ATTENDANCE

Meyer (Chair), Ali, Bansal, Bardwell, Dooley, Dunnum, Halula, Hammer, Kim, Lephardt, MacBride, Monahan, Taylor (substitution for Soeka), Wolburg, and Zanoni.

The February 4, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was called to order by Gary Meyer at 9:05 a.m. The Reflection was given by Kyuil Kim.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Halula, seconded by Kim, to approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2010 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

Discussion of January 21, 2011 Webcast on Assessment Reports

1. The Chair reported that there were 29 attendees.

2. There was a discussion of the articulation of performance goals. Our reports tell us how many students perform at what level, but we do not ask programs to set specific goals in terms of the numbers of students who meet or exceed the standards. Should we add the idea of performance goals into our assessment reporting documents? The general consensus is to try to build this more formally into our assessment program in one or two years.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of revised assessment plans from ANTH, SOWJ, and OSD.
   a. ANTH: The committee was concerned that the measurements are redundant. Be more specific about what the measures are and whether they are identical across all courses. It is not clear what the assessment cycle is (which outcome in which year?). The plan refers to the sr. survey, but which survey (university?), and which items (which survey questions correspond to which outcome). The program might consider measuring two outcomes in a year. Learning outcomes and performance indicators were definite strengths.
b. SOWJ: The first outcome is unclear as to what “the standard of social justice” might be. For the fifth outcome, is identification sufficient? They provided performance goals, but not description of the measures. They should diversify the way in which they collect data (a single multiple choice exam). They should link specific outcomes to specific questions on the exam, rather than using aggregate data.

c. OSD: Perhaps it might be useful in general to provide background information, like mission and goals, for every program. Some examples of the “prompts” used as indicators in the first outcome would be helpful. What sorts of actions might be taken in response to the data collected here? Since only the first learning outcome was discussed today, the rest will be discussed in the next meeting.

2. Hiring a full-time Assessment Director. Meyer described his vision for the hiring of an assessment professional to help oversee the day-to-day management of assessment on campus. Part of the aim is to associate assessment more with student learning than as compliance with Provost mandates, which is why the director will be situated in the Center for Teaching and Learning. As Dr. Meyer begins the work on drafting the position description, he has asked for a discussion of the committee’s vision for the Assessment Director, especially as regards qualifications. During the course of the discussion, the committee expressed a concern that the Director function more as a consultant and resource for faculty and co-curricular programs, rather than taking over assessment completely.

ADJOURN

The February 4, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Monahan