

Central Connecticut State University
UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTION

RECEIVED
President's Office

Senate Motion Number FS 11.12.005B

NOV 7 2011

TO: President Jack Miller

Central Connecticut State University
New Britain, CT

FROM: President of the University Senate

1. The attached motion of the University Senate, dealing with: **Assessment Committee Recommendations** is presented to you for your consideration.
2. This motion was adopted by the University Senate on **10/24/2011**.
3. After considering this motion, please indicate your action on this form, and return it together with the original copy to the President of the University Senate.

11/7/2011

Date

B Barr for C Barrington
Candace Barrington, President, University Senate

ENDORSEMENT:

TO: President of the University Senate

FROM: President Jack Miller

1. Motion Approved : ✓
2. Motion Disapproved: _____ (Explanatory statement must be appended).
3. Action "is deferred": _____
4. Resolution Noted: _____
5. Other: _____

11/11/11
Date

Jack Miller
President Jack Miller

Proposal from the Academic Assessment Committee

CURRENT PROCESS:

- Departments submit full assessment reports each year to the office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
- Reports are reviewed by the Academic Assessment Committee following a 3-year cycling plan where only 1/3 of the reports are reviewed and feedback provided to the department each year.

The committee proposes the following changes to the current assessment process:

- Move to a four year cycling plan. Departments would submit a full report in year one, followed by a brief interim report focusing on changes/developments in their assessment program for subsequent years. Cycle repeats.
 - Process would be phased in to get each department on the four year cycle*

RATIONALE:

- Committee does not have time to review 96 full assessment reports every year, provide meaningful feedback and attend to their other duties.
- Departments need time to implement changes. Some, but not all, changes can be implemented within one year. Changes that are more substantial may require considerable course revision or even development of new courses and will require a longer implementation cycle. In cases such as these, or when the assessment is based on course-to-course measurements (understanding of a specific concept measured in course "A" and measured again in course "B") there might be a yearlong lag and there will be no data to report.

BENEFITS:

- Allows for more periodic review of departmental assessment activities. In any given year the Academic Assessment Committee would read full reports from ¼ of all departments on campus, and interim reports from all/most departments.
- Allows for more feedback to departments
- Allows departments to focus on changes to their assessment practices. For example in year one a department may suggest a particular change, in year two, they implement that change, in years 3 and 4 they assess the new change.
- Provides for a more effective assessment program on campus.

* Assessment Committee is currently determining how to phase in the 4-year cycle.