

Meeting Minutes for the
University Assessment Committee Meeting
Tuesday, August 24th, 2010, 2:00-3:00 p.m.
Conference Room, Second floor, Olin Physical Sciences Building

In attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair), Guy Bruce, Ken Crooks, Brian Ehrlich (conference call), Veronica Giguere, Pierre Larochelle, Hamid Rassoul, Ted Richardson, Tim Rosser, Matt Ruane, Andy Stanfield, Manolis Tomadakis, Alex Vamosi

Absent: Richard Turner

I. July 28th meeting minutes approval – all approved

II. Debrief on Assistant Assessment Administrator candidate

The Chair related that a candidate, Brandy Douglas, had visited the campus to interview with the Senior Vice Provost, Ray Bonhomme, and the Director of Institution Research, Leslie Savoie. She also met 5 members of the UAC: Matt Ruane, Tim Rosser, Andy Stanfield, Hamid Rassoul, and Richard Turner. The reviews of each interview were favorable; however, the salary associated with this position is well below the candidates minimum salary requirements. It is uncertain at this time whether the position will be acceptable to her.

III. Assessment Item Timeline

Before talking about the Timeline, the Chair added a last minute item to the agenda which included mention of work the Provost requested of each Dean. The Deans are now working on mission statements for their colleges, and it was decided that the UAC would review those as well as the mission statement for the university to make sure that there was good alignment between them. Modification of the university mission statement may be required.

The modified timeline was discussed, and it was pointed out that the only change requested by any UAC member came from Manolis Tomadakis via Pierre Larochelle. In the timeline (**Attachment 1**), the UAC will meet in November after the Assessment Maps and Measure Statements have been reviewed and returned to DRC Chairs.

IV. Review of Assessment Evaluation Rubric

The UAC members reviewed the Assessment Evaluation Rubric in anticipation of its use for reviewing the assessment items to be submitted this fall. To avoid confusion, it was decided that the rubric would be split into two documents: one for reviewing assessment items (for use now) and the other for reviewing assessment results and action plans (for use later). In the first document, the sections on Department Mission Statement, PLOs, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Further Considerations were amended to reflect Florida Tech's assessment policies and standards. The amended rubric is attached to the minutes (**Attachment 2**).

V. Action Items

- a. DRC Chairs and members follow the Timeline for reviewing and submitting assessment items.

VI. Next meeting: Tuesday, November 9, 2010; 2-3 p.m.

Attachment 1: Modified Assessment Item Timeline

Because reviewing and finalizing the Curriculum Maps for each program are necessary before Assessment Maps, Measurement Statements, and Achievement Targets can be prepared, I am recommending the following timeline for submission, review, and modifications of items up to the final reporting by the DRC Chairs (i.e. Dec. 3rd). I have talked with Andy Stanfield, and he plans to hold two identical how-to workshops on Measurement Statements with Achievement Targets by the October 15th deadline. The presentation will then be available on the UAC website. Anyone interested in learning more about these workshops should contact Andy at astanfield@fit.edu.

By Friday, Aug. 27 th	UAC meets to go over Assessment Evaluation Rubric criteria
Friday, Aug. 27 th	Curriculum Maps due to respective DRC Chairs
By Friday, Sept. 3 rd	DRCs meet to go over Assessment Evaluation Rubric criteria; divide Curriculum Maps among members for peer review of Mission and PLO statements, according to rubric criteria (no AC should review his/her own program assessment items)
Sept. 17 th	Reviewed Curriculum Maps and graded rubrics with comments due to DRC Chair (you can decide if you want the DRC to meet in order to discuss the comments and grades); send a photocopy of the rubric to departments or degree programs; those that need modification or corrections should work with DRC to finish by Oct. 1 st
Oct. 1 st	Corrected and final Curriculum Maps are due to DRC; these will be submitted online by the appropriate AC
Oct. 15 th	Rough drafts of Assessment Maps and Measurement Statements with Achievement Targets are due
By Oct. 22 nd	DRCs meet to go over Assessment Evaluation Rubric criteria; divide Assessment Maps and Measure Statements with Achievement Targets among DRC members for peer review of Measures and Achievement Targets according to rubric criteria (use the initial rubric form!) (again, no AC should review his/her own program assessment items)
Nov. 5 th	Reviewed Assessment Maps, Measure Statements with Achievement Targets, and graded rubrics with comments due back to DRC Chair (you can decide if you want the DRC to meet in order to discuss the comments and grades); send a photocopy of the rubric to departments or degree programs; those that need modification or corrections should work with DRC to finish by Nov. 19 th
Nov. 9 th	UAC meeting to discuss progress and/or problem areas

