University Assessment Committee
October 24, 2008
Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bardwell, Bloom, Dooley, Gemoll, Kim, Krueger, Lephardt, Levy, Meyer, Moyer, Rofes

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

REFLECTION/PRAYER: Kim

MINUTES: The minutes of October 3, 2008 were approved with modifications.
Modification 1: Moyer’s name was misspelled throughout the minutes. Modification 2: Remove names of reporters from all groups. Rofes moved for approval, seconded by Meyer; 9 votes for, 0 votes against and 1 abstention.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Student Affairs web site - Dooley referenced the Division of Student Affairs assessment web site (www.mu.edu/osd/assessment.shtml). Bloom noted this might be a good model for departments to post their assessment data.

Assessment reports update – Bloom indicated that program directors will receive a pdf containing information submitted on the 2007-08 report.

Moyer raised concern that a PHD report in his department reflects data from only one student. Bloom and others acknowledged this to be a significant issue that needs to be addressed. Rofes suggested that Kipfmueller from the Office of General Counsel on campus be contacted for his opinion on the issue. Bloom said she would contact General Counsel. Bloom also indicated that she would send a note to program leaders to let them know that she is aware of this issue and that it is being addressed. Lephardt asked about the requirement for posting reports and who will give directive. Bloom indicated that Pionek (OMC) will have a developmental version of the assessment web site soon for the UAC to review and that these issues can be addressed at that time.

CONTINUING BUSINESS: Institutional assessment data (skipped this item). Program for assessment peer review working seminars, November 21. There will be two sessions; one from 8:30am to noon and a second from 1-4:30pm. Bloom inquired as to what would be helpful for participants prior to beginning the actual reviews. She noted that at the workshop last year, Meyer introduced the rubric which was followed by a panel that illustrated the review process. It is estimated that about 60 percent of the participants
this year will have attended a peer review session previously. Bloom will work to ensure that a “veteran” is placed at each table.

Lephardt suggested we provide “big picture” information, especially with respect to the upcoming focused site visit. Rofes believes people want to know what they’ll be doing during the day and thus thinks spending time reviewing the rubric would be helpful. Bloom suggested a presentation on measures, with special attention to the distinction between direct and indirect measures. Dooley thought it might be good to allow participants to talk about the feedback they received last year at this event and how they used it to improve their assessment work. Krueger suggested a focus on the vignettes that have been drafted for the HLC report. These stories illustrate how programs have closed the loop, which could be the event theme this year. Meyer volunteered to review the vignettes and identify a few for Bloom that might be highlighted at the workshop.

Bloom clarified that each program should send someone to the workshop and that if a department has more than one program, it should send more than one person. She believes it is beneficial for someone from each program to actually be on hand to hear the feedback. Bloom further noted, in response to Dooley’s inquiry, that table leaders could review their own programs.

As to availability for the workshop, all members of the UAC (present at this meeting) indicated they were available for both sessions with the following exceptions: Meyer (excused for a national conference in San Diego), Rofes (available in the morning only – has recruited someone to replace him in the afternoon session). Bloom will contact former Committee members to see if they’d be willing to come back to be a table leader for a session.

**NEW BUSINESS:** Rubric Review – Committee members reviewed three of the five rubric categories making the following changes:

**Learning Outcomes** – Add a bullet to Level 2 that reads, “Learning outcomes are routinely communicated to faculty.” Bloom noted this was not something that was emphasized previously and so workshop participants may have questions about why it appears in Level 2 (reflecting university expectations) rather than Level 3 (reflecting best practices).
Assessment Measures – Level 1: Bold the word “generally” in the second bullet; Level 2: Add a parenthetical example to the first bullet (to make it “fit” with the example provided in the second bullet of Level 1 (Bloom will do this); Level 3: remove “(not on 06-07 report)” from third bullet; also Level 3: Bloom to rework bullet two to focus more on “use”.

Results – Add “(not on 07-08 report)” to the last bullet on Level 3.

Moyer suggested the rubric be sent to program leaders prior to the workshop. Dooley pointed out that the use of the word “faculty” in latter parts of the rubric may be problematic as it doesn’t fit all relevant audiences.

The UAC will complete their review of the rubric at the next meeting on November 7.

Bloom asked for volunteers to present the rubric at the workshop and to provide an opening reflection. Krueger volunteered to present the rubric (Meyer to send bullet points from last year) and Lephardt agreed to provide a reflection which she will present in the afternoon session and someone else (need a volunteer) will present in the morning session.

Prior to adjournment, Bloom distributed an article on assessment from the July/August 2008 issue of Change.

Meeting adjourned at 10:34am.

Respectfully submitted

Gary Meyer