

**Student Affairs Assessment Council
Minutes
January 17, 2007**

Attendance: Kent Sumner, Suzanne M. Flores, Melissa Yamamoto, Jo Alexander, Beth Dyer, Johnna Voght, Ann Robinson, Kami Hammerschmith, Linda Reid, Pat Ketcham, Tina Clawson, Bob Kerr, Rick DeBellis, Gina Shellhammer

Continue discussions and training on using the rubric for reviewing assessment plans

Rebecca provided the group with an assessment plan for review to help improve rater reliability. As discussions occurred, it was apparent that there are many ways in which to interpret meaning from various words. Most of the issues that made for difficulty in the rating was having to assign a number. The groups tended to agree on comments and ways in which the plan could improve but the assignment of a number was more difficult. For example, if three of the goals were good and one was not, how do you determine a rating? Or if the goals were good but the mission was not—how can you rate the goals? While not all of these issues had time to be addressed, the general rule of thumb, was that if most of the section was “developing” or “accomplished” then provide that rating and make sure in the comments to address the areas of strength in that section as well as the areas of weakness. The comments are most important as that is what really matters in the learning and development of plan writers.

Rebecca also commented that the numbers are for her use and that maybe that is not a good rating scale or method to assessment plan improvement. This may need to be addressed differently in coming years.

Distribution of materials/plans, etc. for review

Some of the plans were available to be distributed for reviews and Rebecca distributed them with forms, etc. included. She also indicated that she would send the forms, etc. via email as well as putting them in with the plans to be reviewed.

Changes in Review Dates/Locations??

Postponed until the next meeting.

Questions/Comments/Thoughts?

It was brought up in the group that sometimes it is frustrating to spend a great deal of time reviewing a plan when it is apparent that the plan writers/department/unit has not spent that much time on it. Many agreed that this was difficult. However, some also mentioned that some smaller one-person type units could not be at the Assessment Council and so had to rely on others to get the info. The comment however was made that some of the units who seem to have a hard time with their plans do not have people at the assessment council and they do not come from one-person units.

It was suggested that maybe we need to make personal invitations to those groups and to maybe have a “buddy-type” system for some departments. This is an issue that has come up before and that the entire assessment council may need to address again.

Next Meeting: January 31, 2007 MU Council Room, 9-10:30am