

University Assessment Committee
February 6, 2015, 9:00-10:30
Raynor Library Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Patricia Bradford, Karen Evans, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Guy Simoneau, Fred Sutkiewicz, Pol Vandavelde, Baolin Wan, Joyce Wolburg, Jean Zanoni

Guests: Dan Bergen (Residence Life), Deb Swanson (Recreational Sports), Courtney Hanson (Career Services), and Kent Beausoleil, S.J. (Student Development)

I. Call to Order/Reflection

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. by Sharron Ronco.
No reflection was offered.

II. Approval of minutes from January 16, 2015 meeting

The minutes for the January 16, 2015 meeting were reviewed.
Motion to approve: Noreen Lephardt
Second: Pol Vandavelde
Motion passed by voice vote. Minutes approved without correction.

III. Reconsidering Assessment in the Co-Curricular Areas

Sharron asked guests from co-curricular areas to share questions or concerns they have regarding assessing student learning outcomes in the co-curricular areas. Jodi Blahnik shared how co-curricular areas differ from curricular assessment. A challenge in co-curricular is there is no consistent path for students – may see some students numerous times, some students never. There also is no set curriculum to follow and learning outcomes are vague. Gathering information is a challenge because can't require students to participate or complete assignments.

Career Services: have no data that students are helped. Students come when having trouble and then stop when they feel better but no actual data that they are better. Have learning outcomes but may not necessarily result in students ending up with satisfying job and no way to track students after graduation to determine end results. Noreen asked about possibility of using a survey to reach those students who used career services. Issue of low response rate and confidentiality in medical/counseling areas discussed. The biggest burden is counselors feel locked in to learning outcomes and making sure they hit all of them rather than having it be a fluid/natural process – counseling to the rubric rather than to the student.

Residence Life: Main focus is community development and RA's facilitate that development. Abstract learning outcomes that are indirectly assessed and most students think they are very proficient at outcomes. What do they get out of the assessment process: work on roommate conflict where RA's meet with each room with conflict.

Recreation Sports: Concentrate on assessment with specific groups such as student employees, club sport athletes. Assessment has helped look at what student employees are

learning but difficult to address all students who use services because no incentive for students to provide data. Another challenge raised by Jodi is that much of the work is inter-departmental.

Student Development: Vague learning outcomes and difficult to see if programming is tied to learning outcomes. There is a tendency to collect only quantitative data which is seen as problematic.

Sharron asked about other reporting requirements. All areas have an annual report requirement and program review. Noreen shared idea of authentic assessment and need to keep focus on how assessment is helping us improve our programs rather than only doing assessment for assessment sake. Fred shared an example of how the Dental School uses multiple data sources to assess learning outcomes, including qualitative sources.

Noreen asked what would be a helpful next step: Student Development: systematic review of learning outcomes; Counseling: develop type of curriculum map that represents all counseling areas and programs to help develop appropriate learning outcomes; Residence Life: maturity model is very faculty driven – could we develop a maturity model that is more co-curricular driven? Jodi said Student Affairs does have an assessment committee that represents most student affair co-curricular areas so some of this work could happen there. Sharron suggested idea of developing co-curricular outcomes for university and then decide where it makes most sense to gather information for how we are addressing those outcomes. Discussion of the shift from emphasis on quantitative, prescriptive assessment to more qualitative and organic. Discussed how might go about developing 3-5 overarching learning outcomes for co-curriculars and process for doing that. Jodi will take this idea back to Student Affairs Assessment Committee.

IV. Innovation Funding Proposal

Noreen suggested taking out the word “grading” and use “evaluation”. Fred suggested including additional assessment technology resources (i.e., Teleform). Discussed increasing the amount requested in budget for Year 2.

V. Professional Development Workshops

Sharon reminded us of the upcoming assessment workshops and UAC meetings.

VI. Meeting Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn: Jodi Blahnik

Second: Karen Evans

Motioned passed by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:23 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Evans