Assessment Committee
Minutes of Meeting
November 16, 2009
4:15-5:15 PM, Investment Center

Kristin Camenga, Daryl Stevenson, Paul Young, Amanda Wilgus

1. Report on my activities in my office:
   a. Working on the CLA Executive Summary for release later this week.
   b. Working with IS to shape up their Senior IS Assessment (survey to be sent this Friday)
   c. Continued work on the Periodic Review Report
   d. Prep for the IDEA course eval program (is taking more time than I thought it would)
   e. Going to Philadelphia December 8-11 for the Middle States conference as the Accreditation Liaison Officer.
   f. Working with Art and For Lang to create their outcomes
   g. Working with Gabe Jacobson on a thorough facilities assessment—what needs attention and a fix?
   h. Two off-campus projects that involve me, and for which we will get some good data.
   i. NCMSLC assessment (follow up)
   j. Data-gathering for Scannel and Kurtz (consultants) for the Financial Services audit.
   k. Data for an Arthur Vining Davis grant proposal.
   l. Spiritual Life Committee survey, Online Task Force data-gathering
   m. Completing the Houghton Report Card (executive dashboard)
   n. Sometimes working on the new website.

2. Reviewed issues about the online course evaluation program.

3. Discussed the new language for Faculty Handbook section 4.6.1.1.2 Course Evaluations (see below). The Academic Dean asked us to send to Connie Finney’s Task Force.

4. Discussed the issues of a) Should we legislate for more faculty to do more evaluations? What would be the effect on students? On faculty? b) Remove the term “general education” and let “lower-level” do the work. c) Agreed that both department chairs and instructors should have access to the free responses. d) Suggested we announce to students when faculty will decide about course evals that semester, in hopes that students might persuade faculty to do more evals. e) Should we engage the SGA in helping to set up a web site where students could go to provide anonymous feedback if no chance in class?

For future discussion:
1. Departmental outcomes and methods of assessment, as they are submitted. Currently the Art, Math, Philosophy, and the Foreign Language folks are actively working on drafts, with others likely doing so. The goal is to have all departments have outcomes approved during this academic year, hopefully by late fall 09 or early second semester.

2. When the new academic structure is approved, we need to adapt the recent Departmental Self Study document to it—perhaps early spring 2010.

3. Revisit the draft of essential, college-wide outcomes and assessments and, after further revision, move these forward for consideration by the APC and the faculty.

Next scheduled meeting: 4:15-5:15 PM, November 30, 2009 in the Investment Center. Please place it on your personal calendars.

Respectfully,

Daryl Stevenson, Chair

New language for the Faculty Handbook (March 2010)

Current copy:

4.6.1.1.2 Course evaluations

The latest revision of the course evaluation form is to be used for evaluation. Non-tenured faculty and all faculty seeking promotions should evaluate all classes during any given evaluation. Tenured faculty should evaluate at least one general education or lower-level course and one upper-level course. In order to maintain an appropriate data base for statistical analysis, tenured faculty members are requested to conduct course evaluations at least one semester each year. Quantitative data resulting from these evaluations, except that from questions designed by the instructor for his or her purposes, will be kept on file in the offices of the department chair and the academic dean.

Proposed new copy:

4.6.1.1.2 Course Evaluations

Our course evaluation program, Student Ratings of Instruction, is delivered online and created by the IDEA Center, Kansas State University. Tenure-track faculty and all faculty seeking promotion should evaluate all courses each semester using the Diagnostic Form during any given evaluation cycle, including half-semester courses. To maintain an appropriate data base for statistical analysis and to achieve minimum faculty development expectations, tenured faculty may use the Short or Diagnostic Form and are required to evaluate at least one lower-level course and one upper-level course each year.
All quantitative data, including common Houghton questions and departmental questions, will be kept in the offices of the instructor, the department chair or division associate dean, and the academic deans’ office. However, qualitative data from free responses and any additional personal questions designed by the instructor are kept available only to the instructor, the department chair, and the divisional associate dean, unless the candidate releases the full record of such data to the academic dean’s office and, by extension, to the Rank and Tenure Committee. Without prejudice, there is no expectation to release the personal, qualitative data that is not comparative.