Academic Assessment Council
December 14, 2017
Hodges #605, 3pm

1. Introductions
    Janelle Coleman, Heather Hartman, Michael McFall, Barb Murphy (Gen Ed), Charlie Quick
    (Business), Alex Long (Law), Katherine Ambroziak (Arch & Design), Communication,
    Chuck Collins (Arts & Sciences), Misty Bailey (Vet), Ragan Schriver (Social Work)
2. Guiding information (from the Provost Office website)
3. Janelle's presentation – Update on progress and her role
    a. Course level and program level assessment
    b. Curricula and learning outcomes
    c. Faculty development (TLI unit)
    d. Training available (workshops, webinars, etc.)
    e. Opportunities for Growth: more actions based on results; lack of data analysis;
        perception that assessment is an add-on
    f. Actions: Developing more online resources (videos, webinars, info); more
        meetings with departments to discuss needs; revise rubric; more targeted training
        development; recognition of successful assessment (exemplars); new tech support
        coming
4. Feedback
    a. Course-level assessment: voluntary 3-step process (examine learning outcomes,
        ensure the assessments align with the outcomes, and help faculty devise a plan of
        execution for implementing in the course)
    b. Frustration with lots of reports; new people might not know what they're filling
        out (need short list of most important things); might want to point out overall
        trends. Assessment Steering Committee can look at "hard cases" to determine
        who to contact for one-on-one/two-by-two approach to improve.
    c. How many outcomes per program; can we add one? Process for retiring (for a
        reason). Certification in assessment may be a good idea for new people, put on
        resume. Intro to rubric, develop outcomes, talk about measuring outcomes…
    d. Why would we correct/update the report after receiving feedback? If we re-
        review…Funding (stipend) for faculty fellows to review them (2nd round).
5. Process/Rubric
    a. Meta-assessment rubric
        i.   No Report if no data collection or anything beyond that. Then outcomes,
             but still no report.
        ii. Descriptions (Beginning, Developing, Satisfactory, Advanced). In the
             institutional level review, are we assessing how the report is written or
             how the program is being run.
        iii. Replace report with "Process"
        iv. Ratings in different areas might be more helpful than an overall "score" or
             "rating"
        v.   In Feedback Form, Janelle tells you where you are on the rubric in each
             category, then an overall. Copy/paste descriptors from the rubric.

vi. Department Heads should know how their programs look; encourage people to do better. Specific event for them would be good…how does it all integrate?
vii. General meeting not as helpful as a targeted meeting to show how it looks, discuss specific areas for improvement
viii. Two issues: quality of the report vs. impact of assessment process on the department. Exemplars to show effective assessment and how it actually improved the program.
ix. Assessment conference at University of Florida…idea for UT? Day? JMU
  1. Sessions on just one part of the process (e.g., analyzing outcomes)
x. Advice to get people to be interested…
xi. Some faculty members have checked out, leaving, retiring…Change that assessment person
xii. People need to know the value
xiii. Janelle to help departments by looking at their outcomes
xiv. No prompt to document how changes from last year affected this year's outcomes

Arch Grad Certs – Program Status Report. Janelle to document the discussion taking place and delay on decision.