Assessment Committee Minutes
Investment Center
September 21, 2010

Present: Kristin Camenga, Ben Hardy, Susan Martin, Daryl Stevenson (chair and scribe), Paul Young

Prayer and introductions—Ben and Susan are new to the committee. An FDC rep to be assigned.

Report: My current activities--
--PRR completed and prelim report returned
--revising the 11 key indicators for the Report Card (Board and Pres Staff)
--updating all the fall stats for the web site (faculty and student related)
--preparing for evaluation of the new curriculum in October for both faculty and students
--Learning Tableau, a data visualization software program for our academic dashboard
--introduced the college-wide Essential Learning Outcomes document for review by AC
--working with PACE staff to integrate IDEA and PACE

The following assessment reports were submitted over the summer for spring 2010:
Communication, Education, History, Political Science, Intercultural Studies, Integrative Studies, Mathematics [Physics was submitted since this meeting]

Business:
Revisit the Faculty Handbook language for IDEA (PACE) that was discussed last spring.
Discussion: the issue focuses on the extent to which IDEA’s “soft” data is shared up the pyramid of command. Should department chairs and area associate deans get the total data package, or just the chairs (along with the individual)? If both, what does that do to the motivations of faculty to create extra questions? Do we risk any abuse of power by associate deans—and, is there the same potential by the chairs, making the argument moot? But should associate deans be in the know about all faculty members under their area (and not just in their own department, if they are chairs)? Who reps the faculty member at the Rank & Tenure hearings? If it is the Associate Dean, should not she be in the know about anything that bubbles up in the free responses? Some chairs are also associate deans so is it fair to have some get some data but then others none? How do we balance the faculty member’s right to protection from unfair practices against the rights of an associate dean to have full knowledge?

Plan: Daryl to speak to the Academic Dean about the R & T process and the role of the area associate dean. Then have departmental discussions—invited by Daryl’s email of explanation—to get more clarity from the faculty who will be most impacted by this. That can inform further discussion by the associate deans and the dean’s office.

Next meeting: October 5, 3:15, Investment Center