UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE  
February 18, 2011  
9:00 AM to 10:30 AM  
Zilber Hall 470

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE


The February 18, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was called to order by Gary Meyer at 9:05 a.m. The Reflection was offered by Kim Halula.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Dooley, seconded by Halula, to approve the Minutes of the February 4, 2011 meeting with change in date of meeting to February 4, 2011. Motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS and INFORMATION ITEMS

None

CONTINUING BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of revised assessment plans from OSD and Computational Sciences. 
   a. OSD: The committee felt the program did a nice job of matching up the beliefs in their program mission and vision to the program learning outcomes. Committee members had some difficulty matching measures to performance indicators and suggested keying the measures to numbered indicators. A discussion followed that many learning outcomes for ODS were affective measures rather than cognitive/academic measures which are common to evaluation of academic programs.
   b. Computational Science Ph.D.: The committee felt the program did a very good job overall. They recommended substituting the word “field” for “area” in the first outcome. The committee recommending omitting the words “read, comprehend and” from third learning outcome as the third action of “synthesize” in the learning outcome was a higher level skill that encompassed the other actions. Under the Use of the Information heading, the committee members suggested a need to identify how the information would be used beyond how information would be shared.
c. Computational Science Masters.: The committee also felt the term “area” was too
generic in the first outcome and suggested the be more specific in identifying “the field
of computational sciences.” Similar to the Ph.D. program, the committee
recommending omitting the words “read, comprehend and” from second learning
outcome as the third action of “synthesize” in the learning outcome was a higher level
skill that encompassed the other actions. Under the Use of the Information heading, the
committee members suggested a need to identify how the information would be used
beyond how information would be shared.

2. Assessment Peer Review Rubric Review
Rebecca Bardwell presented a draft of subcommittee (Bardwell, Lephardt, Acord)
document revising the Peer Review Rubric. Initial feedback from the committee was quite
positive and complimentary. The format of the document was changed from a list to a grid.
The level numbering system was changed to a descriptive, nominal system using the
headings “Best Practice, Meets Standard, Developing, and Undeveloped.” The formatting
change was designed to encourage reviewers to focus on Best Practice elements first. The
committee questioned the indicators listed under best practice for Measures. Specifically,
direct measures are regarded as more powerful and desired indicators than indirect
measures. The committee felt the second indicator under best practice for Measures is
actually a “meets standard” expectation. There were a few performance indicators that
seemed to be lost during the transition from the old to new document or migrated to a
different area. The subcommittee will again review the document and report back to the
UAC.

ADJOURN

The February 18, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was adjourned
at 10:30 am (Bardwell/Wolburg).

Respectfully submitted,

Fred Sutkiewicz