

University Assessment Committee
September 25, 2002
Large Faculty Conference Room

Members present: Dr. Rob Scott (**Chair**), Dr. Anita Manne, Dr. Lynne Hvidsten, Ms. Jane Richardson, Ms. Lisa Simensen, Mr. Mike Skoglund, Dr. Noni Threinen, Ms. Emily Tweed, Dr. Jane Wittich

Absent: Dr. Mary Tuchscherer, Cody Hoefert

Review Minutes:

Minutes from the September 18, 2002 meeting were presented and reviewed.

Motion *Manne, Wittich* was made, seconded and passed to approve the minutes with one minor change to page 1.

Update on the Survey:

Dr. Scott stated there may be a problem of logistics for generating a faculty survey at this time, since the eight learning objectives are so broad in nature. It was felt it would be better to wait until specific criteria have been identified to ensure that faculty have a better understanding of what information we're seeking.

Assessment Training Pilot:

Dr. Threinen presented an overview of a training pilot for the Assessment review process aimed at Curriculum Assessment Teams (CAT's). She requested that members of this committee "work through" the training process that would ultimately be presented to CAT teams. This included reflection/discussion and questions pertaining to the assessment process, the purpose and definition of assessment, and different types of assessment methods that are utilized.

Among the questions that Dr. Threinen addressed with the Committee were:

1. What is your definition of assessment?

The responses were the following:

- How to measure if a program/class is meeting its goals, objectives & standards
- A priority process (systematic)
 - process objectives are identified first

- Improve student learning through evaluation of all components of teaching and learning
- Realizing this is a continuous process
- Documentation of external and internal reporting

Dr. Threinen inquired whether committee members felt there were any missing components for this process.

The Committee also discussed how we are currently assessing students at this time. The committee provided the following responses:

2. Its “after the fact”.
3. We “teach to board scores”. It has been a summative process.
4. We have course testing and quizzes.
5. Clinic entrance/exit exams
6. CBI/internship program assessment
7. (This provides good narrative and quantitative analysis)
8. Student Course evaluations
9. Alumni surveys
10. Self appraisal by the Board
11. Dr. Wittich stated the Curriculum Interest Groups (CIG’s) used to coordinate course and program evaluations.

The Committee analyzed the “**Effective Communication**” learning outcome as it relates to the Assessment Methods that were identified.

This Committee inquired which of the Assessment Methods that were identified, members of the committee used for the courses they teach. Committee members discussed – “How do they address effective communication in their courses?” Several members of the Committee outlined how they addressed this topic specifically with the courses they teach. This exercise was intended to assist faculty with outlining areas of improvement in their teaching methods as it relates to each of the Institution-Wide Learning Outcomes.

Dr. Threinen inquired what was helpful to Committee members regarding this training review process. She added the goal is to have this training assist faculty in assessing their courses within the CAT committees, without becoming too cumbersome of a process.

Dr. Threinen inquired whether Committee members would consider facilitating one of the CAT teams in the future?

Action: Dr. Threinen requested that Committee members provide written feedback regarding their thoughts regarding the CAT pilot training.

Minutes written by: Diane Newcomer

Approved by: _____
Rob Scott, D.C., Chair
Assessment Team

Cc: Dr. Chuck Sawyer,
Senior Vice President