# Assessment Committee Meeting – Minutes

October 13, 2017 At Least It’s Friday| 11:00 - 12:30 pm |Library 329

Attendees: Jim Hatton, Kristin Nagy Catz, Craig Stillwell, ~~Lee Ayers~~, Dorothy Ormes, Hart Wilson, Jody Waters, Dylann Loverro, Christina Richardson, Shanell Sanchez, Erin Wilder, Michael Stanfill, Chris Stanek. **.**

1. Discussion of new core themes and objectives – Questions
	1. What should our input to the Core Themes people look like? Extent, detail, options, etc.
	2. What will the impact be on programs?
	3. How to produce such input?

**Committee members expressed their thoughts about the proposed core themes and objectives and their associated indicators. First at summary of the comments:**

* **Some objective descriptors were missing topics members thought were important.**
* **The language could be made more specific.**
* **The members had no first-hand experience measuring some of the objectives.**
* **The structure seemed “flat”, i.e., each objective seemed to have the same weight. This will be fixed by the varying number of indicators attached to each objective.**
* **All of this is driven by accreditation requirements and will be handled by the university accreditation response team.**

**At the end, because of tight timelines, Jim charged the committee members as individuals with expertise in diverse areas to provide the accreditation team (Jody, Kristin, and Chris) with their suggestions for rewording the objective descriptors and for measuring (indicators) success achieving those objectives. We will keep in mind that the best indicators are measures of output, embedded in the operations of the university programs, and are measureable. Measures that can be compared to similar measures used at other universities and institutions are preferred. As an example of an indicator that we are familiar with, one might say, “Seventy percent of student papers sampled during the assessment committee’s annual senior writing assessment scored accomplished or exemplary on all section of the critical thinking rubric.”**

1. Who assesses what – The wild and crazy Library Model – **Jim surfaced the idea, just an idea, that various programs on campus could take ownership of particular student learning outcome expertise. For instance, like the library took “ownership” of information literacy, math could take “ownership” of quantitative reasoning, comm could have oral communication, etc.**

**The rest of the agenda will be addressed at further meetings.**

1. Perform institutional senior writing assessment.
2. Gather papers – Kristin
3. Pick sample – Rene
4. Change rubric – discussion
5. Norming
6. Assigning teams
7. Set up moodle and qualtrics
8. Watch for exemplars
9. Discuss what report should look like.
10. Discuss how to incorporate USem studies and MSC work.
11. Discuss closing the loop.
	1. Professional development
	2. Train writing tutors
	3. Library’s plans
	4. Faculty development through MultiState Collaborative
12. Ideas from our May 19, 2017 Brainstorming session. We will keep these in mind as we work on student writing.
	1. Get feedback from people using our rubric.
	2. Address the mismatch between our requirements and 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.)
13. Academic Assessment Reports - January
	1. Short report on program participation this year – Kristin
	2. Improvements to the process?
14. Perform institutional oral communication assessment - January
	1. Debrief – note that we got more assessments in the winter term
	2. Review report
	3. Plan
15. Organize three assessment workshops – There will be a fall workshop mostly about TracDat and adjusting to the new core themes. The winter workshop will have the results of the senior writing and oral presentation assessment reports and the spring as usual?
16. Work with the university studies people as they design assessments for the integration strands. Jim will meet with Lee to discuss this. A possible disparity between our strands and the new themes may be emerging.
17. Standardize analysis of rubric data- Disappointing. Jim hasn’t given up.
18. Communicate to our students the work of the assessment committee. Our students already have some ideas.
19. SOU is participating in ETS pilot test of an assessment of civic engagement and cultural competency. There is difficulty finding students to take these tests as there was with the CLA.
20. We know that students are encouraged in some classes to express their thoughts via digital(video) media and in other ways. What can the committee do to assess these types of products for critical thinking and communication competency? We will work on this this year.