

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

**MINUTES, MARCH 4, 2005**

LC-31J; 9:30 – 11:00 AM

Present: Malcolm Sherman, Bruce Szelest, David Dai, Maria Brown, William Lanford, Kristina Bendikas, Lee Franklin, Marjorie Pryse, Menouka Case, Barbara Wilkinson

Sherman reported to the Council on the report he made to the Executive Senate. Discussed were certain aspects of self-study report findings that could be embarrassing. For example, Italian is operating with no margin, Political Science has some issues between newer faculty and tenured faculty, Economics has graduate students teaching upper division courses and teaching large numbers of courses that may impact their ability to graduate in a timely manner. The consensus, however, is that we should not avoid making these reports public. The stated goal was to operate as transparently as possible. It will be difficult to separate out what is to be accessible. Some things may be damaging to the campus. Pryse mentioned the resource and planning implications, and suggested that the UPC should be involved in determining what documents to make public. The UPC should be involved prior to making policy. Lanford suggested that everything has resource implications. Pryse responded using an example of a small doctoral program, and asking whether this program is able to admit more students, and indicated she would be uncomfortable making this type of decision without consulting UPC. Szelest reminded the council that Sue Faerman made the distinction between making documents available through CETL and on the web. Lanford added that faculty must be able to see the documents. Pryse agreed with the making documents available through a CETL repository, but not on the web. Szelest reported that the campus does not have the capacity for an internal web. Lanford suggested using one of the libraries. Wilkinson suggested that CETL adopt its library-like procedure for accessing its other resources to the self-study documents. Lanford suggested that CETL not permit checking out self-studies. The council agreed to make self-study documents available at CETL. Szelest suggested that this should be reflected in the procedures, page one, paragraph three.

Pryse asked about the destination of the annual reports. Szelest suggested dissemination. Sherman suggested Barbara Wilkinson's office. Lanford said that we don't want to tell departments that they have to file a report with this office, but perhaps we could recommend. Brown said we could facilitate the process by providing templates for departments, and spin it as a helpful document. Pryse added that what we really want is some sense that they have followed through on their assessment plan. Szelest that the Director of Assessment will provide templates to departments. Pryse suggested that the annual reports be kept in the same file as the self-study document. Lanford asked what we can mandate? Szelest observed that Pryse's suggestion makes the self-study a living document. Lanford suggested that some departments won't want to do it. Pryse suggested that some chairs will be retired when the next self-study is being prepared, and this is a way to review what has been done. Berkowitz added that after seven years it's easier to put together rather than scramble, similar to the tenure process, and we could use language to reflect a strong recommendation. Lanford suggested that the Director of Assessment

send reminders to chairs. Szelest said that the current language reflects this if the Director of Assessment is responsible for it. Pryse said that this can't be linked to resources. Lanford said that using the Italian Studies example, we are adding responsibilities. Pryse responded that LLC department needs to take this into consideration. Case suggested that interns could be assigned. Lanford asked about assessment resources. Pryse suggested a doctoral internship. Lanford responded that this is an interesting concept. Brown said that there are weaknesses in many self-studies. Szelest responded that Wilkinson is responsible for bringing up these issues, and the Provost's Assessment Advisory Committee will also be involved. Pryse said that Josh Smith had money to train undergraduates. Szelest responded that they were his students and they did it for extra credit.

Sherman asked for subcommittee reports. Bendikas explained that the Slavic Studies report was comprehensive and thorough. One concern was the loss of teaching assistants. It was relayed that the external reviewers commented that this is a necessary program that it is rare, especially in this region. Lanford asked what the word "horizons" means? Bendikas responded it was a specific statement in the self-study guidelines. Sherman asked whether we should send a report to the Senate? Lanford responded that he saw no reason this report can't go to the Senate. Sherman said okay. Bendikas then reported that the subcommittee was shocked and concerned about Italian Studies. There were several omissions in the report, as identified in their summary report. Brown explained that the two Italian faculty were culturally isolated from the department, that they work hard and don't talk about the problems so they don't lose their jobs. Sherman added that one of the faculty was working for adjunct pay. Brown added that they are giving many independent studies because they have no resources for 400 level courses, and that someone needs to know this. Franklin suggested that the shortcomings in the self-study have the same cause. Pryse said that assessment lifts the rock. Sherman announced that he will miss the next Senate meeting. Franklin asked, if the faculty is afraid, should we notify them? Brown responded that the chair should be notified. Lanford said that there is a responsibility to the students. Szelest said that Wilkinson will reformulate the report. Brown said that the subcommittees can collect the summary information and give to Wilkinson for preparing a Senate report. Sherman suggested adding a statement about how Italian is overburdened. Szelest asked whether we are in the position of championing the cause? Sherman suggested asking UPC. Szelest said to send to the Senate. Sherman asked about telling the department, should I call Italian or LLC? Brown responded the department. Case asked if we should wait and report on all languages? Lanford asked what languages have seats? Brown responded Spanish and French. Sherman asked what languages have more seats than demand? Berkowitz responded that upper level Russian and Hebrew, and added that anecdotally the numbers are stronger in the last few years. Sherman stated that the second year of language meets General Education requirements. Brown added in order to take a second year of language, students either take a placement exam or have five years of high school language with a grade of 85. Berkowitz suggested that Wilkinson email changes to the Italian report.

Szelest introduced the Institutional Assessment Plan document. Sherman said this is what the Provost hopes is a final draft of the document, and asked that we locate the document on the web and send comments to him. Szelest said he would send an email with

procedures. Sherman asked about next self-studies? Szelest suggested French and Chemistry.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara Wilkinson.