

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE JOINT GROUP MEETING

December 2, 2002 5:00pm
SUB Spanish Room

Those Present: Candy Young, Marty Eisenberg, Garry Gordon, John Ishiyama, Erika Woehlk, Doug Davenport, Don Kangas, Ruthie Dare-Halma, David Gillette, Sarah Mohler, Marie Orton, Carol Hoferkamp, Sally Cook, Sue Pieper, David Hoffman, Randy Smith, Maria Di Stefano, Bryce Jones, Nancy Asher, Dave Rector, Michael McManis, Heidi Templeton, Shawn Doyle, and John Bohac.

- I. Garry Gordon and Sue Pieper passed out copies of the Assessment Plan, a chart with assessment instruments' and programs' characteristics, a list of committee members, and a sign-up sheet for tasks outlined in the Plan.
- II. Representatives from this committee attended an American Association of Higher Education (AAHE)/Higher Learning Commission (HLC) conference in Santa Fe last month. We were a good presence and resource for the universities there who were in the beginning stages of their assessment programs.
- III. This year, the new VPAA's Advisory Committee on Assessment will be focusing on meaningful analysis with meaningful results. Both groups will have weighty responsibilities in order to accomplish this.
- IV. Committee members introduced themselves.
- V. The Assessment Action Plan
 - A. This plan was developed by the people participating in the AAHE/HLC conference: Sue Pieper, Ruthie Dare-Halma, Doug Davenport, David Hoffman, Maria Di Stefano and Garry Gordon.
 - B. The most recent version of the plan has the word "instrument" struck out at several places.
 - C. The Plan describes many goals regarding assessment and assigns each task to a particular group, such as the Design and Implementation Group or the Analysis and Reporting Group.
 - D. Questions
 1. How does the Plan fit in with HLC? Our picture year is next year. We shouldn't be motivated by accreditation, but we need to make headway in discipline outcomes assessment. For HLC, we need to analyze what we have, not what we will have. We will be evaluated under the new criteria.
 2. What outcomes are you referring to in column 4 of the Plan? Outcomes of the Plan, not learning outcomes.
 3. What about the junior test and student motivation? Shouldn't we do something before January so we don't go another semester with poor results from unmotivated students? Some incentive ideas:

- a. Offer small scholarships
 - b. Registration privileges
 - c. Better testing conditions i.e., an assessment day
4. We need to act on this student motivation problem quickly: how? This is one of the tasks on the Plan, so you may sign up to work on that subcommittee if you wish.
 5. What's going on with the writing assessment? There has been an interim assessment in place. Students work with their JINS instructors to evaluate their writing. The plan is to have a permanent program in place for Fall 2003.
- VI. The plan for next semester's meetings is to meet somewhat infrequently as a whole committee. The two separate groups will meet more frequently and will work on their assigned tasks outlined in the Assessment Plan. Each task leader may recruit any outside person they wish to help them accomplish their task. During the larger group meetings, each task group may send one representative to report on their progress if not all task members are able to attend.
 - VII. David Gillette passed out a draft of the questions for the upcoming Interview Project. The committee was asked to evaluate the questions and offer suggestions for improvement.
 - VIII. The meeting dissolved approximately 7:50pm.

ew