do courses need to meet every competency? Some faculty think they have to take on all competencies.

-Will more time be required to connect course work to competencies?

-How can communication barriers be bridged to allow for open communication? It was mentioned that support would be needed from various levels including disciplines, departments, and administration to help faculty understand the process and encourage participation with assessment.

The Committee also agreed that adjuncts need to be on board. Jennifer mentioned that general education assessment should be part of the New Faculty Academy. Mentorships may also help faculty further understand general education assessment. Barbara asked Committee members to think of ideas for sessions at the Learning Institute in May. One idea was to have a session where faculty could bring their own rubrics and share these along with the general education competency rubrics. Another suggested session would be “General Assessment Rubrics: Debunking the Myths” to provide a forum for faculty to share their questions or concerns so that any false information about TCC’s General Assessment Plan might be corrected and a better literacy might be promoted. A session could also be held for faculty to bring their own assignments to be included in the online repository.

d) LibGuides Presentation

A librarian will provide a presentation of LibGuides at the next meeting.

6. Review Faculty Feedback Charge/Learning Institute Data Update

The faculty feedback from the May Learning Institute was small in number and limited in scope. This feedback was not representative of the faculty or the Instruction Committee. Barbara was not comfortable using this data as valid information.

a) Plan for individual faculty surveys to be sent for each rubric

The Committee agreed that we are not prepared to survey the entire faculty at this time.

b) Discussion of issues

Barbara and the Committee agreed that a reliable survey instrument is needed to collect faculty feedback. Amanda suggested that we collect feedback about the rubrics from the general education assessors first, then decide how to collect more feedback.

7. Other

The next meeting will be on January 13th at 2PM in room 4101 in the new Academic Building on the Chesapeake Campus.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.