Assessment Committee -- Report of meeting of 9/22/09 -- Attending:
A.Dueweke, J. Dugas, Fink, Heinritz, K.W. Smith

1. Kathy Smith was chosen as chair.

2. The committee reviewed documents including a memo from outgoing chair Gary Gregg to FEC and the new committee in which next steps for the committee were outlined: a review of a list of departments with assessment plans in final form or in revision; an outline of a plan for assessing « breadth » in the new curriculum; a notation that the feasibility of tracking breadth in the new curriculum needs to be reviewed with the Registrar.

3. The committee put on its agenda for the next meeting a review of an edited version of DITF – developed outcomes of a K education.

4. The committee decided to ask FEC for a response to the previous committee’s memo of May 26, 2009, in which two strategies for assessing breadth were outlined. With receipt of a response from FEC, the committee will select the appropriate strategies and work with the Registrar to determine the feasibility of collecting the necessary data.

5. The committee invites departments who have assessment plans in final form or revised form to post these at the Moodle site.

6. The date for submission of departmental assessment steps and evaluation of them was September 1. After discussion, the committee recommends that departments observe a new deadline of October 15 as a more realistic time for submission of these documents.

7. The committee’s next meeting will be Tuesday October 6 at 4 p.m.
Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes
October 13, 2009

Present: Anne Dueweke, John Dugas, John Fink, Marin Heinritz, Kathy White Smith

1. We approved the minutes of 10/6/09

2. We addressed a question from James Lewis, Chair of EPC. On the new course form, faculty are asked to answer the question: “Describe any outcome assessment efforts associated with this class.” EPC is finding that the answers elicited are not helpful. We agreed that the question did not seem helpful and suggested instead that faculty identify which departmental learning outcomes are addressed by the course. Once we have formal institutional outcomes, it would also be helpful for faculty to identify which institutional outcomes are addressed by the course.

3. We returned to the list of institutional learning outcomes and pared it down further (see revised document submitted with these minutes). We still need to work on the wording of B #3. We also need to think further about whether the M-GUDS, LEP, or other instruments will be valid assessment instruments for some of these outcomes.

4. Kathy said she would email department chairs to remind them that assessment plans are due by October 15.

5. John Fink spoke Alyce Brady, Registrar, about the feasibility of assessing breadth as described in the memo from the Assessment Committee to FEC on May 26, 2009. Alyce said it would indeed be feasible to assess breadth through a report in Datatel Colleague, but not for another 4-5 months. By that time reporting capability in Datatel will be better established. This timeline is fine because we would start the transcript analysis with the graduating class of 2010.

6. Kathy reported that she asked James Lewis if EPC would continue to assign new courses an AOS, CR, QR, or CE designation so that the transcript analysis described in #5 would work. He has not replied as yet.

7. Anne said she would send out a copy of the Perry scheme to all committee members.

8. Kathy reported the following year-long agenda for the Assessment Committee to FEC:
   - Finalize a plan for assessing breadth
   - Continue to work with departments on refining their assessment plans and possibly read and respond to assessment reports (KWS will discuss the latter with the Provost)
   - Continue to refine institutional learning outcomes and identify direct measures for assessing them
   - Begin to develop rubric(s) for assessing departmental learning outcomes through SIPs and comps

Submitted by Anne Dueweke, October 13, 2009.
Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

November 24, 2009

Present: Anne Dueweke, John Dugas, John Fink, Marin Heinritz, Kathy Smith

1. We approved the minutes of 11/9/09 with amendments to point #2: Does a department repeat its assessment measurement of one year the following year as well as adding on? It would seem to be onerous if every measure had to be repeated each year.

2. We worked on the language for responses to the assessment reports from Art and Theatre. Departments can wait until the next annual assessment report to respond to our questions and suggestions.


4. We then reviewed the Spanish assessment report. All committee members agreed that the report was well organized with a focused analysis on three learning outcomes. The department used an appropriate measure for the outcomes (comps). We especially liked the reflection on whether they were assessing the right outcomes and using the right method. The strategies for improvement made good sense and if implemented should improve the Spanish curriculum for majors and non-majors alike. We discussed the possibility of using the Spanish assessment report as an example of what effective use of assessment looks like.

5. Next we reviewed the IAS assessment plan. The committee agreed that although most of the methods discussed in the plan have the potential to be good assessment tools, they are currently not being employed as such. The report did not provide meaningful evidence of how well students are achieving departmental learning outcomes. The committee suggests focusing on one assessment method and approaching the process with the expectation that it will yield helpful information on what is working and/or not working in terms of students achieving departmental learning outcomes. The committee suggests focusing on the method of comps for next year.

The committee also felt that the director could capitalize on the time invested in the very valuable activity of meeting with all IAS majors to discuss progress in the major by developing a simple rubric of questions typically asked of students in those meetings that relate to student learning outcomes. Doing so would likely capture some helpful assessment data.

Finally, the committee suggests eliminating the career meetings as an assessment tool because it appears that no real assessment data can be gleaned from those events.

6. The meeting was adjourned shortly before 5:00. The next meeting will be Monday, January 4, 2010 at 4:00 (Monday of first week). We will discuss the French and German assessment reports.

