# Assessment Committee Meeting – Minutes

October 2, 2015 | 11:00 - 12:30 pm |Library 216

Attendees: Jim Hatton, Kristin, Craig Stillwell, Lee Ayers, Jamie Vener, Hart Wilson, Jody Waters, Vicki Suter, Dale Vidmar, Rene Ordonez, Erin Wilder, John Taylor, Jeff Gayton

1. Membership and meeting times.

Member list: Jim Hatton(2 yrs), Kristin Nagy Catz, Craig Stillwell(2 yrs), Lee Ayres, Jamie Vener(1 yr), Dorothy Ormes(1 yr), Hart Wilson, Jody Waters, Vicki Suter, Dale Vidmar(honorary?), Rene Ordonez(3 yrs), Erin Wilder(2 yr), Chris Stanek(in absentia), Tiki Boudreau(No longer on the committee), John Taylor(3 yr), Jeff Gayton, Another 3 yr person?, Heather Buchanan(student)

 We need a three year person and a one year person. Jim will inform Deb Brown and ask David Humphrie for an art person.

Election of chairperson – Jim was elected

Meeting times: Every other week starting today – Already on our google calendars

1. Goals for this year: Last year’s statement - As we go about our business and focus on learning outcomes we will use “teaching for student learning and success” as a framing device.

Suggested Goals:

* Perform Institutional senior writing assessment adding a QL component first quarter – Revisit the process that includes FUSE.

The Usem instructors will be comparing FUSE outcomes with corresponding senior writing. The library will be working with the MAT faculty on an information literacy assessment. This led to a discussion about the role of the committee as programs, in these cases – Usem, Library, MAT, begin to do detailed comprehensive studies and reports. The studies are primarily used for the specific programs but they may have larger implications for the university. We suggest that if the studies are to be shared widely that they come through the Assessment Committee for review and discussion and particularly if they go to the senate they be given the committee’s imprimatur. We hope to see the results of the two studies.

* Program Review process through this committee suspended for this accreditation year. We can help with doing the analysis and setting up the process – the critical friend idea.

The program review process will be handled out of the provost’s office this year as the academic program reviews are critical to the accreditation report. The summary report that we usually do will be done as part of the accreditation report by an accreditation steering subcommittee composed, as it turns out, of members of the assessment committee. The report will be reviewed by the assessment committee. We will be offering help to programs as they work on their reports.

* Devise an institutional oral communication assessment – Rubric exists.

We will do this year. We will need to get an idea of the population of possible senior talks, look at and possibly improve the rubric, and run a pilot this year.

* Organize three assessment workshops – possibly the fall workshop facilitated by a subcommittee of the Accreditation Steering Committee.

We are thinking that the fall and winter workshops should be facilitated by the Accreditation Steering committee. The program reviews will take the form of report structured identically to the accreditation guidelines. They are due to the provost on March 15, 2016.

* Determine our role vis-à-vis graduate programs.

We don’t think this comes under our purview. Jim will check our committee’s charge.

* Maintain our vision for eventual use of portfolios as an institutional assessment device.

We will maintain the portfolio task force as a subcommittee of our committee and reaffirm their efforts.

* Work with the university studies people as they design assessments for the integration strands.

There is possibility of getting hold of writing from the university studies courses as an intermediate measure.

* Oversee the CLA for this year.

We talked about getting seniors to take the test, the changes to the test, and how to award the students for doing well.

* Communicate to our students the work of the assessment committee.

Heather will be the student rep this year again. Yeah!

1. Information
* Program List in TD will be cleaned up.
* Student names in TD are forbidden.
* TD will have common structure.
* Kristin has a PEAK student.
* Suggestion: Look at Support programs in TD.
1. Getting our processes in motion – Planning our second meeting.

We adjourned early for members to get to convocation.