

Academic Assessment Committee

April 27, 2005

Minutes

Present: T. Mack, S. Field, G. Senn, J. Little B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

Dr. Mack welcomed Drs. Ball and Cullen to the meeting and thanked them for the School of Nursing's Assessment Report.

Both Drs. Ball and Cullen wanted the Committee to understand that the School of Nursing passed the NLNC. This is a major accomplishment. Dr. Cullen explained that the report sent to the EVCAA was not their complete report.

The Committee made the point that despite the fact that certain units may have program-specific accreditation requirements, all degree programs at USCA must meet SACS standards in the context of institutional accreditation. As a consequence, for the purpose of annual program review, all units must "articulate goals and objectives for student learning outcomes, measure the extent to which student performances meet these goals and objectives beyond the attainment of final course grades, and use the results for curricular improvements and adjustments."

To meet SACS standards, the School of Nursing could focus on certain ongoing assessment initiatives, such as a Satisfaction Survey that looks at each of their nine objectives and an Employer Survey. The Committee suggested that all this data could be put into a tabular format. It was suggested that the nursing faculty might have to call the Institutional Effectiveness Office to get help putting this information into a format that would be beneficial to gathering and analyzing data.

The Committee observed that meetings that Dr. Cullen now regularly holds with the clinical faculty could be easily transformed into focus groups. Minutes are taken at these meetings that could be summarized into major findings, and these overall findings and the actions that they prompt could be put into the assessment report so long as they are aligned with appropriate learning outcomes.

Dr. Mack summarized today's meeting – he requested that the School of Nursing devote most of the assessment section of their annual program review to student learning objectives and data determining if their students are reaching their goals and that Nursing is using this information to make program adjustments.

Dr. Ball noted that they could document the focus group and use minutes, exit surveys and employer surveys. This data could be recorded into a format that will make it more accessible for future analysis.

Dr. Hosch will meet with the School of Nursing prior to the submission of next year's program review.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee

April 4, 2005

Minutes

Present: T. Mack, S. Field, G. Senn, B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

Dr. Mack welcomed Dr. Val Lumans to the meeting and thanked him for the History and Political Science Department's assessment reports.

Dr. Lumans shared with the Committee that the History Department has made the transition from using portfolios for assessment, which were too cumbersome, to using a rubric. Each semester, one upper-level course is analyzed, either using a paper or the final exam. The faculty member uses the rubric to break down the project. They note if the student is a History major, their class, and other pertinent items. Most assignments should touch on each item in the rubric. The History Department hopes over a period of time to gather enough data to track various issues, concerns, etc. The Committee looked over the first one that was done last semester. The instructors complete these rubrics themselves. It was noted that perhaps some descriptive criteria might be set up in the rubric. It was also pointed out, however, that this was a very good start. Once the faculty gains some experience in using this rubric, they will see additions and/or changes that may need to be made to the rubric.

The goals and objectives in the assessment report were based on the old mission statement. Their goal for the Fall is to rethink new goals and objectives using the new USCA mission statement. *The institution challenges students to think critically and creatively, to communicate effectively, to learn independently, and to acquire depth of knowledge in chosen fields. The university values honesty, integrity, initiative, hard work, accomplishments, responsible citizenship, respect for diversity, and cross-cultural understanding.*

Dr. Hosch suggested that the History Department might coordinate with the IE office. Together, they may be able to keep track of who's a major in History, and other important information about History majors.

A suggestion was made that the History Department might use a standard test (created by their faculty) for History 101 and 102. This test could be given to all students. That instrument would also help Dr. Lumans to see if the part-time instructors were teaching what was required in these classes. There are certain things that need to be covered in these courses and this would provide a check.

The Political Science faculty do give their students a pre and post test. They have been giving this test for about three years. It is knowledge based and gives the faculty a good idea of what a student has learned. Dr. Hosch noted this should appear in the goals section of their report so that outsiders know this is being done.

The Use of Results would be more effective if they showed a match. They need to see how the items relate to each other. Dr. Lumans realizes it is too vague and he will work on getting the results matched to the goals/objectives.

