

**Assessment Committee Meeting - Minutes and Flip Chart Notes**  
**Tuesday, October 16, 2007, 11am-1pm**

Present: C. Broadus-Garcia, B. Hosch, K. Kostelis, C. Lovitt, C. Morano, J. Mulrooney, P. Petterson, A. Pozorski, L. Uribe

Discussion over lunch was facilitated by B. Hosch about future directions of the Assessment Committee. The following outline is a slightly reorganized list of items from flip chart notes (see outline below).

Following this discussion, Dr. Hosch also reported that 87 freshmen had completed the CLA this Fall, and additional test sessions have been scheduled to garner at least 100 participants. Instructors of senior level courses will be approached to encourage seniors to participate in the Spring.

Dr. Hosch also shared a report about results from the National Survey of Student Engagement. He called attention to the section on general education to point out not that these results are definitive (they are not), but rather that the end result of the general education assessment program ought to allow us to identify areas in general education where students are strong as well as where they need to improve.

**Flip Chart Notes**

What should assessment at CCSU accomplish?

- Inform/improve classroom performance
- Connect practice/learning across departments
- Should happen in all schools/cross-fertilization
- "Piggyback" assessment initiatives/reports as much as possible
- Inform teaching . . . use data for personal level adjustments – use data for programmatic adj.
- Usefulness to us should be primary, compliance should be secondary
- Program development for future answer the question: Are we meeting our objectives?
- Faculty "buy-in"
- Faculty should be most involved with assessment
- Environment should be transformed to expand assessment
- Should communicate and collaborate more effectively

What should the Assessment Committee do?

- Committee should have:
  - Written charge
  - Organizational authority
  - Work committee: members should be committed
- Be ambassadors for assessment
- Find/use models that can demonstrate effective methods
- Consult with General Education Subcommittee to redefine general education outcomes
- Provide feedback to Departments about assessment practices
- Provide questions and assistance before feedback
- Provide overview of tools and resources
- Statement about use of assessment results (not to be used to evaluate faculty or administrators)
- Feedback (?)
- Offer assistance
- Formal communication mechanism

[An unresolved question in this discussion was whether the Assessment Committee's focus should be on assessment in programs, general education, or both]

Structure

- Possible locations for Committee:
  - Faculty Senate
  - Provost
  - President

*Pros and Cons of Locating Assessment Committee in the Faculty Senate*

| <b>Pro</b>  | <b>Con</b>  |
|---|---|
| Increase in legitimacy and responsiveness<br>Politics [political/positional authority]<br>More “open”/ transparency<br>Institutional identity | Loss of expertise<br>Loss of commitment, personal ownership<br>No lunch<br>Politics<br>Loss of “working committee” - less work may get done<br>Loss of institutional memory |

*Pros and Cons of Locating Assessment Committee under Provost*

| <b>Pro</b>   | <b>Con</b>  |
|--|---|
| Work is directly linked to academic learning and responsible university office<br>Retain institutional memory/commitment | Administrator, not faculty hurts perception<br>[Transition of Provost can disrupt activity – mentioned after meeting] |

*Pros and Cons of Locating Assessment Committee under President*

| <b>Pro</b>                             | <b>Con</b>                                  |
|--|---|
| Retain institutional memory/commitment | Administrator, not faculty hurts perception |

The meeting wound down in the discussion of pros and cons of locating the Assessment Committee under the Provost or President.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Braden J. Hosch