

**Ad Hoc Assessment Committee  
Meeting Notes  
December 6, 2007**

Present: Mark Nielsen, Diane Prorak, Dana Stover, Rula Awwad Rafferty, Michael Whiteman, John Foltz, Grace Eckwright, Suzanne Billington, Diane Armpriest, Jane Baillargeon, Jeanne Christiansen.

1. Melissa to survey the group for spring meeting times.
  
2. Jane introduced the draft rubric developed by the work group. The following comments were provided:  
Use – be clear about use (i.e., is the rubric for developmental improvements? Is it an evaluative tool?)
  - Use a checklist for self assessment
  - Use as a tool to assist with technical assistance
  
3. Committee members provided feedback on the draft document:
  - a. Learning outcomes
    - Add a definition to “an appropriate number.”
    - Add examples to “reflect higher levels of learning.”
    - Keep it simple and understandable - not overly technical.
    - Not all learning outcomes are higher level of learning – proportional strategy does not work.
    - Are they included or not and match with the learning outcomes. Make sure the higher levels of learning are well represented. (exceeds – emphasizes, meets – includes).
  
  - b. Tools and resources
    - Define appropriate, sufficient and not sufficient – use the same wording for meets and exceeds; consider adequate (meets).
    - Add multiple measures within each area of measure.
  
  - c. Benchmarks and targets
    - Use the same wording for appropriate, sufficient, and not sufficient.
  
  - d. Results and analysis –
    - Add to “clear findings are represented in all methods” (see tools and processes).
  
  - d. Actions –
    - Add co-curricular on second statement.

- e. General comments
  - Strengthen the web interface to support this assessment work
  - Provide definitions (e.g., Bloom's taxonomy)
  - Provide examples of best practice and practices that do not provide the necessary information for program assessment (e.g., use of grades)
  - Provide information on expectations for annual assessment (e.g., how many learning outcomes annually? Length of cycle when all learning outcomes must have been assessed?)
  
- 4. The group suggested the following as next steps:
  - Revise the document and circulate by December 14<sup>th</sup>.
  - Share the findings at the January 8<sup>th</sup> conference.
  - Pilot – one department per college.
  
- 5. Additional discussion topics included:
  - Jeanne provided a reminder about the January 8<sup>th</sup> UI assessment conference.
  - Formalizing assessment is an addition to workload. The following observations and suggestions were made:
    - Consider staff person per college
    - Data gathering – free-lance, consultation (buy-out time)
    - Build on what we have been doing all along through careful and formalized documentation
    - Multiple strategies to move along
      - Develop common data sets, where appropriate
      - Jump start
      - Recognize time
  - Provide more information on running effective focus groups
  
- 6. A recommendation was made to use a brown bag format in spring 2008 to provide support for the assessment process.