The Committee also recommended next year to include a table in their report showing their results and how they match to the goals. The objectives also need to be up-to-date with the new USCA Mission Statement.

Dr. Mack explained that the next step will be Dr. Hosch's review of next year's report to see if the department has addressed the Committee's suggestions. A follow-up letter will be sent to the History and Political Science Department referencing this meeting today.

The next item on today's agenda was consideration of Committee Recommendations for the End-of-Year Report. The Committee was in favor of sending all recommendations to the Faculty Assembly.

The School of Nursing report will be reviewed at the next AAC meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee

March 23, 2005

Minutes

Present: T. Mack, S. Field, J. Little, R. Li, G. Senn, B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

Dr. Mack welcomed Dr. Ed Callen to the meeting and thanked him for the Psychology Department's assessment report.

In his general remarks, Dr. Callen stated that the Psychology Department's assessment report had data from the previous plan. That had caused some confusion among the Committee members. Dr. Callen explained that his department had seen some flaws in the previous years plans and therefore created a new plan. The new goals are more in line with the Psychology Association's suggestions and the department's actual mission and goals. The new data will be gathered from the Senior Exit Survey, the Major Field Tests as well as some courses taught. Alumni data gathering had been a problem in the past, but new data, it is hoped, will be coming from that source also.

The Committee was pleased with the new goals the department set forth. There was some concern, however, that the objectives might be too ambitious. There are lots of objectives listed. Dr. Callen's response was that once they begin collecting the data, if there are too many objectives and it proves cumbersome, they will look at eliminating some of them.

The Committee felt that more linkage is needed between the data collection and curricular adjustments. How does the department use data to make improvements? These answers should be looked at in the next report.

Discussion of definitions of terms in the report followed. What is "passed"? "Selected questions will be passed by 75%." It would be helpful if the term "passed" was defined. Dr. Callen agreed that was a good point and they need to define.

The Committee felt that setting benchmarks can appear arbitrary. The Psychology Department may want to consider whether they need to put benchmarks into the report. Dr. Callen said when his department discussed benchmarks they had long discussions. Is a starting point bad?

The Committee would like to see the department include tables and charts into their plan. It will be helpful in looking at historical trendlines and that's important for SACS.

Dr. Mack asked Dr. Callen if he had any questions for the Committee. Dr. Callen noted he would take these suggestions back to the department. Dr. Mack also informed Dr. Callen that next year, their assessment report would be reviewed by Dr. Hosch. That is done to make sure some sort of response has been made to the Committee's recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee

January 26, 2005

Minutes

Present: T. Mack, S. Field, G. Senn, R. Li, B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

The minutes of the January 12, 2005 minutes were approved.

Follow-Up Memos to Psychology and Sociology Programs

Dr. Hosch indicated that letters to the Psychology and Sociology Departments would be based upon the approved minutes.

Dr. Hosch reported that the Chair of the History, Political Science, and Philosophy Department has agreed to attend an AACU assessment conference in February. It is requested that the reviews from the Assessment Committee for History and Political Science be sent to Dr. Lumans after that February conference.

Assessment Cycle Process and Evaluation of Progress

The Appendices and other supplementary assessment materials for the School of Nursing Program Review Report were distributed. These documents are addenda to the Nursing Assessment Report. Discussion about the School of Nursing's assessment report was postponed until the February 2nd meeting to give Committee members an opportunity to review the materials distributed today.

There was discussion, however, about how the institutional assessment process has been approached by units with their own additional accrediting agencies. Members of the Committee observed that in areas where institutional assessment process (driven in large part by requirements for accreditation through SACS) and unit-level accreditation overlap, it is certainly appropriate to submit congruent documentation. However, in cases where SACS demands that assessment evidence of program-level learning outcomes be provided, which in some cases may go beyond what is required by area accreditors, units must still adhere to the guidelines for institutional assessment regarding what information needs to be submitted to the Assessment Committee.

Proposed Recommendations:

The Committee recommends that electronic and paper copies of all Program Review reports should go to the Institutional Effectiveness Office, to reduce the document transmission issues that have occurred this year and to begin archiving materials for SACS.

