

## Assessment Committee

9/10/2018

Present: Lee Nickles, Andrew Bobilya, Cathy Grist, Kia Asberg, Ellen Sigler, Marissa Ray, Patricia Bricker, Sarah Meltzer

Feedback and discussion of CIR review and process

- Set expectations for who reviews before it goes through process
- Very little guidance about who does what
- Excel spreadsheet format (likely to change)
- Prompts on CIR need to be worded more clearly
- Sometimes you choose not to make a change – what if we decide not to do so? Do we get credit for it?
- Programs had to retrofit for this exercise
- Contradiction between message to “tell our story” and generate what fits in a narrow box to make SACSCOC happy
- No place for assessment on continuous cycle over years
- Issue of putting out reports for programs that may or may not exist
- We almost need some reporting/work that is more comprehensive to tell our story

Do things ourselves – guidance for our own college’s process

- Collaboration around a google doc to get faculty to report on what they were doing relative to an objective
- Note we will likely need to report on 2-4 outcomes; if programs know this up front, they can plan
- Lack of plan due to not knowing what we’re doing
- Lack of pulling the program faculty together systematically – challenging for faculty in overlapping programs
- Process should be defined before the academic term starts
- Led to frustration
- Lack of review of Assessment Plan
- Consider shifting how we use strategic planning day and assessment day

Resources:

- Sample wording; exemplars
- Training materials that had same outcome worded to be a 1, 2, 3, and 4
- A workday for writing the CIR
- One-on-one consultation, maybe on a department basis
- More extensive feedback at college/department level
- Training for everyone who is reviewing these, DH level for example