

Assessment Committee Meeting

Huntington, Drinko Library 402 & MUGC, AC 211

Meeting called by: Mary Beth Reynolds

Members Present: Bill Pierson, Louis Watts, Mary Beth Reynolds, Rex McClure, Janet Dooley, Janet Dozier, Caroline Perkins, David Pittenger

Ex-Officio Members Present: Frances Hensley, Sherri Smith, Deanna Mader, Karen Barker (Recording Secretary)

Guests Present: Will Holland (Representing SGA)

Members Absent: Ed Bingham, Elaine Baker, Loukia Dixon, Michelle Duncan, Wayne Elmore, Dan Holbrook, Sean Hornbuckle, Celene Seymour

Minutes

Agenda item: Approval of Minutes from February 27, 2009

Discussion: Minutes were approved as submitted.

Agenda item: CLA and NSSE Updates

Discussion: CLA:

- Very good results for seniors. Marshall seniors scored in the 89th percentile compared to peer institutions.
- 78% of the seniors who took the test scored at expected level or better and this was dispersed across university departments.
- Mary Beth issued a request that UAC members ask their constituencies to encourage freshmen to take the exam. Additional sessions can be scheduled as needed through October.

NSSE:

- The response rate for NSSE completion was very good; 37% for freshmen and 34% for seniors.
- Results across 5 major benchmark areas were fairly consistent with 2008 findings, indicating that Marshall students are satisfied with their educational experience.
- Mary Beth encouraged committee members to view the complete results on the Office of Academic Affairs website (<http://www.collegeportraits.org/WV/MU>).
- The NSSE will be administered again this spring.

Agenda item: Discussion of Syllabus Review Procedures

Discussion: Mary Beth reviewed last year's committee recommendation to shift syllabus review to a college/department level process and requested feedback on drafts of forms that departments can use for evaluation.

- David commented that he prefers the recommended procedures because it allows experts in the disciplines to determine whether the syllabi meet the needs of students in the department rather than asking a committee member to make what may or may not be an educated judgment. He also pointed out that the recommended process can serve as a springboard for departmental conversations regarding the efficacy of outcomes and the use of syllabi within the department.
- Caroline asked whether every syllabus would need to be evaluated each semester. Mary Beth explained that departments will determine appropriate evaluation cycles. She also asked "who" should do the evaluations, whether the department chair or a faculty committee. David suggested leaving it to the colleges to mandate the process. He also suggested framing the recommended procedural changes as an opportunity for formative discussion. Janet asked about whether the UAC should have a process to ensure that all syllabi are evaluated over a cycle. Bill agreed that all syllabi should be reviewed, but that departments should be responsible for ensuring inclusion.
- Mary Beth asked for suggestions for communication and implementation. David and Caroline suggested that the directive should come from the dean's offices. The committee agreed; therefore, Mary Beth will send an email to the deans outlining the new process and requesting that they oversee dissemination to the departments.
- Bill mentioned the need to make the changes palatable to deans, chairs and faculty due to the extra work that will be required of them. Deanna suggested reminding deans that it is a good idea to let faculty know that this can be applied to the faculty service requirements on annual reports.

Agenda item: Multicultural and International Course Syllabus Review

Discussion: Mary Beth asked the committee to review the syllabi of courses that have the multicultural or international designations and presented suggested forms for that purpose. She stressed that courses don't have to address every MC/I component, but that by comparing syllabi across the board we could determine whether the outcomes are being sufficiently met. The committee agreed to the evaluation and Mary Beth distributed assignments. She also said that the purpose of this evaluation is NOT THE SAME as the purpose of regular course syllabus evaluation. The committee will NOT use its typical checklist for this evaluation, nor will it share feedback with individual faculty members. The purpose of this evaluation is for general education assessment. This evaluation will allow the committee to determine, across courses offered this semester, which expected multicultural and international student learning outcomes are being covered (and in how many courses) and how each learning outcome is being assessed. This review will shed some light on the uniformity and/or diversity of outcomes and assessment methods being used in these courses. Mary Beth sees this as a first step in determining how to move to step two, which will be to decide the best method or methods to begin collecting direct assessment of student learning in these areas. Her goal is to be able to do this in such a way as to avoid adding extra work to the instructors teaching these courses.

Agenda item: Additional Business

Discussion: No additional business was brought forth.

Agenda item: Future Meetings

Discussion: Mary Beth expressed an interest in having another meeting relatively soon and asked about which days would be best for a lunch meeting. Monday and Wednesday emerged as the favorites.

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barker

Karen Barker
Recording Secretary