

University Assessment Committee
Minutes for January 23, 2008

-- Respectfully submitted by Joan Aitken, Secretary

Planning

John Tew, Director of Institutional Research, said he believes we can have an operational assessment document system available by the end of January. We discussed the system for reviewing proposed CLOs, CAs, and CARs. We will use 25 classes in the trimodal study, so there are 75 items to review. The system will enable us to notice assessment documents with problems, and then we can send the documents to the department to update.

There will be shared folders, with a timing process. We can make changes after we try the new system. This system will use a five-week cycle and will be set up to keep rolling. John will work through the alphabet, beginning with trimodal document so the committee can see what's happening there. There are three documents per course. We are dealing with multiple people, so we can't foresee exactly what will happen.

Each file will lock while in use. If we can't get into a file, someone else is in there because only one person can access a file at a time. If a UAC member can't get into all five sets of documents, there's a problem. After a UAC member uses the *save* function, the next person will see the edits. Don't wait until the last minute because documents will disappear Sunday afternoon and the next group will appear on Monday.

Summer. This system can be tried this spring and revised during the summer. The committee does not meet May to August. We may need to figure out a way for a few committee members to work on submissions during the summer. This process will be outlined on the website.

Other elements of the process work the same. Submissions and changes go to Debra and Brian. This process has not changed. This does not interact with the syllabus. UAC prohibits changes right now. Minor changes should be able to move quickly (in a week). The Program Coordinator will be involved as the department determines. John, Brian, and Debra will contact the department as needed.

Can anything be done about typos? Need to run through the system again to make corrections.

Can anything be done about spacing errors? Spacing errors are caused by the software.

UAC's Assessment Document Approval System

The committee approved the following system to review and approve department assessment documents beginning February, 2008.

Any assessment document begins at the department level and after Program Coordinator approval, comes to the UAC (Brian and Deb) via uac@park.edu. If a new document comes in asking for any kind of a minor change, it will go to the top of the list for consideration in the system.

The UAC is responsible for approving course assessment documents (Course Learning Outcomes AKA CLOs, Core Assessments AKA CAs, and Core Assessment Rubrics AKA CARs. These documents are eventually uploaded into each course syllabus shell.

The Deans are responsible for approving Assessment Plans. Departments may want to work with their deans during planning stages.

There will be three **UAC folders**: (a) pending, (b) ready-to-move, and (b) approved. UAC members will receive an email saying the documents are in the pending folder. Each email will have a link to the folder so we can go directly to the document. The folders are viewable to the committee only, not the entire faculty as originally discussed.

Folder 1: Pending

The folder will receive 5 documents at a time. UAC members have 7 days to review and comment on those documents. After 2 days, UAC members receive a reminder, and again. The documents will disappear at the end of the week and more will appear. And so on.

We can use double-strike through and colors so it is readable or bubble inserts if we prefer. It will be a Word file. We need to make suggestions so there is the least aggravation and best return. If a UAC makes a change on the document, other UAC members won't change it even if they disagree, but will add comment next to the original comments.

Folder 2: Ready-to-Move folder.

After 7 days, the documents will move to this folder. Here is what Deb and Brian will receive.

1. No edits, then the documents go directly to John's office. If nobody makes any comments, then the document is approved. If nothing is done to it, Brian and Deb will forward the documents.
2. Minor edits will be facilitated by Brian and Debra through the department.
3. Major edits go to the department.

Deb and Brian have a week to access and decide what to do. Movement from this folder to the next is manual—not automatic—so Deb and Brian can take care of the document as they consider appropriate. Deb and Brian can type the approval/revision date into the document before they send it to Sue. Brian and Deb have it the next week. Debra or Brian can send a personal email to the department saying the document is approved. There's currently no automatic procedure notification system when something is all approved.

Folder 3: Approved

Sue will move approved documents to the website. She will upload and over-ride old documents. If Sue sees a file that is something other than a clean Word file--with bubbles or comments--then she will talk to Brian or Deb.

DESE

Education needs changes so they can input state standards. Whenever Betty sees them in the system, she will comment if they need state standards. Betty will need to handle this for now regarding ones that need education standards after they are approved and before they go to Sue.

We may need to set up an automated system to make sure we don't make a mistake. This applies to any course an education major may take. That would be a difficult list to come up with immediately. For the next few months, Betty will alert Brian and Deb.

Training

We talked about how to review documents. The emphasis is on Bloom's taxonomy. Three hundred and four hundred level courses need to be higher level on Bloom's taxonomy. Here is our webpage: <http://park.edu/assessment/>

A Culture of Evidence

Denise lectured on the article *A Culture of Evidence*. The article was written by ETS. Sec. of Education Spelling said that we have a problem in higher education, but Congress has backed off. There will be no national assessment rules or laws this year. The report card for higher education was an "Incomplete" because there was not enough assessment. Student course surveys have been the main way of assessing. There isn't much evidence of student learning at the college level. ETS proposed an evidence-based culture. They want a value-added model using a pre-post model. Another approach would be an absolute standard.

Anyone wanting his PowerPoint should contact Dennis Kerkman directly.

We will continue discussion in the next meeting.

Attendance

In attendance: Teresa, Brian, Joan, Evelyn, Kevin, Betty, Carol, Kevin, Deb, and Wen.

Guests: John Tew, Larry Ewing, and Alphonso Ogbuehi.

Members: Joan Aitken, Betty Bennet, Brian Cowley, Ed Hight, Wen Hsin, Dennis Kerkman, Evelyn Knowles, Teresa Mason, Vince O'Rourke, Kevin Payne, Carol Sanders, Debra Sheffer, Pete Soule, and Amy Wolf.

Next Meeting

February 20, 2008, 11:00-12:30, Board Room (Underground).