Minutes
Assessment Oversight Committee
Dec 14, 2009

Present: Shane Drefcinski, Duane Ford, Dennis Ciesielski, Margaret Karsten, P.B. Ravikumar, Matthew Roberts, Amanda Tucker, Carlos Wiley

Guests: Donna Anderson and Barbara Daus

1. Members and guests were introduced. Karsten moved and Tucker seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the Nov 23, 2009 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

2. There were no announcements.

3. Donna Anderson provided documentation on International Program’s Mission Statement, Statement of Purpose, Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment Tools, Dec 2009 Assessment Review, Pre-Assessment and Re-Entry Assessment Tools. Major points addressed during the meeting were as follows:
   a. This is the first time that International Program/Study Abroad is presenting to the AOC.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes are the premise of the Pre and Re-Entry Assessment Tools.
   c. Students in the Institute for Study Abroad Program, Affiliate Programs, and International Exchange Programs are the ones assessed through these tools.
   d. Assessment first started in 2006 and has continued since.
   e. Since the Pre-Assessment Tool is a paper instrument administered mandatorily, there is a 100% response. But the Re-Entry Assessment Tool is not mandatory and thereby results in only about 30 to 45% response. Steps are being taken to increase the latter response. Affiliate program students take an additional on-line re-entry evaluation wherein the response rate is again only around 30 to 45%.
   f. Out of nine areas of assessment, six have shown consistently improvement between pre and re-entry responses.
   g. Ciesielski inquired if a narrative/journal type of qualitative assessment would provide more and pertinent information than a quantitative assessment used in the pre and re-entry tools. Anderson replied that this is being looked into.
   h. Applying to international program, questionnaires, assessments etc will all be moved to the on-line application called “Study Abroad”. A better re-entry response rate is anticipated due to the ease of electronic access and automatic e-mail reminders.
   i. Moving towards a more sophisticated and robust assessment tool used by other institutions in the field of education abroad called Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) is being investigated. Some UWP International Program personnel plan to attend a forum on this subject during the Education Abroad Conference in March 2010.
   j. In response to a question from Drefcinski as to whether assessment results are being compared with other schools, Anderson mentioned the difficulty due to schools using different schools.
   k. An Assessment Oversight Committee Grant helped the Institute for Study Abroad Programs personnel to attend the Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) review process Forum at the Education Abroad Conference during 2007-09.
   l. In response to a question from Tucker as to why a decision was made to change the “Introduction to Aboriginal Studies” as an elective rather than a required course at New Castle-Australia, Anderson mentioned that it was done due to rigid time conflicts.
m. In response to a question from Ravikumar as to how/who decides whether courses at institutions abroad meet our curricular requirements, Anderson mentioned that in some cases such as in Engineering and Mathematics, equivalency has been established. In most cases, advisors and/or faculty and/or department chairs sign off on student completed standard forms if requirements are met.

n. Roberts inquired if any journal evaluations are made. Anderson mentioned that on-site coordinators use journals for course credit but journals are currently not used for assessment.

o. Tucker inquired as to how many students participate in the international programs. Anderson replied that it is often about the same as the national average of about 2%, but sometimes it is as high as 10%. Attention was drawn to data often seen in the literature of much higher percentages realized when they the number of students participating in international programs are presented as a percentage of graduating students.

p. The discussion went back to the idea of journal based assessment rather than purely objective or quantitative assessment. Several ideas were discussed including a journal assessment first followed by an objective assessment, use of on-line instruments and special course credit for generating journal responses. The logistics for journal assessment for even 100 students at the high end was not considered too unwieldy. Wiley mentioned that plans of moving to web assessment will help any assessment modifications that will be incorporated.

4. The AOC Summary of Student Support Services that Drefcinski prepared was approved unanimously.

5. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

P.B. Ravikumar