MEMBERS PRESENT: Acord, Bloom, Dooley, Gemoll, Halula, Kim, Krueger, Lephardt, Meyer, Moyer, Rofes, Zanoni

CALL TO ORDER: The Meeting was called to order at 9:00am by Vice Provost Bloom.

REFLECTION/PRAYER: Rofes

MINUTES: The minutes of September 19, 2008 were approved with corrections (dates on page 1, and modification of phrase on page 2 to “The purpose of this site is to reach out both externally and internally). (Rofes moved for approval, seconded by Acord. Passed unanimously.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS and INFORMATION ITEMS
- Bloom reported that she met with Tom Pionek, who is working on the design of the new assessment webpage. Lori Ozminkowski is working to reformat the materials on the existing page, which is necessary before moving them to a new site. Bloom reported that the work is more than she had anticipated.
- The “save the date” cards for the Peer Review Seminar have been mailed. Formal invitations will follow shortly. Each program is requested to send one person, although additional individuals can be accommodated.
- As of Tuesday’s deadline, 108 assessment annual reports have been submitted (there are a total of 104 academic program reports and 16 co-curricular reports). Bloom reported that the form did not hold up as well as expected, meaning additional data formatting will be required. Lephardt reported a challenge some users experienced with directions for starting/saving their reports. Bloom indicated that software exists that would assist with reporting, but financial resources have not currently been available. She noted that this results in staff time costs to accomplish the submission and review of the assessment reports.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Review of Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plans of New Programs

Bloom started the discussion by reviewing the revised document with guidelines for developing learning outcomes. After this discussion the Committed divided into four groups to review the submissions of five new programs:
- Corporate Communication
- Dispute Resolution
- Philosophy
- Elementary and Secondary Education (combined)
After twenty minutes in work groups, each team shared highlights of discussion on one of the program learning outcomes. Complete notes for each work group discussion were to be submitted to Bloom following the meeting.

Philosophy
- Language was reviewed for the first learning outcome. After a full-group discussion about the relationship between learning outcomes and performance indicators, the committee suggested a minor revision in the first learning outcome to “Use principles of reasoning (logic) in philosophical analysis.
- The work group indicated they felt there were measurement problems throughout the assessment plan, particularly with the relationship between grades and the application of a rubric to written work collected as part of the measurement. The committee agreed that assessment rubrics should not be correlated to student grades.
- A suggestion was made that the three #4 learning outcomes for the various tracks should be written as one learning outcome, and they seem closely related to learning outcome #3.
- A suggestion was made that data should be reviewed and discussed by the full faculty, in addition to the Assistant Department Chair.

Dispute Resolution
- Work group suggested a minor change to the wording of learning outcome #3, replacing “address” with “manage.” Performance indicators were reworked slightly and information from measures was included in the performance indicator column.
- A question was posed regarding measures as to who rates them and what rubric or rating form is applied. It was suggested that we need to be clear with programs that they should include information in their assessment plan about how the data collected will be evaluated.

Corporate Communication
- The work group felt that the document was well-done, although they noted that the column for “Use of Information” was not addressed.
- During the discussion, it was also clarified that assessment reporting for programs that included courses taught by different colleges/departments still happens through the program’s assessment report.

Education (Two programs)
- In several cases, the learning outcomes also included performance measures. For example, a change was recommended for outcome #1 to reword as “Apply deep content knowledge to complex teaching situations” and use the remainder of the sentence as three performance indicators.
- It was recommended that measures be evaluated by full-time faculty, in addition to student teaching supervisors.
- In addition, full-time faculty in the program should be included in the review of data and development of recommendations.
After discussion of the five program plans, Bloom reviewed what happens next with the committee recommendations:

- Bloom reviews the work group notes for each program and adds the comments and suggestions to the document submitted by the program’s assessment coordinator. She invites continued discussion with her for questions or clarification.
- Program assessment coordinators are encouraged to share the recommendations with program faculty, who meet to determine the final version of their outcomes and assessment plan.
- The final version is submitted to Bloom, who posts it on the assessment website. This becomes the “official” version of the program outcomes and assessment plan (until such time as they are revised).

2. Discussion of Institutional Assessment Data

Did not occur due to time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 10:32am

The next UAC meeting is October 24 at 9am in AMU 254.

Jon Dooley, Recorder