

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
May 20, 2004
Fetzer Boardroom

Members present: Dr. Noni Threinen, (**Chair**), Dr. Dale Healey, Dr. Max Hines, Dr. Anita Manne, Mr. Mark McKenzie, Dr. Rob Scott, Ms. Emily Tweed, Mr. Tony Wangerin, Ms. Xianhui Yang

Absent: Dr. Lynne Hvidsten, Ms. Jane Richardson, Dr. Okokon Udo

Approval of last meeting minutes:

Motion *Manne, Tweed* to approve the minutes from the May 13, 2004 meeting with two minor changes. Motion passed.

Assessment of Student Learning Responses:

Dr. Threinen stated that today's meeting is to summarize responses from Assessment Committee members after reviewing the Assessment of Student Learning Matrix. The rating scale is 1-9. (See attached matrix). Following are the responses from members:

I. Institutional Culture

a. Collective & shared values

Category 3 - Four votes
Category 4 - Four votes
Category 2 - One vote

- Emerging, but University doesn't have an understanding of the process.
- We have completed most things, but not all.
- We have made progress.
- We still have a ways to go, but on the cusp to break wide open.
- We have a few things in that column for Category 4.
- A lower rating by looking at our institutional culture.
- A good start on the first three bullets.
- We have more focus at this time.

b. Mission

Category 2 - One vote
Category 3 - One vote
Category 4 - Two votes
Category 5 - Four votes
Category 6 - Two votes

- Mission statements are identified and this ties to the purpose statement.
- This area is almost completed.

- It doesn't link as much to student learning as it should.
- We're doing average in this area.
- A low rating when you exclusively review the defined mission.
- Good progress on this point.
- Do individual programs have established missions and goals?
- Even if established, not necessarily executed.

A general consensus that our mission is to advance natural healthcare. However, it was felt by several members that we should add the words "student learning" to our mission statement. Also, our institution wants a focus on student learning with students clearly able to demonstrate what they've learned.

II. Shared Responsibility

a. Faculty

Category 2 - two votes

Category 3 - seven votes

Category 5 - one vote

- Still a lot of uncertainty in this area.
- Some progress, but a lot more to learn.
- Some progress.
- Several members of the faculty still equating assessment as the grades that students receive.
- We're in the broadbased level of understanding.
- A core group developed information, but not embraced by all faculty yet.
- Feeling like we're well along the way in this area.

c. Administration/Board

Category 3 - one vote

Category 4 - three votes

Category 5 - five votes

Category 6 - one vote

- At some level, doing all these things.
- Deans are committed to doing this.
- Fairly good at the senior level.
- Everyone quite good with the exception of the Board of Trustees.
- The administrators are at the director levels.
- Pretty solid with the exception of the Board of Trustees.

d. Students

Category 1 - two votes

Category 2 - eight votes

- Not addressed yet.
- A good start with student representation on the Assessment Committee.

- Some progress with impending progress in the near future.
- Recent developments have included students, but still a long way to go.
- On the cusp with the website and outcomes listed on course syllabii.

II. Institutional Support

a. Resources

Category 4 - three votes

Category 5 - four votes

Category 6 - three votes

- A budget for faculty attendance at conferences.
- There is a budget for the assessment process.
- Institution is showing a financial and resource commitment to the Assessment process.
- Faculty conferences.
- Faculty release time? Not sure about this area.
- Good so far, but a question regarding the annual resources process.
- Hit five out of seven so far, but need more visible space presence for assessment activities.

b. Structures

Category 4 - one vote

Category 5 - seven votes

Category 6 - two votes

- It seems like we've already completed this.
- The Assessment Committee is established and focused.
- Well established.
- Pretty good job in this area.
- Can do more as committee members, but need more mentors.
- Need clear annual calendar of events.
- We could also coach more individuals.

III. Efficacy of Assessment

Category 2 - one vote

Category 3 - eight votes

Category 4 - one vote

- Just starting this process.
- Starting to collect data, but no changes yet.
- Completed most of columns 1 & 2.

Action: Dr. Threinen will compile this information and will bring it to the next meeting.

Update regarding Faculty Assessment Focus Groups:

We will have 90 minute sessions for the focus groups. Dr. Okokon Udo will lead these groups. As part of that process, he will inquire what faculty members feel we can do better in relation to the Assessment process.

Dr. Threinen commented that she believes we're on the cusp of making significant progress with the Assessment review process, especially in closing the loop for the learning outcome regarding communication.

The next meeting will be held on **Thursday, May 27, 2004.**

Minutes written by: Diane Newcomer

Approved by: _____
Noni Threinen, D.C., Chair
University Assessment Committee