Minutes
Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Assessment Committee
Thursday, May 13, 2004
Academic Affairs Conference Room, FDHL 2122, 9:00 a.m.

Present: Cutler, Barton, Powell, Jackowiak, Hoehner, Wadkins, Wozniak, Damon

Absent: Because this was a special meeting, absences were not recorded

Guests: Liz Peck, Ken Nikels

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Glen Powell, committee chair.

I. **Powell introduced** Liz Peck, former committee chair, to present a framed copy of the resolution the committee passed in March commending her for her leadership as the first chairperson. In keeping with her usual practice, Peck brought food (donuts.) Powell made arrangements for coffee. After the presentation, Peck expressed her thanks and left us to continue the work.

II. **Nikels report.** Powell asked Ken Nikels to review information from the NCA Visitation Team. Nikels was present for the Team’s brief oral exit report and provided information to the Committee about it. Nikels indicated the Team’s written report would be available in the summer. The University will be able to read it and correct any factual errors. The Team’s report then goes to the North Central Association. It will be reviewed there and the Association will then make final recommendations that may not be available until the fall. Nikels reviewed the oral report. He reported that several areas in the criteria section were noted as needing University attention. The only criterion that will require an NCA follow-up visit in 2007-2008 is the area of assessment. Team concerns related to the limited progress that had been made since the last NCA visit when assessment had been raised as a problem area. Team members felt more progress should have been made to institutionalize assessment. The areas they noted in particular were graduate programs, distance education, General Studies, writing intensive and cultural diversity courses. They indicated there is not yet enough evidence that programs will be modified based on assessment. The return visit is intended to make sure that happens. Nikels emphasized that departments/programs need to be convinced that modifying programs based on assessment is important so that changes will be supported.

III. **Assessment Program Proposal.** Powell shared Faculty Senate response to the Assessment Program Proposal that was presented at the April 19 Faculty Senate Meeting. The phrase “budgeting initiatives” in the document was seen only negatively or as a threat. Members suggested that “resource allocation to improve instruction and programs” be substituted. Additions should be made to the Deans and the Chairs/Directors sections to emphasize shared responsibility of assessing interdisciplinary programs and also for assessing graduate programs. Additional discussion centered on committee membership issues. Several Faculty Senators felt strongly that one person represent the Faculty Senate. In the end the committee decided to include a broad statement that “more than one constituency could be represented by one person.”

Damon moved, Hoehner seconded, that the final decision about representation on the committee be made by the VCAASL with consultation from the appropriate constituency. Motion carried.

Jackowiak moved, Cutler seconded, that all members have voting privileges. Motion carried.

Wozniak moved, Jackowiak seconded, that the amended document as changed at the meeting is acceptable and should be forwarded to the VCAASL.
IV. **Powell distributed** an Inventory of Assessment Instruments from non-academic university departments that was compiled by Jeanne Cutler. These may serve as other assessment sources for future review. There may also be unnecessary redundancy that could save money. Powell also distributed a document entitled “Agenda for Assessment Program” which he had developed with input from Jeanne Butler since his permanent appointment as Director of Assessment. He asked that those members present to review the document and submit additional ideas.

Powell was asked when the new committee organization would begin with turnover of members. He stated that he planned to follow the Faculty Senate Committee schedule so the new committee would begin in October. Barton has provided Powell a list of current faculty committee members with the dates they began serving on the committee. Powell also clarified that Jeanne Butler’s contract as CTE Director/Assessment Coordinator is a ten-month contract. After this year it will be an August 1 – June 1 contract.

Powell also distributed an Institutional Benchmark Report from the National Survey of Student Engagement that could be used to assist with institutional assessment. He explained it was an example of data that is available, but often not well distributed.

Powell emphasized again that the NCA Team was very complimentary of the work that had been accomplished by the Assessment Committee. He stated that the follow-up report and visit would mean this work won’t be marginalized and that what has been successfully started will continue.

V. **Assessment website.** Cutler explained that she had been trying to examine the Assessment website from the points of view of the various constituencies who might use it. She requested that Committee members consider what they would like to have included on the website or how they might want to be able to use it that might be different from the constituencies she has already consulted. Committee members should forward these ideas to her.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Ann Barton, Recording Secretary