The Committee will make a recommendation that the EVCAA that she emphasize to the professional schools (Business and Nursing were mentioned as particular examples) that SACS will not accept unit-level accreditation by AACSB, NLNAC, NCATE or any other entity in lieu of its own standards. They must make sure that they fulfill the institutional requirements for assessment, which are designed to meet SACS standards, in addition to their unit-level accreditation activities.

The Committee will develop a recommendation in its end of year report that all units publish their goals and objectives in the USCA Bulletin.

These recommendations were discussed but no formal vote was taken, nor were the recommendations officially adopted at this meeting.

Review of Assessment Reports and Report Characteristics Checklist

The Committee reviewed the History and Political Science Reports using the Characteristics of Unit Assessment Report Checklist. These checklists are working documents internal to the Committee and will not be forwarded to unit leaders.

Some Committee members indicated disappointment with the quality of assessment reports received by the Committee this year. Dr. Hosch indicated that he would like to add up all the checks from the Assessment Checklist at the end of this semester in order to generate a representation of how effective the assessment process has been. This sort of aggregation will preserve some unit-level anonymity while still conveying areas of general strength and weaknesses in the overall assessment system.

History/Political Science

The Committee decided to send one letter to Dr. Lumans about the Political Science assessment report and the History assessment report, since both majors are situated in his Department.

History

The Committee observed that the program objectives listed in the History assessment report derive directly from, and in many cases copy verbatim, the pre-2003 USCA university mission statement goals for all USCA students. These goals as listed in the History assessment report are:

History students will acquire skills and understanding and develop their capacities in:

1. thinking critically
 - a. connections (perceive interrelationships)
 - b. point of view (causality, validity and perspective)
 - c. relevance (how events of the past affect the contemporary world; “lessons of history”)
2. communicating effectively, using and developing oral and written communication skills as well as utilizing relevant technology
3. appreciating cross cultural perspectives
4. exploring values openly and critically
5. finding and examining relationships among disciplines, concepts, and areas of study
6. developing depth and breadth of knowledge in the history discipline.

Committee members agreed that while this attempt to connect to university goals was laudable (showing how the unit wants to indicate linkages with institutional mission), these goals did not appear to be specific enough to history to describe the learning outcomes of a history major, i.e. most appear as though they could be applied to any major. Further, the linkage of these goals to an institutional mission statement that is more than two years out of date gives the appearance of a potential misalignment. One committee member observed that the outcomes listed seem to conflate the outcomes of general education with the more specific outcomes of an undergraduate major in history. There was some discussion, however, about how a transformation of some these outcomes (esp. #1) could be made to strengthen them and more directly address the learning outcomes of history, primarily by, emphasizing student actions, focusing on main verbs in the outcomes, and some specificity. A revision along these lines might look like:

History majors will:

1. Think critically about historical events and interpretations
 - a. Perceive interrelationships and make connections among historical events and ideas.
 - b. Describe and analyze point of view (including causality, validity, and perspective) in primary historical documents and secondary historical interpretations.
 - c. Evaluate historical relevance by explaining how events of the past, “the lessons of history,” affect the contemporary world.

Etc.

The additions in the example above are modest yet significant; 1) they describe what students will do, and 2) they clearly delineate disciplinary scope. Objectives for the goal of effective written communication might closely mirror those outlined for the Rising Junior Portfolio, although some adjustment may be necessary to ensure they are suitable for the discipline. In many ways, this sort of transformation may be seen as “packaging,” but refashioning goals and measurable objectives in this way will lay the foundation for a meaningful assessment system that will produce results that faculty find useful. As the Department reviews these outcomes, the Committee suggests that the faculty review the American Historical Association’s publication, “Liberal Learning and the History Major” (1990), under the heading “History and Liberal Learning” for examples of major-level outcomes identified by their professional organization.¹

The assessment report indicates that current assessment practices rely heavily on syllabus checks and transcript reviews of student progress (process indicators) rather than evaluations of student performances (outcomes indicators). As a result, the report does not offer readers significant evidence of the extent to which students accomplished program goals based on direct assessments of student performances made by faculty or other qualified professionals.

