

University Assessment Committee

Friday, November 3, 2006

Meadow Lark Rooms

Members present: Sarah Beck, Russ Danielson, Pam Hansen, Bob Harrold (chair), Bonnie Klamm, Harriet Light, Justin Miedema, Charles Okigbo, Larry Peterson

7. Convened at 1:00pm
2. Minutes from the October 6, 2006 meeting were approved
3. Agenda and announcements
 - a. No additions or corrections
 - b. Sarah Beck volunteered to be recorder for the meeting
 - c. No announcements
 - d. Overview of handouts: Progress on Reviews of Assessment Reports for 2006-2007, Record of Assessment Reports Received by the University Assessment Committee for 2004-2005, Record of Assessment Reports Received by the University Assessment Committee for 2005-2006
 - e. No items presented
4. Committee reports
 - f. General Education Committee – Larry Peterson
 - i. Handout: ‘Options for Assessing General Education’
 - ii. Central question: Are students graduating with a well-rounded education?
 - iii. Some departments don’t want to change their assessment methods
 - iv. Some people have raised questions about the costs and benefits of assessment
 - v. There was no vote taken, but the 5-year course report sounded most preferred at the chairs meeting on October 18, 2006
 - vi. Assessing one course does not reflect the entire general education outcome or how well-equipped students are at graduation
 - vii. H. Light assumed general education course reviews were supposed to be included in the department review/assessment → L. Peterson pointed out that not everyone feels that way, and noted that the 5-year review only asks for what the students do, but not how those activities help them in the overall scheme of their education
 - viii. L. Peterson pointed out that if there’s an overall problem with general education, it’s not going to help to look at specific courses
 - ix. There is a comprehensive test that can be given, but not enough NDSU students have taken it to establish validity
 - x. B. Harrold said students at technical schools don’t like general education courses, and thinks results from a broadly-based test would be a good assessment of general education

- xi. L. Peterson: faculty like the high autonomy in education and don't like to be asked to assess themselves
 - xii. First choice: let the general education committee decide how to evaluate students' knowledge and abilities
 - xiii. Second choice: joint review with GEC
 - xiv. Third choice: UAC decides how to evaluate students' knowledge and abilities
 - g. University-wide Assessment Plan Subcommittee
 - i. Purpose: to revise the assessment plan
 - ii. Formed an outline to work from
 - iii. B. Harrold will email it out to the members
- 5. Unfinished Business – communication discussion
 - h. H. Light encouraged B. Harrold to find evidence regarding the importance of assessment to email over the faculty listerv
 - i. C. Okigbo said there aren't any direct positive or negative consequences for doing assessment to tell everyone that assessment is in the best interest for all of us, not just B. Harrold
 - j. S. Beck liked the idea of making the teacher evaluations public record so the teachers and evaluators (students) would take the evaluations more seriously
 - k. B. Harrold: But how do we assess the students?
 - l. L. Peterson says we should illustrate the value of assessment through example of past improvement
 - m. H. Light pointed out that not all department chairs resist assessment
 - n. B. Harrold said we need to communicate the value to deans, not just department chairs
- 6. New Business – none
- 7. Committee adjourned at 2:10pm