

Assessment Coordinating Council

Tuesday 7 December 2004

10:00 a.m.

CSU 201

Meeting Minutes

Attendance: Rollie Rowe, Ted Johnson, Rosemary Kinne, Judith Luebke, John Frey, Jennifer Guyer-Wood, Julie Snow, Maria Baxter-Nuamah, Michael Fagin, Tracy Pellett, Warren Sandmann, Don Descy, Gael Mericle

**I. Welcome & Introductions** – (Did You Know?)

Short discussion centered on faculty perceptions of assessment as based on 2004 survey. Two key findings were that most faculty (80% agreed to strongly agreed) that assessment is a big part of their roles as teachers. However, less than 50% agreed or strongly agreed that assessment plays an important role in shaping priorities within the university. Faculty sample size was 281 with a response rate of 25%)

**II. FAQ** – The idea and relative use of a brochure was discussed. The consensus was that the development and use of an assessment brochure was positive and should be pursued. Possible areas to address included: What is being assessed here at the university and/or from each division; How do we use data to manage resources and make decisions; Time frame of assessment activities; Resources – where to find; How is assessment tied to mission; Define assessment; Why do assessment; How well are we using are resources; What are costs/benefits; What are recent results; How does information affect advisory boards.

**III. Meeting Minutes Review 11/08/04**

**IV. Surveys: Orientation/Enrollment (Student Record Update)**

Lynn Akey provided most current form of update – whereby committee reviewed and made suggestions. Summary of suggestions included changing comment – (select all that apply – in racial/ethnic identification to “If you consider yourself multi-racial, select all those that apply)

**V. Faculty Survey (assessment confidence, attitude, use, concerns)**

Short discussion regarding the contents of the 2004 Faculty Assessment Survey ensued. Attendees were asked to read for informational purposes. The results seemed to stress that faculty value assessment, use a variety of methods, and use results for improvement at the individual or course level – but do not necessarily have the same sentiment at the program and institutional level.

**VI. Institutional Assessment Plan – discussion regarding areas assessed & timeline**

See <http://www.mnsu.edu/acadaf/pdfs/InstAssessmentGridFD.pdf>

See <http://www.mnsu.edu/acadaf/pdfs/PRA/MSU%20Institutional%20Assessment%20Plan%20112204.pdf>

Faculty were asked to review the assessment plan for areas that still need to be measured. A fire alarm curtailed any discussion. This is meant to be a major topic of discussion for the next meeting.