

**University Assessment Committee/Faculty Senate Assessment Advisory Committee
Winter Quarter Joint Meeting**

February 16, 2010

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Carol Gittens (CG), Ed Schaefer (ES), Diane Jonte-Pace (DJP), Don Dodson (DD), Ed McQuarrie (EM), Bruce Leisher (BL), Dan Lewis (DL), Dan Ostrov (DO), Josef Hellebrandt (JH), Stephen Lee (SL), *Yutaka Niino, Graduate Intern for Office of Assessment*

- I. **Welcome and Review of Agenda**

- II. **Status of the Annual Assessment Report Timeline**

CG – University Assessment Committee (UAC) at their meeting on Jan 22nd 2010 further discussed the suggestion to do Assessment Reports every other year based on the statements that were made at the last joint meeting of the UAC and the Faculty Senate Assessment Advisory Committee (FSAAC)

EM – Upon review thinks that a potential switch to every other year is problematic. Business School has their AACSB accreditation next year. Believes the assessment would be conducted but the report writing would be put off until due; would prefer an update to previous year's report.

CG – UAC is proposing that the Annual Assessment Report be called the “Annual Assessment Update” - Any name change would be helpful; Also suggested shortening the recommended length of reports to 2-3 pp (this would be one page less than the current recommendation). March 1st deadline feels out of synch with rhythms of academic year and doesn't allow full year of assessment once report is done. June 1 was suggested. Perhaps would be helpful to have depts/programs decide on what works best for them in terms of the annual due date (e.g. Law School cannot do a June deadline because of semester schedule).

SL – A March deadline is disruptive in his dept. Because of summer break the committee has to reconvene several times to get report written in time, doesn't allow dept to reflect upon or implement suggestions.

EM - Would prefer something more in synch with academic year that allows for time for CG to offer feedback which can then be implemented in the next academic year.

DO – Believes there is less bureaucracy if every other year; would like depts. to have flexibility to do what works best for them re: every or every other year.

ES – Reports backlash re: survey done when he was Faculty Senate President. A lot of resentment about assessment, especially regarding amount and meaningfulness to depts. Some depts. have many goals, so difficult to assess them all, but pared down goals become nebulous and difficult to assess. Scaled back (i.e. every other year) might provide opportunity for faculty to see changes from assessment implemented, which could improve faculty buy-in.

SL – Approach in Communication Dept. has been to build off Program Review and examine what is meaningful to faculty and in terms of learning outcomes. If Assessment is tied into Program Review or some portion of it, it could improve faculty buy-in.

CG – There are a lot of misperception about how much assessment must be done and most departments have some mechanisms in place already that they can use or build upon. Need to communicate this to depts.

Some discussion about the usefulness of curriculum matrices, rubrics, and how to actually get reliable data; there is agreement that there is no one-size-fits all approach to assessment. CG adds that rubrics are not inherently reliable; best way to get reliable data from rubrics is consistency by the users.

DL – Perspective from Engineering School: Because of ABET most Engineering faculty are familiar with learning objectives and assessment of student learning. We need three elements for assessment to work: assessment must be manageable, measurable and meaningful.

DO – University Assessment Committee will do better generally with lots of communication with depts., chairs in particular. Better outreach will increase faculty buy-in. Also following up on feedback offered by the Office of Assessment, finding out if the feedback was helpful to depts., what wasn't.

CG – Also need to communicate to depts. that assessment does not equal data collection; can be Year 1 collecting data and Year 2 reflection and/or implementation. Will be working this into feedback reports.

III. University Assessment Committee plans for feedback on the Annual Assessment Reports

CG – The current year's objective is putting the feedback mechanism into place for the Annual Assessment Reports. There will be a letter from the Office of Assessment that will include: what's going well, recommendations that appear warranted based upon the dept's report, and offer for how the

Office of Assessment can support the implementation the recommendations. This letter is not evaluative but purely formative (supportive though recommendations to make the assessment process more manageable and meaningful). Dean's Office and, where applicable, affiliated University Assessment Committee members in Dean's Office, will be cc:ed. Follow up will generally include a meeting with dept chair and/or report author; UAC will help with letters informally.

General discussion about working to help depts. understand that Dean's Office is cc:ed as a way to help the Dean's Office understand and assist dept needs. There may be some perception that honest self-study by a dept could backfire in terms of resource allocation and this needs to be addressed.

JH - Will be important to have an informed exchange with Program Review and Assessment re: how to assist with resource allocation to help depts.