

Assessment Committee Meeting

September 10, 2015 at 1:30 pm

Committee Members: Tryphena Bledsoe (chair), Shelbea Comer, Lynn Davis, Jeremy Dorman, Dwayne Ferguson, Kathy Watlington, Denise Wilkins, Emily Zabcik

Training Handouts:

- IE policy & Procedures
- Direct and Indirect Measures
- IE Assessment Database- User's Guide
- Assessment assignments
- Assessment Rubrics (academic, technical, & support)
- Evaluator worksheet (electronic file) to be emailed

The Assessment Rubric (Academic, Technical, and Support):

Findings = Results - Column should contain collected evidence relating to stated actions used to accomplish the objectives and SLOs. Sometimes this is stated as a percentage of students who mastered an objective or percentage of improvement from year to year. (See 2014-2015 IE below for details).

Analysis of Findings = Use of Results - After evidence has been organized and processed, and summarized, a plan for improvement is stated.

Evaluation Summary– the collection, organization, processing, summary, and plan for improvement is written is detailed in a narrative report. Note that the Evaluation Summary button on the IE database page may link to the IE documentation folder for the current year. To see a unit's Evaluation Summary, you will need to find the Evaluation Summaries folder in the current year's list of IE documentation folders. There is a single folder for all Evaluation Summaries each year.

Documentation - Make sure all links work and are pertinent to the Action and Results.

Specific comments: Be constructive. Objectives and actions need to be measureable and at least one of the actions per objective should have evidence collected and documentation shown. You may wish to suggest methods of direct and indirect measurements for actions in your comments.

Ratings on the Rubric: In statistics, **inter-rater reliability** is the degree of agreement among raters. It gives a score of how much homogeneity, or consensus, there is in the ratings given by judges. It is useful in refining the tools given to human judges, for example by determining if a particular scale is appropriate for measuring a particular variable. If various raters do not agree, either the scale is defective or the raters need to be re-trained. (copied from Wikipedia)

1. Each rater independently scores his/her assigned units (between 9/10/15 and 9/21/15) and types in specific comments in your electronic Evaluator worksheet Word file. Comments then can be copied from this document and pasted into the IE database Evaluator table (Table 1 below).

2. Check the 2015-2016 IE Plan in the data base for the first half of your evaluator assignment list. The IE PLAN is complete when the action step is filled in through the “Planned Evaluation” Column. This is your chance to look at the action step to make sure it is measurable and that the planned evaluation is an appropriate way to measure it. Make comments in the last column if you find a problem with the 2015-2016 Plan. You will copy this column into the compiled evaluator worksheet (see #3).

3. Meet with your co-rater during the week of 9/22/15 to 9/30/15 and come to a consensus on ratings on which you differ. Be sure to compile your ratings and comments (from the last 2 columns) into **one** of the evaluator worksheet Word files.

4. Copy all ratings and specific comments into the IE database comment box. See Table 1 below.

5. Email your compiled and completed Evaluator worksheet Word file(S) to me ASAP but for sure by October 1, 2015. I will compile these eight documents and forward the compiled document to Dr. Shannon. Don’t email it to me until the last column is filled in with yes/no (2015-2016 plan complete?) and some comments.

This is what the “scoring” area looks like in the IE database. You can copy from Word and paste into this table in the IE data base. Once you and your co-evaluators have come to a consensus on the rating for the Findings, Analysis of Findings, and Evaluation Summary, fill in this table and finalize the Assessment.

Table 1

Year	2014-2015
Unit	Unit Name
Reviewers	<input type="text" value="names"/>
Contact Person Presenting Report	<input type="text" value="unit contac"/>
Findings Related to Assessment of Program Outcomes	<input type="text"/>
Analysis of Findings	<input type="text"/>
Evaluation Report of Analysis	<input type="text"/>
Specific Comments	<input type="text"/>
Finalize Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Update Cancel	

2015-2016 IE Plan Checklist (last column of Evaluator worksheet Word file)

1. Each Unit should attempt to have 3 goals; a marketing goal, a facilities goal, and a student goal.
2. Each Unit Goal has at least one objective; each objective has at least one action.
3. Academic and technical units have at least two student goals. One goal should relate to the unit's graduate assessment plan (GAP) which is the way the unit assesses its program (general ed. core for academic units).
4. Academic and technical units have SLO(s) or capstone course objectives for graduate assessment (SACS). Academic units will probably use Panola College SLOs for the Core Objectives which they are required to assess.
4. All objectives and actions are measurable (directly or indirectly). One of the actions of the objective has the measure in the action or the planned evaluation column.
5. Each action has all un-shaded columns completed (through Planned Evaluation).
6. Write yes or no and notes or comments in the "2015-2016 IE Plan Complete?" column of Evaluator worksheet document as to what has not been completed for the 2015-2016 plan. Do not fill in the grayed out cells.
7. Email your completed Evaluator worksheet to me by October 1, 2015 and I will compile these eight documents and forward the compiled document to Dr. Shannon.