The report does promisingly indicate that there are plans to perform some direct measurements of student outcomes using a rubric (beginning in Fall 2004) as well as a testing strategy (tentatively scheduled for Spring 2005) on “an experimental basis.” The implementation of a rubric for use at the end of Fall 2004 appears to be a positive development. In order to provide the unit with formative feedback, the letter to the unit will request that Dr. Lumans forward this rubric and collected results to the assessment committee. There is some concern that the initial formulation of program goals may have reduced the usefulness of the results the rubric will produce, and the Committee could provide some useful guidance with a review of the rubric.

As four points to cover in the meeting with the Chair about History, the Committee would like to:

1. See and discuss the rubric, including how it was implemented in Fall 2004
2. Hear an elaboration of the testing plan and discuss implementation and expected findings
3. Discuss in more detail any outcomes findings that were not presented in the written report
4. Discuss future plans

Political Science

The assessment report for Political Science lists learning outcomes for majors that, like those for the History major, appear to derive from the general goals for all USCA students listed in the pre-2003 university mission. As listed in the Political Science assessment report, these outcomes are:

Political Science students will acquire skills and understanding and develop their capacities in:

1. thinking critically
2. communicating effectively, using and developing oral and writing skills
3. developing and applying technological skills appropriate for practicing political science methodology
4. appreciating cross cultural perspectives
5. exploring values openly and critically
6. finding and examining relationships among disciplines, concepts, and areas of study
7. developing depth and breadth of knowledge in the political science discipline.

The shortcomings in these outcomes are much the same as what is listed above for History; indeed, their very close similarity would seem to indicate that the two majors expect nearly identical learning outcomes, yet this is very likely not the case. These outcomes further do not indicate specific objectives under #1 (as in History above) that could help to identify what measurable

¹ Available online at <http://www.historians.org/pubs/Free/LiberalLearning.htm>

behaviors characterize the application of critical thinking in political science. Especially in the context of the useful assessment exit test used by political science faculty (see below), a restructuring of these goals to map onto student competencies deemed important by the faculty would strength the assessment program quite substantially.

The program's use of an exit exam to assess student competencies appears to have produced some useful results. For instance, the report states, "we seem to do best in teaching the essentials of American government" and "Students seem to do well at defining the nature of public policy, but did not remember the pluralism model of policy making." These types of results represent excellent examples, but the assessment report should provide a table with all results by program level objective. For instance, one program objective might be something like, "students will describe significant characteristics and structures of American government and their explain strengths and weaknesses." Data from exam questions would be aggregated to demonstrate the extent to which students had mastered this learning outcome, and this type of data would be presented for *each outcome* covered by the exit exam (this presentation would preferably be done in a table). The report appears only to describe highlights. In essence, the assessment practice appears sound, but the grouping of results by program goal and objective as well as the reporting of all results should have appeared in the assessment report. The test itself would have made a useful attachment to the report as an appendix.

The Committee generally thought that the initial project to perform both entrance and exit exams valuably gestured toward value added assessment, however, given that results indicate, "students know virtually nothing when they enter the program," continuing to expend energy measuring entry competency on a regular basis may not distribute faculty energies most effectively to generate useful results.

Upcoming Meetings

The Academic Assessment Committee will meet on February 2, 2005, 8:30 – 9:45 a.m. The Chair noted at they will review the Nursing report at that meeting. The Committee should be ready on that date to send appraisals to unit heads and invite them to visit with the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee

January 12, 2005

Minutes

Present: T. Mack, S. Field, G. Senn, R. Li, B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

The minutes of the December 2, 2004 minutes were approved.

Follow-Up Memos to Programs in 2003-04 Assessment Cycle

In December 2004, memos had been sent to the heads of: Biology/Geology, BIS, Business Administration, English, Math, and Visual and Performing Arts. Dr. Mack asked Dr. Hosch to provide an update on how the recommendations were received from the various academic unit heads.

