

2007 Assessment Task Force DRAFT Minutes

June 22, 2007
10 AM-12:30 PM

SCHEV Main Conference Room

In attendance: Robin Anderson, Elsie Barnes (for President Myers), Joseph DeFilippo, Deborah DiCroce, Dary Erwin, Geoffrey Feiss (for President Nichol), Karen Genteman, Vernon Harper, Wayne McWee, Monica Osei, Monty Sullivan

Invited guest: Steve RiCharde, Director of Assessment, Florida Atlantic University

1. Introduction

- Description of agenda
- Introduction of Steve RiCharde
- Deborah DiCroce commented on conversation with Council members in Washington, DC.
 - ❖ The conversation was pleasant and engaging. In her view, Council does not have a “one size fits all” framework in mind for the guideline document.
 - ❖ There was mutual agreement that the Virginia assessment process should be rigorous and constitute a step forward in Virginia’s leadership on assessment.

2. RiCharde Presentation on Fall 07 implementation

- RiCharde asked how the TF understands the concept of value added
- The group commented that, “too narrow a definition would be problematic given institutional diversity.” Additionally, it was mentioned that Virginia traditionally has had a pre/post test conceptualization of value added.
- Steve RiCharde’s presentation continued:
 - ❖ The presentation identified the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional assessment plans submitted to SCHEV.
 - ❖ Particular attention was given to the methodologies used to assess the value added approach.
 - ❖ RiCharde’s feedback will be provided to institutions within the next week or so.
- Institutional effectiveness became an important touchstone for the discussion. Moreover, the strength of the product resides in the flexibility for institutions to demonstrate value added according to their mission and institution specific methods.
- The committee cautioned that institutions cannot “turn on a dime” and that they will get better at doing value-added as they gain experience.
- Comments were made that buy-in is necessary throughout all institutional constituents in order for the process to be successful.

3. Discussion of guideline document

- The first draft of guideline document was presented for discussion.
- RiCharde mentioned that the guideline document should “close the loop” by including information regarding program improvement.
- Feiss and Erwin volunteered to draft a “close the loop” section.
- The committee spoke about using SACS program improvement to extend the guideline document
- The committee spoke at length about the “the box” of assessment being much larger than in the past. In other words, there are more external constituents and ramifications that stem from assessment processes.

4. Discussion of value added versus competency

- The group questioned whether competency phraseology should be used in the guideline document and if so where it would be placed.
- The group observed that institutions have become familiar with doing assessment based on the six core competencies and many will continue to perform competency-based assessment. The guideline document should continue to refer to the six “core areas” but avoid the term “competency” except where competency-based assessment is specifically intended.

5. The next two meeting times were established:

July 23rd, 1-3:30 PM, SCHEV conference room

August 21st, 1-3:30 PM, SCHEV conference room