

University Assessment Committee
October 5, 2012
Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Lea Acord, Rebecca Bardwell, Patricia Bradford, Jon Dooley, Kim Halula, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Michelle Nemer, Chris Perez, Eva Soeka, Sonia Shan, John Su, Fred Sutkiewicz, Joyce Wolburg

REFLECTION/PRAYER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 by Sharon Ronco. The new student representative, Sonia Shah, was introduced and she shared a bit of her background with us. Michelle Nemer offered a seasonal reflection, Lessons from Geese.

APPROVAL of MINUTES

The exceptional quality of the minutes was reflected. A correction to the minutes was noted. The comment that Sharon Ronco was looking for alternate funding for the mini grants from the HLC is in error. The proposals to HLC were for presentations rather than funding. Proposals were submitted to the HLC conference by Sharon Ronco, Eva Soeka, Noreen Lephardt, and Rebecca Bardwell. With this correction the minutes were approved unanimously (Eva Soeka moved for approval and Noreen Lephardt seconded).

CONTINUING ITEMS

- Comments were elicited on the September 21st new PALs workshop:
 - Many UAC committee members presented and were present at the workshop.
 - 14 new PALs were in attendance.
 - The program went well and attendees were engaged.
 - Even those who had attended previous workshops learned something new at this workshop.
 - The presentations seemed new even though some of the material was recycled from older presentations.
 - Those UAC committee members who are not PALs found the information helpful.
 - The presenters were enthusiastic.
 - The program may have been a bit rushed – it could have incorporated more practice.
 - In the future the workshop could be more specific – for example ask PALs to bring program objectives with them and work specifically on objective writing.
 - It was a good overview – save the specific information for another time.
 - If the program were longer people may not be able to carve out enough time for it.
 - More departments are asking for 1 on 1 help

- Update on pending assessment plans
 - There has been some push back, but most units are on board.
 - There have been no reports of problems inputting data.

NEW BUSINESS

- Review of mini-grant reports
 - All recipients did what they said they were going to do.
 - Two reports are not yet in.
 - Initially it was intended that recipients would present at the Peer Review Workshop. Looking at the reports it appears that not all are amenable to presentation. – Three will be asked to make presentations.
 - Three reports may be too much time for the Peer Review Workshop.
 - What other methods for dissemination of the results might be considered?
 - How might the grants/grant recipients be assessed for the UAC's learning?
 - Todd Hernández was asked to specifically comment on his grant, A Comprehensive Instrument for Assessing Foreign Language Speaking Proficiency Program-Wide. He reported that the instrument was effective for assessing language proficiency, but the time for administering it was unwieldy. Their next step is to make it more sustainable.
 - A table summarizing the results of the Mini-grants is attached.
- Planning for peer review seminar
 - Sharon Ronco asked how can the Peer Review Workshop be ramped up? A discussion ensued which contained many useful but somewhat random suggestions.
 - Have participants come prepared to discuss specific questions.
 - Group programs into more similar groups (i.e., undergraduate programs, professional programs)
 - A discussion on the method for disseminating the reports included such suggestions as asking participants to bring computers to the workshop, asking departments to print off reports, asking participants to print off the reports. The final summary suggested sending PDF files of the reports for a table to each person at the table. Each person could decide to print off the reports, bring an electronic device with the reports or make notes to bring to the meeting.
 - Perhaps we have had enough change this year and the format of the workshop should stay the course for another year.
 - Give participants 3 questions to focus their review on. Maybe the questions could push the programs to a new level. An example might be benchmarking. The educational piece could be on the same topic, benchmarking and then the programs could immediately see the use of the educational piece as they review the reports.
 - Sharon was asked what her 3 goals for the workshop are. They are:
 1. Move the ship forward – this is her only chance for educating all the PALs.
 2. Have participants gain new information from the workshop.

3. Switch the emphasis in the PALs minds from “What do you want from me” to “What will help improve your program.”
- What will the rubric for the assessment of the plans look like? The previous rubric does not reflect the framework and language of the ARMS program.
 - A poster session from Jon’s office plus a room for presentations on the Mini-Grants was suggested for the lunch hour. Participants from the morning session could stay for it and participants from the afternoon session could come early for it.
- Peer Review Workshop specifics.
 - November 9th
 - 9:30 – Noon and 1:00 to 3:30.
 - Tables will be assigned with similar programs.
 - Programs will be provided with specific questions to address during the review.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30.

Respectfully submitted,
Rebecca Bardwell, Recorder

Mini-Grant Report of Results

Department	Amount	Used for	Project leader	Proposed timeframe	Report?	Expended	Project Completed	Comments
Ed Policy and Leadership	\$2,400	Graduate student	Jeff Labelle	Spring 2012	Yes	\$2,400	Yes	Survey of 77 program graduates conducted. Report contains analysis of comments for perceived strengths, weakness of program preparation. Alumni data base constructed.
Nursing	\$2,500	\$1,700 for graduate student, \$750 for software.	Kerry Kosmoski-Goeffert and John LaDisa	Spring, 2012	Yes	\$1,884	No	Demographic questionnaire still under development; five sepsis scenarios and corresponding performance rubrics were developed. Had a problem with graduate student help.
International Business	\$1,600	\$1,000 for student, \$600 software	Jamshid Hosseini	2012-2015	Pending		No	Initial GPI surveys completed; students will be post-surveyed in 2015. Report on pre-survey results to be submitted October 2012.
Office of International Education	\$2,500	\$1,000 for test codes, \$1,500 for training.	Blake Ward	IDI seminar is June 18-20; IDI pilot will occur in 2012-13.	Yes	\$2,458	No	In progress: 39 students were given the pre-departure IDI survey; 39 students remain to be surveyed. Final report will be submitted February, 2013.
Ed Policy and Leadership	\$3,000	Workshop leader from Alverno	Joan Whipp	Spring, 2012	Yes	\$3,000	Yes	35 Participants in workshops on new Teacher Performance Assessments for licensure requirements. 8 classes are piloting assessments this fall.