Dr. Hosch reported that through personal communications to him and in a meeting of Academic Council in December, some unit heads had expressed concerns with the review letters they received. Concerns included the extent to which unit heads were responsible to the Committee and the amount of time they had to address Committee recommendations. Dr. Hosch also reported that the review memo addressed to the School of Business did not cover an appendix about assessment that was not in the possession of the IE Office at the time of the initial review. Dr. Hosch will send a more formal report to the AAC to summarize some recommendations from these exchanges with unit heads.

Review of Assessment Reports and Report Characteristics Checklist

The Committee reviewed the Sociology and Psychology Reports using the Characteristics of Unit Assessment Report Checklist. These checklists are working documents internal to the Committee and will not be forwarded to unit leaders.

Sociology

The Sociology Department program review assessment report lists six outcomes for majors. These are that majors are “expected to be able to” do the following:

1. Communicate effectively orally and in writing,
2. Collect or assemble sociologically relevant data on a given topic,
3. Integrate data/materials from a variety of sources into a logical framework and draw conclusions from it,
4. Exercise a sociological imagination (an ability to apply sociology to everyday life),
5. Set aside an ethnocentric viewpoint in order to appreciate cross-cultural and subcultural differences, and
6. Be aware of the pervasiveness of social change and of its causes and consequences.

On the whole, these outcomes reflect a general level of outcomes that the Committee agreed require some subdivision into more discrete and measurable components, especially for outcomes 1, 4, 5, and 6 (2 and 3 might actually reflect learning objectives under the broader goal of “Perform research in sociology”: a. Collect or assemble ..., b. Integrate data/materials ... c. draw conclusions ...).

The Committee discussed the distinction between “Goals” and “Objectives” and the extent to which drawing such a distinction might be valuable. For the purposes of the assessment checklist, “Goals” appears to better reflect the level of abstraction of the outcomes than does the word “Objectives.” Not all of the Committee members agreed that this was a practical distinction to make with unit heads. Nevertheless, for the outcomes listed, Committee members agreed that the items listed in many cases appear too broad for meaningful measurements, and even under oral communication,

for which objective-like measurable items are listed, such elements could be formulated as verb-driven statements to obtain better results.

The Committee was encouraged by efforts focused on curricular reform based on some assessment efforts in oral and written communication. Overall, however, findings from portfolio evaluation were not presented in the report (it would seem that this information would have been easy to provide), and Committee members observed that this omission weakened the appearance of the Department's assessment efforts. Such additional information would include the following:

- A table listing aggregate results for each outcome from the portfolio assessment.
- A copy of the assessment rubric or an explicit linkage of assessment activity/result to each goal (as was done with the survey).
- Development of measurable specific learning objectives that derive from each broad learning outcome listed in the report.
- Use of data from Junior Writing Portfolios of sociology majors. While the Department might want to adapt some objectives to tailor them more closely to writing in the discipline, these writing portfolios would provide a useful source of baseline data with only a very small investment in time for data collection.

Finally, the Committee offered praise for the Department's instinctive attempt to develop measurable objectives for oral communication – specific outcomes like these should be developed for each of the Department's broad outcomes listed in the report. Nevertheless, some substantial refinement of these oral communication objectives into verb-driven outcomes is warranted, and the Committee also agreed that the designation “fair” as point 2 on the 5-point scale was not the best word to use – some Committee members suggested the word “weak.”

Psychology

The Department of Psychology presented assessment data from 2003-04 as well as a newly developed set of goals and objectives for student learning in the major. The Committee decided to respond to the goals and objectives in the new plan and to the measures and results in the old plan.

Overall, Committee members indicated that the new plan of goals and objectives was exceptionally strong and in many ways was exemplary or exceeded the guidelines for program review. There were some qualifications, however, expressed by individual committee members.

- One committee member judged the objectives to be “crowded” with too much to measure.
- Several committee members indicated that the planned measurement points appear appropriate but the linkages between measurements and objectives were not solidly made in the report. For instance, a paper grade would not provide a discrete measurement about student success in each one of the objectives under goal 1, unless a rubric is used. The Committee generally agreed that the Department should develop a rubric closely aligned to the objectives if the selected papers are supposed to address each of the objectives under individual goals.

