

D. Assessment Strategies Comparison & Preparation for Meeting with Provost

It was noted that most likely, the Provost will want an assessment that is based on student products, like a portfolio. It was noted that embedded assessment can assess the whole program as well as courses.

The Committee agreed that a list of criteria for a good assessment tool should be created, and then each of our strategies can be compared to those criteria.

It was noted that the administration will also probably want a three-part assessment: beginning, mid-point, and end. It was cited that the beginning assessment could be the student's entrance test scores (SAT or ACT or other). A final assessment could be an alumni survey like Dean K haleel's.

It was stated that we have to stay away from artifact collection, because that will generate a whole lot of work which will probably fall to faculty. That work could come to a grinding halt from the sheer number of students.

It was agreed that the criteria for a good assessment tool should be:

- Tool is matrix driven
- Tool is outcomes driven
- Tool generates quantifiable results
- Tool is designed by faculty with expertise
- Product vs. demonstration
- Resource availability

The Committee agreed to present in the following order:

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Surveys | Mark Hardt |
| Compass Test | Bruce Brumley |
| Capstone | Randall Gloege |
| Portfolio | Sandie Rietz/Janii Pedersen |
| Bozeman Model | Susan Gilbertz |
| Embedded Assessment | Dan Gretch |

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.