

University Assessment Committee Minutes
Friday, January 24, 2003
Memorial Union, Badlands Room (365)

Present: Sherman Goplen, Bob Harrold, Terry Knoepfle, Allyn Kostecki, Mary Kuzel, Bill Martin, Christy Oliver, Larry Peterson, Mark Schmidt, J.W. Schroeder, Richard Shaw, Bill Slanger.

The minutes from December 10, 2002 were approved with no additions.

Christy Oliver was introduced as the new representative of the graduate students.

Larry Peterson volunteered to serve as recorder for this meeting

There were no announcements.

Subcommittee Reports:

a. General Education

Larry reported that the General Education Committee will inform the University Senate on January 27 that henceforth all general education course syllabi and course web sites must identify the course as having been approved for meeting General Education requirements and include the general education outcomes for which each course is approved. This was in response to a recommendation from Susan Hatfield last fall. Larry also reported that President Chapman had decided that NDSU should not apply to be eligible for Title III grants. Larry thanked Bill Slanger for all of his effort in gathering the information needed to apply for eligibility.

b. Events

There was no report.

c. Reviewing

Mark reported that he, Sherm, and Bob had visited about the dinner meeting process. They suggested a similar model that would create a peer review process in people who are at the review session would review reports from other departments at the same meeting. UAC members will act as facilitators and consultants. Each subgroup of reviews will make an oral report of their initial findings to those present. These meetings will last 1-2 hours, with about 15 people reviewing 4-5 reports. They will not be dinner meetings, but we will see if the UAC or a host college will fund coffee and rolls. Mark believes that 6-7 faculty in the School of Education are committed to this process and he could draw on their expertise and interest. A motion was made (Goplen/Schmidt) and unanimously approved to move ahead and implement pilot rounds of peer review of the annual department assessment reports. The Events Subcommittee will help coordinate them.

The major points of Susan Hatfield's report were discussed previously. Further discussion was postponed.

Bob discussed parts of a PowerPoint presentation from Cecilia Lopez at a recent Association for Institutional Research meeting. There are significant implications for assessment and accreditation. She is worried that standardized tests might be foisted on higher education the way they already have been on K-12. Her message (sounds familiar?) was “Get your act together now!” We discussed some of her ideas. According to her, one of our goals should be to have assessment data available on-line for academic departments. We wondered if all the annual assessment reports and the levels of assessment should be available online? Will this lead to assessment inflation in which people will try to look better? What is the appropriate assessment data to have online?

Bill Slanger distributed highlights of the National Survey of Student Engagement. It is most appropriate to compare ourselves to the other Doctoral Intensive universities. We are improving, but other schools are improving faster.

Bob offered to assist the process of reviewing accumulated assessment reports by providing a draft letter of response to individual reports that would be distributed for review. The members of the University Assessment Committee declined this approach.

Recorder: Larry R. Peterson