Northeastern State University
Tahlequah • Broken Arrow • Muskogee

Student Learning & Assessment Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: April 29, 2015, 12:00 pm, Tahlequah Campus, Bagley 101 with Bb Collaborate to BABT 125.

Members Present: BA Campus: Dr. Julia Kwok and Dr. Lisa Tritchler.
Tahlequah Campus: Dr. JoAnn Starkweather, Dr. Darryl Linde, Dr. Sophia Sweeney, Dr. Jerrid Freeman, Mr. Chad McLane, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. Alan McKee, Dr. Cheryl Van Den Handel, Dr. Mia Revels

Handouts: Results of the Rubric Scale Descriptors Survey (sent via email)

Meeting Notes:
The group discussed the following items:

The inclusion of a zero point on the rubric scale
The literature yielded little information about the use of a zero point for rubrics. Nolet and McLaughlin (2005) assert, "A 'zero' point should be included to differentiate no performance from very novice performance" (p. 64). A four-point analytic rubric used to assess undergraduate students' APA style introductions included a zero, with zero points assigned for missing work. However, the authors did not articulate their reason for using the zero (Stellmack et al., 2009). Dr. Giese pointed out that zeros would be included in calculations unless one intentionally excluded them by marking them with a period ("0.").

The committee decided that a zero point was needed to clearly distinguish between the absence of student work for an indicator (or outcome) and work of the lowest quality. The zero rating represents "no work" or "lack of evidence." The zero point can be appended to the existing four-point scale without impacting the scale or existing performance descriptors.

Rubric Scale Descriptors
10 committee members responded to the Rubric Scale Descriptors Survey. The top scale descriptors were as follows when rank-ordering the top choices:
• Exemplary, Accomplished, Developing, Emerging (4 votes)
• Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard, Approaches Standard, Below Standard (2)
• Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching, Not Meeting (2)

The top scale descriptors were as follows when rank-ordering the combination of each individual's top and second choice:
• Well done, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, Incomplete (5)
• Exemplary, Accomplished, Developing, Emerging (4)
• Exceeds Standard, Meets Standard, Approaches Standard, Below Standard (3)

- Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching, Not Meeting (3)

Key discussion points:

- The descriptors need to be readily understandable by all users. Words such as *Developing* and *Emerging* may not make sense to individuals in some disciplines.

- Three should represent the target for the general population. Four should be reserved for performance that exceeds our expectations.

- What does the 2 point on the scale represent? Not good enough or good enough, but just barely? Which descriptors accurately convey the expectation?

- Some members feel strongly about including the descriptor "Needs Improvement."

- We are all using the VALUE rubrics as a guide. As long as the performance descriptors consistently align with the scale within and across the rubrics, we should be okay.

- Near the end of the meeting, after some members left, the remaining members discussed the possibility of simply using the numerals 0-4 without the labels since numerals are universally understandable. This approach was used when rubric developers determined that faculty relied too much on the labels rather than reading the performance descriptors in the rubric (Newell, Dahm, & Newell, 2002). The elimination of verbal descriptors might resolve the concerns some committee members had about the verbal scale descriptors. However, the reliance on the performance descriptors means that they have to be excellent. Further discussion was tabled since a number of committee members already left.

Next meeting: Are we meeting next week, during finals week? Wait to hear from Dr. Keller about the next meeting date.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 1:00.

Minutes prepared by Sophia Sweeney

References
Newell, J. A., Dahm, K. D, Newell, H. L. (2002). *Rubric development and inter-rater reliability issues in assessing learning outcomes.* Proceedings of the 2002 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition.

Nolet, V., & McLaughlin, M. J. (2005). *Accessing the general curriculum.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stellmack, M. A., Konheim-Kalkstein, Y. L., Manor, J. E., Massey, A. R., & Schmitz, J. A. P. (2009). An assessment of reliability and validity of a rubric for grading APA-style introductions. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*, 102-107.