

University Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda
12-3-07
8:00 – 10:00
SH 263 (Huntington)
MUGC 134 (South Charleston)

I First Hour

1. Approval of minutes from October 22
2. Short discussion of fall syllabi – suggestions for next semester
3. Assignments for Program Assessment Reviews
4. Brief Discussion of new directions for yearly program assessment reports. Points for consideration:
 - Eliminate Program Goals from yearly program assessment reports. These are not currently being evaluated and the major focus of yearly assessment should be on student learning.
 - Yearly assessment reports should contain measurable student learning outcomes.
 - I'd like to have discussion as to whether or not to leave student learning activities as part of the report. There was some sentiment during the October meeting that these may lead to confusion and to people making assessment "course" rather than "program" based.
 - Assessment measures used should be included. However, programs will be strongly encouraged to include the assessment rubrics used to evaluate papers, projects, etc.
 - Benchmarks should be included. Benchmarks should clearly state what a student must do, i.e. the level to which a student must perform, in order to meet the outcome.
 - Results should be given. Results should be fairly specific. For example, if the student learning outcome is, "Students will be able to clearly write a research proposal using APA style," the assessment tool used should be a well defined rubric. Using this rubric, evaluators might assess each student paper in the following areas: title, literature review, research question, method, research design, reference list, correct use of APA style, and writing quality. If the rating scale for each section is from 1 – 5, with 5 being the best score possible, mean results (across students) should be reported for each section of the rubric. That way, faculty can easily see where students need more help. Perhaps students can ask a research question and design the study, but have difficulty locating appropriate information for the literature review. If this is the case, the
 - Action taken might be to include more information literacy instruction into the program.
 - I'd also like to encourage all programs only to assess a couple of student learning outcomes each year. So, if the program assessed students' abilities to write research proposals (and another learning outcome) in year 1, they could begin to implement program changes to strengthen identified weaknesses during the next two years. During the next two years, they'd assess four more student learning outcomes (2 each year). Then during year 3, they'd re-assess the research proposal outcome. This would give programs time to see if changes to the curriculum resulted in meaningful improvements in student learning and would be less overwhelming than having to assess 6 – 8 student learning outcomes each year. In reality, it's almost impossible to do this effectively, and

to implement curricular change that will result in meaningful improvements in student learning.

II Second Hour

5. Discussion of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE).
6. Discussion of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) Results from 2006-2007 and plans for the spring administration.
7. Discussion of Assessment Day.
8. Update on Graduating Senior and Graduate Surveys.
9. Discussion of future meeting dates and topics
 - Monday, January 28 , 4:00 – 10:00: General Education Assessment
 - Monday, February 25, 8:00 – 10:00: Assessment Day update
 - Monday, March 24, 8:00 – 10:00: Analysis of survey instruments and data. Revisions of forms/procedures
 - Monday, April 28, 8:00 – 10:00: Presentation of University Assessment Report for 2007-2008. Discuss plans for needed changes in 2008-2009
10. Additional Business