# Assessment Committee Meeting – Minutes

May 19, 2017 | 11:00 - 12:30 pm |Library 113

Attendees: Jim Hatton, Kristin Nagy Catz, Craig Stillwell, Dorothy Ormes, Hart Wilson, John Taylor, Heather Buchanan, Lee Ayers, Jody Waters, ~~Rene Ordonez~~, ~~Erin Wilder~~

Meeting rooms and dates for spring term. May 19 – Lib 216, June 2 – Lib 329

1. Spring Oral Assessment
   1. Review our efforts at SOAR. **We want to relook at the rubric checklist. Idea worked fine. On the team survey leave the assertions question blank. Even if your partner didn’t show up, put your (individual) results in the team survey. Still some no shows at SOAR. Maybe the door could be posted or the introducer could still show up and say cancelled.**
   2. Signing up for presentations.
      1. Kristin will compile a list of non-SOAR presentations to visit later. **She will.**
      2. We will shoot for 6 per team – seniors only. Subtract from the number you did at SOAR? **Yes.**
   3. Results to be amalgamated with Winter assessments.
2. Program Review Evaluations
   1. How has it gone? **You can send them back. We are worried about the response rate and the fact that most programs are not closing the loop.**
3. **We talked about committee membership. Next year’s roster needs to be in place before summer.**
4. **We also talked about how to measure critical thinking for non-written artifacts.**
5. Date of spring workshop. June 2
   1. Agenda – Senior Writing summary, Oral Presentation overview, PR summary, brainstorm improvements to Senior writing, USem study – **Lee will have a few minutes for this**, Others? **Jim will work this out with Kristin.**
6. Closing the loop for senior writing.
7. Kristin brings individual results to program at PR meeting. Jim develops data sheet. Jim will use median instead of mean for paper length – No easy way to do this with grouped data.
8. Present data at spring workshop, then brainstorm, then recommendations.

Ideas from a brief brainstorming session:

* 1. Get feedback from people using our rubric.
  2. There is a mismatch with our requirements and the actual submissions.
  3. Look at prompt – maybe only to see if potential submission is suitable.
  4. List which didn’t meet the criteria.
  5. FUSE – addressing QR?
  6. Poll the submitters about their revision process.
  7. Have a senior writing workshop at the instructional workshop. (Put on first agenda for next year.)

Eventual To-Do List – So we don’t forget.

1. Jim’s Suggestions for new rubric categories:
   1. Clueless
   2. Aware of it
   3. Working on it
   4. With it
   5. On top of it.
2. Standardize rubric analysis
3. Response to accreditation report recommendations
4. Communicate with our students.
5. ETS pilot
6. One Year Accreditation Report