

## **University Assessment Committee, Park University, October 24, 2007**

-Respectfully submitted by Joan Aitken, Secretary

### Computer Record History

We've had a shared file since 2005 (U drive). When we used eCompanion—a year's worth of work—disappeared. We tried to figure out another way, but it didn't work either. After eCollege lost all our work twice, we decided to stay with Ken Austin. There are automatic layers of backup that we control internationally.

There are thousands of files on there. It was problematic because of individual changes and bookkeeping. Then we purchased USB devices for committee members, which worked pretty well. People stopped using that method. Some things Sue keeps, which needs to be under her control. Mike sent Ken Austin a request, but we don't know what's happened there. CLO and CA need to keep as is for now so it filters down to two people and is controlled. Recommend we used USB devices again. USB is different from U file.

We discussed the pros and cons of shared files and USB device. We need to contact Ken Austin and set up the protocol. There can be pending and approved files. Debra and Brian will be the only ones who can transfer to Sue for uploading. There will be only one copy in the approved file, not multiple versions. Dennis moved that Wen will communicate this to Ken Austin.

### New Plan

A Program Coordinator will submit new CLOs to the committee contact person. If the committee contact person determines that the new CLOs look okay, the committee contact person puts the new CLOs in the shared file (pending) and emails everyone on committee. If no one objects by a 7-day deadline, Debra or Brian will move the CLOs to the approved (read only) folder and forward to Sue for uploading.

### Website

We may need additional links to make sure that all information can be accessed by people reviewing the assessment process. We discussed the website, and we seem to be up-to-date right now.

### Core Assessment Rubric Training

The key is determining the "Meets Expectations." We must have operational definitions (physical evidence). We need two people to be able to look at a document and come up with the same results 80% of the time. Definitions need to be tight. We all know what running is, but let's define it. That becomes hard to do. To the extent possible, we need objective, scientific measurement.

The rubrics can be highly individualized. We looked at an example linked to test questions, another linked to a test that required a specific number of correct answers to achieve the various categories. We looked at a brief rubric that boiled down the categories. Analysis & Evaluation and Application and Whole Artifact are key elements found in the Psychology research. Two key categories are effective communication and critical thinking. A simpler system with fewer categories improves inter-rater reliability. Sometimes a rubric is used for grading. Sometimes a rubric is used in ways not specific

to the grade. We need a list of words we should avoid: “adequate,” “satisfactory, and “to some degree.” Each would need an operational definition or rules for the scoring, then can put the rule in the rubric for clarity.

- Synthesis is drawing things together, noticing how things are similar.
- Analysis is these are key components.
- Evaluation is what is good or bad.

We discussed the value of having the entire department review the core assessments and rubrics.

### Ongoing Improvements

For new course developers, we may want them to reconsider the core assessment and rubrics.

The idea is nothing is in concrete. You find out how imperfect our device is when you implement, so it needs to be an ongoing and evolving self-correction. Self-corrections make this a culture of assessment.

Are we going to be in the business or reviewing previously approved or should it bubble up from the bottom? Some instructors get involved. Everyone needs to know who the course developer is to make sure changes are incorporated. We can ask people to do continual improvement. We may find it difficult to get some revised. Perhaps we should suggest revisions on a rotating basis. This is something we continually need to work on as an ongoing process. We may want to recommend two be revised each year with an updated version.

We will suggest that each department re-evaluate and have planned improvement. This may be 10% per year, for example, where we ask the department to identify your weakest rubrics and revise them.

### Attendance

Present: Joan Aitken, Betty Bennet, Brian Cowley, Ed Hight, Wen Hsin, Dennis Kerkman, Evelyn Knowles, Teresa Mason, Kevin Payne, Pete Soule, Amy Wolf, and John Tew.

**Next regular meeting at 11 AM, Wednesday, November 21, Board Room.**