University Assessment Committee
Meeting: Monday, March 10, 2008
2 p.m. in the Rose Room of the Memorial Union

Members of the University Assessment Committee in attendance: Bakr Aly Ahmed, Russ Danielson, Pam Hansen, Bob Harrold, Abram Jackson, Bonnie Klamm, Harriett Light, Ken Magel, Chris McEwen, Charles Okigbo, Larry Peterson, David Scott, Bill Slanger, Donna Terbizan.

1) Approval of minutes from the meeting of February 4, 2008.
   (Distributed electronically on February 5, 2008.)

No corrections or changes to minutes. Minutes approved as distributed on February 5, 2008.

2) Additions to the proposed agenda and announcements:
   A) Request for additions and updates to the proposed agenda.
      None.
   B) Overview of handouts for this meeting.
      Discussed as New Business
   C) General Education Committee update

Larry Peterson provided a handout and discussed his experience at the AACU Meeting on Integrative Designs for General Education and Assessment held on February 21-23, 2008 in Boston, MA. Larry and three other NDSU faculty attended the meeting. A full report of the meeting will be given to the Provost and the general education committee.

Peterson’s discussion focused on two contrasting examples of general education assessment: James Madison University (JMU) and San Jose State University (SJSU). JMU has a Center for Assessment and Research Studies with an Executive Director, Associate Director, eight full-time faculty members, an IT person and fifteen graduate assistants. JSU uses a course embedded assessment mapped to their program outcomes and assessed by departments.

Additional discussion included
• communication to parents and others by having examples on web page of student learning – examples that are easy to understand,
• Assessment via methods other than testing.
• Voluntary System of Accountability; fundamentally NDSU has, but it is not drawn together.
• JMU’s sophistication with instruments: how they use them
• JMU’s measurement and analysis of student learning between transfer students and non-transfer students.
• JMU’s abundance of feedback on how students are learning.
• JMU’s analysis of developmental learning vs. learning in the classroom.
D) Items presented by members of the University Assessment Committee.

Bill Slanger provided an Institutional Executive summary handout on Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and the results of the CLA taken by NDSU freshman in Fall 2007. Results as expected when comparing SAT and CLA scores. Multi-year results to be posted to web site. 100 seniors to participate in CLA this semester (Spring 2008).

Ken Magel initiated discussion whether the CLA captured the set of skills that it is expected for students based on concerns that aspects not reflected in test so results don’t represent what trying to do.

Bill Slanger responded that the measures are not discipline specific but rather performance-based with the intention of capturing skills in critical thinking, writing ability and analytical reasoning.

3) Subcommittee activities: (Subcommittee breakout discussions)

   No update.

   B) University-wide Assessment Plan Subcommittee (David Scott, Bonnie Klamm, Ken Magel, Bob Harrold).

   Committee met in February and made some changes to U-WAP. Committee is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, March 12.

   C) Items presented by members of the University Assessment Committee.

   None.

4) Unfinished business on March 10 meeting agenda: (no other items added by committee members)
   A) Consideration of revised item for feedback to departments.  
      (Revision distributed on February 5, 2008)
   B) Suggestions for enhancements to annual guidelines and items co-distributed in August to Chairs/Heads/Program Coordinators.  
      (Distributed prior to the February meeting.)

      Resolution: Discussion held on items A) and B) as part of handout discussion. See item 5) below.

   C) Consideration of NDSU Policy 332, Section 1.
      “During each academic year, the instructor will assess instruction in at
least one class by soliciting information from students, peers, or both, for the purpose of improving instruction. Assistance in selecting appropriate assessment techniques is available from the university Senate Assessment Committee.”

Item C) continues to be on unfinished business.

5) Discussion of Handouts (new and unfinished business):
1. Progress on Reviews of Assessment Reports for 2007-2008
2. Example for Feedback to Academic Units
   a. Discussion held regarding the graph lines and the number of areas to be addresses
   b. Harriet Light closed discussion with suggestion that the feedback be used in the next academic year.
3. Annual letter to Academic Unit – review of the assessment process
   a. Basic format has been used for about eight years
   b. Donna Terbizan brought forth two points regarding the reviews: the submission of reports on a basis other than annually and the number reports done by which reviewers.
   c. Committee discussed pros and cons of annual reports vs. longer time periods.
   d. Assessment report is a 3-4 year plan of units assessment plan.
   e. Discussed possibility of incentive plan, i.e., unit rewarded for “good” report and thus files bi-annually rather than annually.
   f. Discussed possibility of having a “model” for departments to follow.
   g. Discussed possibility of using/not using accreditation reports.
   h. Discussed possibility of increasing UAC membership to include at large members.
   i. Discussion halted due to time constraints.
   j. Add to unfinished business for next meeting.
4. Letter to Chairs (Heads, Program Coordinators) – modifications to the assessment process and assessment reports.
   a. Moved to unfinished business
   b. For next meeting
5. Introductory Toolkit for Assessment in Student Affairs.
   a. Prepared and discussed by Bob Harrold.
   b. Shared with student affairs. Awaiting feedback.
6. Overview – Highlights from Civil Engineering
   a. Prepared by Bob Harrold
   b. Provides highlights and good information for those interested.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.