Nov. 19 th	Corrected and final Assessment Maps and Measurement Statements with Achievement Targets are due to DRC; these will be submitted online by the appropriate AC
By Dec. 3 rd	DRC Chairs submit reports to UAC Chair with original copies of all rubrics
Week of Dec. 13 th	UAC meets to discuss DRC reports and to discuss the report to be submitted to the Provost's office
January	Programs begin preliminary assessments, if applicable

Attachment 2:

Assessment Plan Evaluation Rubric

Program Name _____ Year _____

Department Mission Statement		
A concise statement outlining the purpose of the departments or degree programs, who it serves, in what ways, and with what result.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise. • Statement of the department’s or degree program’s purpose. • Indicates primary functions or activities of the department or degree program. • Identifies stakeholders. • Aligned with respective professional organization and program-specific bodies, if applicable. • Specific to the department or degree program (identifies what it does that separates it from others). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of the department’s or degree program’s purpose. • Identifies stakeholders. • Some distinction from other departments or degree programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statement of the intent of the department or degree program. • Doesn’t identify stakeholders. • Too general to distinguish the department or degree program too or specific to encompass the entire mission.
Notes:		

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (PLOs)		
Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observable and measurable. • Discipline- or program-specific. • Aligned with department/program mission statement. • Aligned with standards presented by respective professional organizations, if applicable. • Most use action verbs (according to Bloom’s Taxonomy) • For undergraduate programs, a minimum of 6 outcomes listed, with 2 in each area of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. • For associate and graduate programs, a minimum of 3 outcomes listed, with 1 in each area of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. • Outcomes focus on student learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with department/program mission statement. • Some use action verbs (according to Bloom’s Taxonomy). • For undergraduate programs, a minimum of 6 outcomes listed, with 2 in each area of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. • For associate and graduate programs, a minimum of 3 outcomes listed, with 1 in each area of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes a process, rather than an outcome. • Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met. • Incomplete-not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program. • For undergraduate programs, less than 6 outcomes listed, or less than 2 in each area of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. • For associate and graduate programs, less than 3 outcomes listed, or none in one or more areas of critical thinking, communications, and discipline specific knowledge. • Does not align with department/program mission statement.
Notes:		

Measures

The variety of methods used to evaluate each outcome (PLO) and the criteria or indicators that describe whether the outcomes were achieved.

<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most outcomes have multiple measures with at least 2 direct measures per outcome. • Measurement instruments are clearly described and attached in Document Repository (WEAVEonline), where appropriate. • Target level of achievement is identified for each measure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For undergraduate programs, at least 1 direct and 1 indirect measure per outcome. • For graduate programs, at least 1 direct measure per outcome. • Measurement instruments are described. • Some targets levels of achievement are identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all outcomes have associated measures. • Measurement instruments have not been developed and/or implemented. • Few direct measures are utilized, or only indirect measures are utilized. • Course grades used as an assessment method.
Notes:		

Quality of Achievement Targets

Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome (PLO).

<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing
Achievement targets are specific and measurable, have appropriate time frame, and are aligned with the measures and outcomes.	Level of achievement is described in each target.	Few target levels of achievement are described, or targets are too general.
Notes:		

Future Considerations

Is there a plan for collecting, tabulating, and analyzing assessment results? Have feasibility and efficiency been considered in identifying assessment methods?

Are internal and/or external stakeholders (may include students, customers, faculty, staff, administrators, advising boards, employers, etc.) involved in the assessment process?

Is this plan feasible with current resources and staff?

How will assessment results be used to improve student learning or the programs?

Comments:

--

General Comments: