The May 6, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was called to order by Gary Meyer at 9:03 a.m. Lea Acord offered the reflection.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Lephardt and seconded by Monahan to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2011 meeting with one correction, which Meyer will make. The motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION ITEMS

Assessment Director Search. Meyer announced that the search committee reviewed 13 applications for the position, narrowed the pool to five applicants based on 30-minute telephone interviews, and ultimately selected two candidates for campus visits on May 16th and 18th. Both candidates have managed assessment at their respective universities. Since several UAC members are on the search committee, Meyer invited the other UAC members who do not serve on the search committee to attend a 30-minute session from 8:45-9:15 a.m. on each of the two days. The two candidates will also do a campus-wide presentation for chairs, deans, and other stakeholders from 1:30-2:30 in the lower level of the Raynor Library. UAC members were encouraged to attend one or both sessions. The search committee members are: John Dooley, Gary Meyer, Lea Acord, Kyuil Kim, Tom Hammer, Mike Monahan, Alix Riley, and Linda Latch.

Candidates have already been asked to address what’s attractive about the position, why MU is a good fit, what their past experience lends to the position, and how they will build a culture of assessment. However, Meyer asked for suggestions on additional topics that the candidates should address. Responses emphasized: 1) how to move assessment forward and 2) how to improve teaching.
NEW BUSINESS

The Committee reviewed the learning outcomes for the Master of Arts in Counseling and the Master of Science in Clinical Mental Health Counseling programs. Meyer provided context and noted that the set of learning outcomes are the same for the two COUN masters programs, although program leader Lisa Edwards recognizes the importance of adding other learning outcomes that would distinguish the programs. The two programs share a common core but have different hourly requirements for licensing (48 versus 60 hours). Furthermore, the audience for the two programs also differs since one is aimed at children the other is aimed at adults.

The Committee reviewed all five learning outcomes and noted that the role of self in LO#3 is unclear. There was confusion as to whether the outcome to be measured centered on the motivation of the counselor or the impact of the counselor upon the client. Further discussion centered on how to quantify skills of self reflection. The Committee recommended rewording the LO for clarity.

The Committee also questioned the meaning of “strong identity” in LO#4 and asked what the core behavior is. Members suggested fleshing out differences between identity and professional development. Soeka suggested that counselors must examine one’s own biases regarding race and gender, and practice journaling to become a more reflective practitioner.

The Committee recommended that program leaders develop at least one additional LO to differentiate the two programs and that they frame the differences in programs based on hours.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

Meyer asked the Committee to revisit the Rubric for Self-Assessment and Peer Review Feedback and compare it to the document that PALs fill out for their Program Assessment Report. He asked specifically if changes to the Program Assessment Report are needed. As a preliminary question, Bardwell asked if data from the previous year be provided so that PALs don’t have to re-enter all data, which is a cumbersome process. Meyer had practical concerns and was uncertain that this could happen, but he acknowledged the issue.

Regarding the rubric, Lephardt suggested that “exceeds standards” on the LOs be written in a conditional way. Instead of saying that LOs were reviewed by relevant stakeholders, she suggested it say that they were reviewed by some relevant stakeholders and then provide examples such as alumni, board members, etc.

Bardwell asked for clarification on questions 4, 5, and 6 of the Assessment Report. She questioned whether we want to know whether the LOs were “received” or “reviewed.” Meyer suggested that we should ask whether students and faculty received LOs on an annual basis and
whether any relevant stakeholders reviewed the LOs. We could then ask who these stakeholders are.

Concerns were raised regarding question #14. Meyer asked whether it would be better to ask PALs to identify the LOs assessed in a given year and in the following year than to ask the question as it stands, which poses a yes/no question about a rotation plan.

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was presented, and Meyer took the opportunity to thank members of the Committee for a job well done.

ADJOURN

The May 6, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wolburg, Recorder