UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

MARCH 25, 2011

9:00 AM to 10:30 AM

ZILBER HALL, 470

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE


Excused: Dooley, Kim

The March 25, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was called to order by Gary Meyer at 9:03a.m. Eva Soeka offered the reflection.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Halula, seconded by Wolburg, to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2011 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION ITEMS

The Chair asked the members to note the following dates:

Friday, September 16, 9-12, New Assessment Leaders Training

Friday, November 11, 9-3, Peer Review Working Sessions, morning and afternoon

Friday, February 17 (tentative hold)

Committee meetings next year will be at the same time and on the same schedule.

The Chair stated that the review of applicants for the Assessment Director position would begin on April 22. Currently, there were two applicants.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

There was a lengthy discussion of the Peer Review Rubric. Bardwell distributed a chart with several highlighted sections. There was a discussion of “assessment cycle” and whether that should be delineated in the rubric.

Monahan said that #14 on report deals with this issue. Bardwell commented that it is important to have a direction sheet distributed ahead of time. Meyer said that the Committee might want to make this visible to accreditors. Lephardt said it should be visible to people doing the assessment.

Sutkiewicz asked whether we aggregated data across the University. Lephardt asked whether this should be published somewhere. Meyer noted that it is on the web site. He also stated that it is difficult to aggregate data if it is being “tweaked” each year.

Lephardt asked what are “best practices.” Acord commented that we need a direction sheet to complete the rubric. Meyer asked if it is possible to meet “best practices” without meeting everything that comes before it. Bardwell asked whether we are aggregating data by each point or by program or department. She further asked if we even discuss “best practices” if we haven’t met standards. Lephardt asked whether we have to complete one level to move to the next. Is it developmental? What do we want this rubric to do?

Lephardt asked whether the rubric is a data tool. She continued that this is a formative assessment tool. Meyer reminded the committee that this is not a research project. Peggy Bloom often said that this is the “successive approximations.”

Bardwell asked if this data would be reviewed to determine the success or failure of programs, or to close programs. Hammer stated that we could change ‘best
practices” to “exceeds standards.” Wolburg stated “exceeds expectations” may be an alternative.

Wolburg asked what “routinely sharing” means. There was a brief discussion of the web site and other methods.

Meyer stated that it was important not to lose sight of the big picture. Meyer said there were really two items to discuss: goals and outcomes. Wolburg asked are we really asking of learning outcomes are appropriate for goals. Meyer stated that at this point we should eliminate the sentence: Learning outcomes are based on program goals.

Bardwell stated that there was a problem with the column entitled “Communications and Conclusions.” It was agreed to change that title to “Analysis.” Meyer added the sentence: “Timeline for the assessment of improvement actions specified.”

Meyer said that the sentence should be: are all learning outcomes assessed annually or have you identified and assessment cycle? Bardwell suggested deleting that question.

NEW BUSINESS

Due to the length of the previous discussion, the discussion regarding Graduate Student Core Learning Outcomes was tabled until the next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

NONE

ADJOURN

The March 25, 2011 meeting of the University Assessment Committee was adjourned at 10:30am (Motion: Halula, Second: Wolburg).

Respectfully submitted,

Eva M. Soeka, Recorder