UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
December 3, 2010
9:00 AM to 10:30 AM
Zilber Hall 470

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Meyer (Chair), Acord, Ali, Bansal, Bardwell, Halula, Hammer, Kim, Lephardt, MacBride, Monahan, Soeka, Sutkiewicz and Wolburg

EXCUSED

Dooley and Zanoni

ABSENT

Dunnum

The December 3, 2010 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was called to order by Gary Meyer at 9:05 a.m. The Reflection was given by Noreen Lephardt. Laura MacBride from the Office of Institutional Support was introduced as the committee replacement for Gary Levy.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Halula, seconded by Kim, to approve the Minutes of the November 5, 2010 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Webcast on Assessment Reports.** The Chair announced a forthcoming webcast entitled “Outcomes-Based Academic Assessment Reporting” that will be broadcast on January 21, 2011 (12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.). There was consensus that the committee should view the webcast in lieu of its regularly scheduled meeting at 9:00 a.m. on that date. It was further suggested that invitations be extended to deans, program leaders, chairs, and representatives of the Provost’s Office.
2. **Computational Sciences Assessment Plan.** The Chair announced that the Computational Sciences Assessment Plan will be reviewed during the 2011 Spring semester.

**CONTINUING BUSINESS**

**Discussion of November 12, 2010 Assessment Peer Review Working Seminar**

1. The Chair reviewed data (furnished in advance to committee members) generated from the feedback form that was sent to participants in the November 12, 2010 Assessment Peer Review Working Seminar. The Chair also announced that the practice of distributing assessment reports to seminar participants in advance of the seminar (a practice initiated in 2010) will be implemented again for future seminars.

2. Kim raised the problem of absences at the seminar (an absence meaning that a particular program does not have a representative at the seminar). A question was raised whether unrepresented programs should even be reviewed at the seminar. There was consensus that, when a program is unrepresented at the annual seminar, the Program Assessment Leader for that program should be notified that the program was not reviewed; a copy of this notice should be sent to the supervising Dean and Chair of that program.

3. Hammer asked whether there is a problem if the Program Assessment Leader for a given program does not participate in the annual working seminar. Meyer replied that there is value if the leader is there but that it is also valuable if others have a chance to represent their respective programs. Lephardt suggested that substitutes for Program Assessment Leaders should be prepared to participate in the peer review process.

4. There was a discussion about the rubric used for the annual peer review seminar and about potential problems with the rubric (e.g., Is the rubric too linear? Should certain items be removed from scoring process?) Meyer appointed a subcommittee consisting of Acord, Bardwell and Lephardt to re-examine the rubric and report back to the committee in February 2011.

5. Sutkiewicz raised issues regarding the summary statements that are included at the conclusion of annual program assessment reports and whether some are erroneous or otherwise inadequate. He suggested that perhaps the posting of the summaries on the web should be delayed until after the annual peer review seminar. Lephardt suggested that the UAC consider providing a template that programs could use when drafting the summary statements.
6. Bardwell asked whether the whole assessment process is becoming too “pro forma.” Are programs really making deep changes on the basis of assessment data? There was discussion about the fact that the annual assessment report does not allow all programs to depict everything that is being done in their programs.

7. Soeka suggested that the UAC needs to take care of its image within the University. It should not do anything to suggest that its role is one of “assessment police.” Rather, it must frame its image such that the University community accurately understands the true role of the UAC in the assessment initiative.

8. Acord suggested that the UAC consider ways to shorten the annual peer review seminar. Meyer explained that two things are actually occurring at the seminar: training and program review. Bardwell suggested that the training function be eliminated in view of the fact that UAC offers an assessment training program earlier in the academic year. Meyer suggested that the UAC consider offering a spring workshop on some advanced assessment topic. There was consensus that the morning session of the peer review seminar be scheduled from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., that the afternoon session be held from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m., and that the training segment be eliminated.

9. Acord suggested that Meyer should advise Program Assessment Leaders that the UAC has considered feedback about the 2010 peer review seminar and is making some changes based on that feedback.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was considered at the December 3, 2010 meeting.

ADJOURN

The December 3, 2010 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Hammer
Recorder