

## **COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT (CAA)**

**MINUTES, MAY 30, 2006**

CETL EAST SEMINAR ROOM 11:30AM – 1:00 PM

Bruce Szelest, Joette Stefl-Mabry, Malcolm Sherman, Carol Jewell, Olimpia Pelosi, Scott Tenenbaum, Marjorie Pryse, Sue Faerman, Barbara Wilkinson

Sherman began the meeting with an introduction of items to be addressed. The council must vote on what responsibility the council will take regarding the Project Renaissance program review. Tenenbaum added that the French review was not ready for discussion during the meeting, but would be ready soon and could be discussed by email over the Summer. Sherman requested that the minutes from the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting be distributed. Council members reviewed the minutes. Pryse commented that Lanford's point in bringing the Academic Analytics report to the attention of the council was a good one, but that some of the information, as recorded in the minutes, is incorrect. For example: Academic Analytics gathers the data such that choices of peer institutions and time period are not issues; and the reports are generated such that they can't be used for tenure and promotion purposes. Sherman suggested that a presentation on this topic be scheduled for the next council meeting. It was noted that the way institutions submit their lists may subsequently alter their rankings. For example, last year the University submitted faculty lists that included adjuncts, resulting in lower publication rates. In addition, determining which department should include a particular faculty member is difficult in some situations. These same issues come up with regards to the NRC study. Furthermore, the information in the Academic Analytics report is considered confidential, as not all institutions submitting data subscribe to receive reports. The institutions know about the collection of data, and it is public information, but some council members questioned the policy.

The council turned its attention to the Women's Studies report. The report was discussed two meetings prior, and at that time two revisions were requested. Wilkinson read the revisions. A question was raised about the context of the suggestion in the final paragraph, referring to developing goals and mission statement. The statement was said in the context of the department's relatively new MA. The Women's Studies report was approved.

It was then suggested that the minutes from the 4/4/06 meeting be given to Delong for review. Determining the accuracy of the statements made about Project Renaissance in the minutes was thought to be best made by Delong. In addition, Delong would also be asked to submit a list of potential external reviewers for the Project Renaissance program review.

Tenenbaum asked about the mission of this council, our charge, and how our reports are used. Sherman responded that we don't have authority to recommend additional funding, and it is likely that all departments would be able to make very good use of additional funds. Tenenbaum asked how we know that our recommendations have been implemented. Sherman replied that departments send annual reports. Faerman added that the Senate in general develops policy and makes recommendations for resource allocation, and that our primary function is to report adherence to the process. Tenenbaum clarified that the council would say whether the self-study followed the rules, but would not recommend changes.

Sherman asked whether there were any outstanding topics to discuss, and thanked the council.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Wilkinson.