In terms of the presentation of data collected to assess 2003-04 goals and objectives, Committee members observed that findings appeared not to be analyzed, interpreted or used in a way that demonstrated any utility to the Department. In this respect the report gives the appearance that such items are measured for measurement's sake rather than measured and tracked in order to make useful adjustments to the curriculum or practices of the Department. For instance, ETS major field test results are presented, but no explanation of why the results are lower than the national means or the usefulness of the measurement is offered. As a related point, the case for additional faculty

made elsewhere in the program review appears to rely on data about average class size but not learning outcomes. The case made would seem to benefit by a demonstration that as class size increases, scores on the MFT or other measures go down (i.e. educational effectiveness is inversely related to class size). It would seem that the data about learning outcomes presented in the report could be used to bolster the argument for additional faculty, but this case is not made.

Additionally, the presentation of findings was most effective in chart form (e.g. the ETS results) and least effective when written into a sentence (e.g. X% of students completed each of these courses with a grade of “C” or better) and it would seem that the presentation of all of these findings would benefit from the context of results from previous years. Committee members observed that unless a rubric is used to link student outcomes on papers to specific objectives, future assessment activities in the Department could also suffer from this level of generality in measurement.

Upcoming Meetings

The Academic Assessment Committee will meet on January 26 at 8:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. in H&SS 201. The members are asked to be prepared to discuss the next three reports: History, Political Science, and Nursing. They will also review the notes that will go to the heads of Sociology and Psychology and have those memos prepared.

Another meeting was scheduled for February 2, 2005, 8:30 – 9:45 a.m. The Committee should be ready on that date to send appraisals to unit heads and invite them to visit with the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee
December 2, 2004
Minutes

Present: T. Mack, G. Senn, R. Li, J. Little, S. Field, B. Hosch, M. Bergstrom

The minutes of the October 7, 2004 minutes were approved.

New Business

Dr. Hosch distributed a Progress Report on Gen Ed Goals and Objectives (attached). Gary Senn suggested that Geology be added to Biology in the basic categories.

Dr. Hosch next gave the members a “tour” of the interface located on the Institutional Effectiveness webpage. He also noted that all department chairs were given access to this interface a month before the Program Reviews were due. He explained that this tool can be used for every major to track capabilities.

The next item Dr. Hosch discussed was the Assessment Report Reviews. The AAC had requested the Director of IE to review the assessment sections of the 2003-04 Program Review reports for Biology, BIS, Business, Math and Computer Science, and Visual & Performing Arts. These academic unit reports had been reviewed by the entire committee during the 2003-04 semester.

As noted in the cover memo, the Committee had made 18 recommendations to the five programs listed above. Of those 18 recommendations, three recommendations were addressed fully, three had adequate progress on their recommendations, four made inadequate progress, and eight were not addressed at all. Of the five programs Dr. Hosch reviewed, Visual and Performing Arts did the best job addressing what the Committee asked.

The Committee discussed how to proceed with these reviews. Since the recommendations from the Committee were not fully addressed, the group wondered whether a letter should be sent back to the relevant unit heads. Dr. Mack reminded the Committee that the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs had said that assessment initiatives are among the key administrative responsibilities for all department chairs/school heads. He suggested that Dr. Ozment would be the best person to inform the units that last year’s recommendations are important, and the Committee members agreed. Dr. Hosch will discuss these items with Dr. Ozment at their meeting scheduled for Friday, December 3, 2004.

The next item was the 2003-04 Academic Program Review Guidelines. On the back side of these guidelines is a checklist that can be used by the Committee members when they review the Assessment Reports. All of the members liked this idea but felt that some of the items needed to be defined in a more clear fashion. They also agreed to use these checklists when they reviewed the reports from Sociology and Psychology. Dr. Hosch agreed to consider revision of the checklist based on the committee’s recommendations following this initial trial.

All Committee members were requested to send Maureen the best days and times for the AAC to meet during Spring 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Bergstrom

Academic Assessment Committee
October 7, 2004
Minutes

Present: T. Mack, G. Senn, R. Li, J. Little, S. Field, M. Pedersen, M. Bergstrom

The AAC members welcomed the student representative, Matt Pederson, to his first Academic Assessment Committee meeting.

