

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: January 16, 2026

Time: 10:00–10:45 AM

Location: Kilpatrick Building, Room 221

1. Welcome

2. Building Quality Rubrics

- Ongoing work is focused on developing and improving rubrics, while addressing questions faculty submit.
- Rubrics being shared by instructors are under review, and three handouts were provided to support this process.
- Rubrics should align with CAPE and PSC expectations to ensure desired assessment outcomes.
- While current rubrics generally meet expectations, there is room for continuous improvement.
- An overview was given of how SLL workflows are used to build templates and rubrics.
- Different rubric purposes determine different workflows:
 - **Standard workflow:** Most common; used when instructors directly assess student submissions.
 - **Internship/observational workflow:** Used when students are not submitting work, but instructors provide evaluative feedback (e.g., PDBA).
- Understanding workflows can help instructors when submitting documents for rubric creation.
- SLL includes changes compared to Biotech, though the system is straightforward.
- Faculty may be asked clarifying questions to ensure standards are properly aligned.
- SLML requires specific rubric formatting to capture assessment data, including defining rubric elements.
- The number of rubric elements depends on the size and complexity of the submitted rubric (up to ten elements).

Rubrics may vary in structure and number of elements, but they must align with the intended standards, clearly define what is being measured, and provide sufficient, meaningful feedback to determine whether expectations are met or not.

Programs are assessed on how well their rubrics align with learning outcomes (elements/criteria) to standards, with the primary focus on meeting standards through meaningful, valid, and reliable assessments—while allowing flexibility in whether rubrics assess entire standards or specific components, if alignment, quality, and consistency are demonstrated.

- **Revised form shared electronically**

- The agenda and revised form are shared electronically.
- Faculty are asked to review the revised form and provide feedback.

- **Purpose of the revised form**

- The goal is to streamline the form while making it more informative.
- The form is intended to be a *living document* that guides monthly program meetings.
- It supports tracking continuous improvement and measuring program effectiveness regularly.

- **Alignment with standards**

- The revised form aligns CAPE standards with PSC standards.
- It includes examples of evidence to help programs document their work.

- **Future improvements**

- There is an ongoing effort to create a drop-down, more efficient version of the form.
- Until then, examples provided allow users to select applicable evidence easily.

- **Submission and access**

- All faculty have access to the Teams folders and can upload documents themselves.

- **Timeline for implementation**

- The new form will be officially used starting in **August**.
- For now, only feedback is being collected.

- **Current requirements remain the same**

- Programs should continue using the current form for midpoint checks and goal setting.
- Midpoint check deadlines (e.g., February) remain unchanged.

3. Reliability

- **Internal Reliability is important**

- When multiple instructors evaluate student work, the same rubric should be used to ensure consistency.
- This applies even more when different instructors (e.g., part-time or mentor teachers) teach the course over time.

- **Clear rubric language matters**

- Rubric criteria must be clearly defined so terms like “adequate” mean the same thing to everyone.
- Clear wording helps maintain consistency across graders.

- **Programs can choose their own method**

- There’s flexibility in *how* consistency and reliability are achieved.
- Whatever method is used should align with program and course goals.

- **Be prepared to provide documentation**

- When asked, programs should be able to show how they ensure consistent grading and rubric use.

- **Documentation of assessment methods is required**

- Programs need to document *how* they ensure consistent grading, especially when using rubrics.

4. Revised CI Plan and mid-term impact check -Feedback Discussion

- **Reminder about continuous improvement plans**

- Review and update the plans created after fall assessment day.
- Share impact checks and progress updates in early February.

- **Submission instructions**

- Upload updated materials to the Teams folder under **COE Assessment**, using the folder assigned to each program.
- Previously submitted electronic documents can be uploaded on behalf of the program.

- **Reminder about continuous improvement plans**

- Review and update the plans created after fall assessment day.
- Share impact checks and progress updates in early February.

- **Submission instructions**

- Upload updated materials to the Teams folder under **COE Assessment**, using the folder assigned to each program.
 - Previously submitted electronic documents can be uploaded on behalf of the program.
- **Feedback requested**
 - Faculty are encouraged to share feedback on what to add, remove, or improve.
 - Feedback will be used to update the form before final distribution.

5. What make GCSU, JHL COE Standout

What truly sets GCSU's JHL COE apart is not just that it **meets accreditation standards**, but that it **effectively markets and communicates those standards through data, outcomes, and real-world impact**. The integration of **assessment, accreditation, and strategic messaging** creates a powerful narrative of quality, accountability, and student success.

Next Assessment Committee meeting is February 20th at 10:00 am.

Adjourn