Respectfully submitted by Anne Dueweke, November 25, 2009.
Assessment Committee meeting minutes for January 4, 2010

In attendance: Anne D., John D., John F., Marin H., and Kathy S.

1. We approved the minutes from the 11/24/09 meeting.

2. Regarding the electronic report:
   - we will continue to accept comments from the faculty and incorporate them
   - we will include outcomes
   - we will mention that we are continuing to review assessment reports
   - we will remind those who have not submitted assessment reports to do so

3. Kathy will send the committee’s Art and Theatre Arts responses to Mickey

4. Anne will draft responses to IAS and Spanish reports and will send them to the committee for sign off

5. French Assessment Report
   - the committee agreed that this is a model document
   - this is a department that is learning from its assessment
   - there are a few minor typos for which the committee will submit corrections to Kathy
   - the committee suggests that outcomes one and two be written out on the report under “Learning Outcome(s)” so it is clear what they mean

6. German Assessment Report
   - the committee agreed that, like the French report, this is a model document—a nice example of what needed to be done. They picked something and administered it.
   - the committee wanted to know what the baseline data looked like under “Evidence/Data/Findings”. We also thought the department could comment on how the students did: strengths, weakness, etc.

7. Anne D. announced that Paul Sotherland will be giving a basic overview of the CLA results and the most recent 2009 NSSE results at the all-campus gathering tomorrow. She also announced she and Paul will offer a more comprehensive explanation of the data on Thursday, Jan. 14 at 4 p.m. in the Hicks banquet hall (with wine and cheese) to all staff and faculty.

8. Kathy will speak to Mickey about how best to elicit feedback from faculty, and whether or not an open discussion should be on the next faculty meeting agenda.

9. The Assessment Committee will next meet third week Monday, Jan. 18 at 4:10 p.m. (to give John and Kathy enough time to get to the meeting after teaching)
Assessment Committee Minutes
February 15, 2010

Present: Anne Dueweke, John Dugas, John Fink, Marin Heinritz, Kathy Smith

1. The committee approved the meeting minutes of Feb. 1, 2010 without changes.
2. The committee approved the draft response to Economics.
3. The committee made suggestions for revisions to the responses to Political Science and Psychology. Marin took notes and will revise accordingly.
4. We looked at assessment data from ANSO that was not yet available when they submitted their assessment report. We agreed that the data was useful and that the department was taking appropriate steps to act on what they are learning. When John Dugas drafts the response to the department he will say as much and also suggest that in the next annual update the department make explicit links between the analysis of data and the learning outcomes in the departmental assessment plan.
5. We noted that what we’re missing among all the materials submitted by Philosophy is an analysis of the findings. However, we also realized that the Assessment Annual Update Form does not explicitly ask for analysis. We will revise the form so that column three is titled “Analysis of Findings” instead of “Evidence/Data/Findings.” We agreed that Philosophy took the task seriously and so we do not want to ask for additional information at this point. Anne will draft a response based on what we have.
6. Anne will also draft a response to History; Kathy will try to get the rubric referred to in the English assessment report. After the committee has had a chance to review that rubric, Anne will draft a response to English.
7. Next week we will discuss the reports from Biology and Chemistry.
8. We briefly discussed how to foreground the Institutional Learning Outcomes during the 10th week faculty meeting. Here are some ideas in no particular order:
   a. Talk about them as a dashboard that is undergirded by a web of assessment work at the department and program level.
   b. For reaccreditation purposes these outcomes need to be assessable by direct measures.
   c. The instruments listed in parentheses are initial ideas, but more work needs to be done to determine appropriate measures.
   d. For the foreign language requirement, we think it’s important to periodically assess how well students are doing as measured by a language proficiency exam; however, the outcome does not mean that all students must demonstrate proficiency on an exam to meet the language requirement.
   e. Explain that the list of outcomes was whittled down from the learning outcomes that were articulated in the DITF document.
   f. Distinguish between the five dimensions as a guiding philosophy and the learning outcomes which will be measured periodically.

Respectfully submitted by Anne Dueweke
Assessment Committee Minutes

April 19, 2010

In attendance: John Dugas, Anne Dueweke, John Fink, Marin Heinritz, Kathy Smith

1. We approved the amended version of the 3/29/10 minutes.

2. Anne reported that only one application was received for a Teagle mini-grant and asked for the committee’s feedback on publicizing the Teagle mini-grant program to departments as a possibility for funding departmental assessment work. The committee agreed that it was fine to move ahead in this vein.

3. We discussed a revision of the assessment report template to clarify the instructions for departments. We agreed upon the following revisions:
   a. Switch the “Methods” and “Learning Outcomes” columns so that the “Learning Outcomes” column comes first.
   b. After “Learning Outcomes” put in parentheses: What did you examine?
   c. After “Methods” put in parentheses: What did you do?
   d. After “Evidence/Data/Findings” put in parentheses: What did you learn?
   e. After “Use of Results” put in parentheses: How will you use what you learned?

   See revised report template.

4. We discussed assessing breadth and decided that we will need a high degree of specificity. The next step is to talk with Alyce about the feasibility of doing a detailed breadth assessment. Kathy will invite Alyce to attend our next meeting.

5. Our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, April 28th, from 11:30-12:30 in the cafeteria (we’re trying to work around ACSJL director candidates).

Respectfully submitted by Anne Dueweke.