Dr. Mack noted that today's agenda would cover discussion of the Proposed USCA General Education Outcome Goals and comments from various USCA departments. (Document is attached with Committee approvals, suggestions, recommendations.)

A general editorial comment about the document: It was felt that there needed to be consistency in the format. Under the titles, the statement "Students will..." should be consistent throughout. All categories should be parallel in formatting. More work needs to be done.

Reading Comprehension

Dr. Mack discussed the Reading Comprehension Goals and Objectives. He explained that the first goal had been adopted by the English Department as a combined goal for the required composition sequence: Goal 1a for English 101 and Goal 1b for English 102; as such, both parts of the first goal will be assessed in combination with all 6 writing goals as part of the Department's ongoing program of general education assessment. After discussion, it was agreed that the Reading Comprehension goals as amended (see attachment) are approved.

Oral Communication

The AAC members supported the goals as amended by the Communications Department. There was discussion that the Communications Department will now need to experiment with ways to assess these three goals.

Written Communications

The Department of English made revisions in this category this past August by converting what had been six categories of performance into six student learning outcome statements. These six goals will be assessed as part of the current system of freshman folders. All six goals will also be used in the assessment of Junior Portfolios. The writing goals were approved as amended.

Foreign Language

All members of the AAC agreed that the Foreign Language goals are acceptable and that the Foreign Language Department must now work on ways to assess these goals.

In summary, the Academic Assessment Committee approved the Reading Comprehension, Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Foreign Language objectives and goals and agreed that the campus needed to move forward on collecting assessment data on these outcomes by the end of the 2004-2005 year.

Mathematics, Statistics, and Logic

The Committee suggested that Dr. Hosch should meet with the Math Department Assessment Committee and Dr. Premo-Hopkins to integrate these goals for all relevant disciplines. Also, as suggested by the math faculty, these goals need to be revised with some acknowledgement of technology where appropriate.

Natural Sciences

The Committee endorsed Dr. Hosch's suggestion that he set up a meeting with representatives from the Departments of Biology and Chemistry to discuss the objectives and goals for the Natural Sciences general education requirement.

There was some discussion about the items as stated currently. Does Item #1 correspond to the lecture portion of each course, and does item #2 correspond to the lab portion? Dr. Hosch will be able to seek clarification with the groups when he meets with them.

Social and Behavioral Sciences

After much discussion, the Committee made a few suggestions in this category. However, it was the Committee's viewpoint that the departments involved need to get together to discuss them.

The AAC members requested that Dr. Hosch assemble a focus group with representatives from the following departments/disciplines: Sociology, Psychology, and Political Science to integrate the goals in this section. Dr. Hosch will provide a follow-up report to the AAC.

Please see the attached document for more detail about the Committee's suggestions regarding the current list.

Humanities

The AAC members recommended the formation of a focus group to integrate these goals. Representatives should be enlisted from the following departments: English, Visual and Performing Arts, Communications, History, and Sociology. Dr. Hosch will report back to the AAC on the work of this focus group.

Cross Cultural Understanding

This requirement needs considerable clarification. The Committee endorsed Dr. Hosch's recommendation that the campus move ahead on this category once we get a handle on other more manageable sections of the general education program.

Civilization and Civics

Dr. Hosch will talk to history and political science faculty to integrate these goals more effectively; he will report back to the Academic Assessment Committee.

In summary, the Academic Assessment Committee approved the following goals:

Reading Comprehension
Oral Communications
Written Communication
Foreign Language

Dr. Mack reminded the members that they will be reviewing this year the assessment reports from the following departments/schools: History, Nursing, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.

The Committee will also be reviewing Dr. Hosch's written appraisals of how well certain units (Biology/Geology, Business, English, BIS, Mathematical Science, Visual and Performing Arts) responded to last year's review of their assessment reports. Rather than waiting until the next review cycle (3 years) the procedure now is to have the IE Director review the progress made by each unit in the first year subsequent to formal Committee appraisal.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Bergstrom