# Assessment Committee Meeting – Minutes

February 5, 2016 | 11:00 - 12:30 pm |Library 329

Attendees: Jim Hatton, Kristin Nagy Catz, Craig Stillwell, Jamie Vener, Dorothy Ormes, Hart Wilson, John Taylor, Heather Buchanan, Lee Ayers

1. University Studies Committee proposal to the senate – **We examined the documents.**
   1. **We felt that TracDat should be deemphasized. Instead just list the levels of instruction.**
   2. **The condensed syllabus should include information about the strand the course satisfies and the goals of that strand and therefore the goals for the course.**
   3. **We did a little bit of close reading and suggested some clarifying (we thought) changes to Lee Ayers.**
   4. **We were concerned that the skill level goals where too low on the Bloom’s taxonomy.**
   5. **Although the document requires samples or at least descriptions of assignments that would meet the goals, there is no requirement about standards for the assessments as might be provided with a rubric or key.**
   6. **Do the forms meet a goal of getting the strand courses working toward the same goals?**
   7. **We had a long discussion about how these forms fit into the overall mission of the assessment committee. Will there ever come a time when the assessment committee can gather and evaluate student work from all strand E courses for example, and report on the university’s progress in achieving it Humanities mission as descripted in strand E?**
2. Senior writing:
   1. Are we done now? **We have 62 out of 66. Jim will check what is up.**
   2. Discussion of what we saw. These topics came up last meeting. We will review and extend.
      1. We may want to revisit the standard conventions rubric. – **The committee reemphasized the need to revisit the rubrics.**
      2. The library is in process for doing the information literacy evaluation. – **Still working on it.**
      3. The paper in a foreign language was evaluated with the help of a person knowledgeable in that language.
      4. Self-reflective and creative writing senior writing can be problematic. We need a category of paper called “problematic”. The term “nonapplicable” was rejected. We spent some time discussing what we really wanted in the senior writing samples – really the best examples of senior work. Somewhere, according to our catalogue, seniors need to do some sort of research work. And that is what we want to see.
      5. Are we behind the curve? Should we be considering blogs for example?
      6. We need to determine why we have seen so many papers that need revision.
      7. We may start saving exemplars of senior writing. **Jim will ask for exemplars.**
   3. How should the report look? We will look at last year’s.
      1. We will want to separate our report for FUSE and Senior Writing. – **The committee agreed.**
      2. Is this year the year when we have some calls to action? **The committee noted that we haven’t connected measurement to action. The papers might be better this year if they are for many reasons including the passing out of the rubric to interested departments. The unrevised papers may be a result of system – written near the end of the last term, handed in at the last minute etc.**
      3. **The USem people rated FUSE papers and capstone papers for the same people. Chris Stanek is working on the data. Jim will work with Lee on the form of the report. It will be separate from the Assessment Committee’s Senior writing report.**
      4. **Jim, Kristin and Lee will think through what we want in the senior writing report. We will compare years but will all sorts of caveats.**
3. Oral communication survey – Reminder: we would like to get a survey done by mid-February. Jim will collate the results. – In progress. **Jim reminded the members of the committee.**
4. Planning for the CLA – We will be contacting programs to send cohorts of students. The programs will be picked at random. - progress
5. Is Linkedin useful for our purposes? This is a place for students to post their good work and recommendations from their teachers. Also a way to keep track of alumni.

On-going (so we don’t forget)

* Portfolios
* University Studies – Houses are doing strand writing which is being assessed. Lee will report back to the committee. The University Studies committee is revising forms to be sure foundational skills are still being assessed. – see topic 1
* Communicating with our students – Language from the catalog:

**Assessment**

SOU is committed to improving the quality of instruction by assessing student outcomes. The University determines the progress of the learning process by relating outcomes to clearly defined learning objectives. During their collegiate careers, students actively participate in the outcomes assessment process. Student participation contributes to curriculum design and the evolution of the learning community.

John is working on some kind of document or other means on what graduates have to learn for his program.