

UNIVERSITY SELF STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes

March 27, 2007

Present: Ms. Robyn Dickinson, Dr. Richard Klonoski, Dr. John McInerney, Dr. Linda Ledford-Miller, Dr. Elizabeth Randol, Dr. David Rusak, Ms. Bonnie Strohl, Ms. Valerie Taylor, Dr. Janice Voltzow (Co-Chair) and Mr. Ed Steinmetz (Co-Chair)

Guest

Substitutes: Ms. Mary Elizabeth Moylan (for Dr. Dona Carpenter)

Recorder: Ms. Valerie Taylor

1.0 Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the March 20, 2007 meeting were approved as amended.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Father Pilarz attending April 24th meeting

Dr. Voltzow announced that Father Pilarz will be attending the April 24th Self Study Steering Committee meeting. The topic of the meeting will be the Goals of Ignation Education, which was originally scheduled for May 8th. The topic of the May 8th meeting will now be Educational Effectiveness, Standards 8-14. Dr. Voltzow asked the committee members to review the **Vision of Ignation Education** in our Self Study Design, pages 8-10, before the April 24th meeting, and to think about their standard(s) in light of this. [Dr. Voltzow would like to send Father Pilarz summaries before the April 24th meeting – MORE????](#)

2.2 Draft Reports

Dr. Voltzow will review all drafts before April 10th.

2.3 Governance Structure

Dr. Voltzow announced that Mr. Jerry DeSanto emailed faculty and staff an update on the proposal for revisions to University governance.

3.0 Review and Discussion

3.1 Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The purpose of assessment of student learning is to evaluate whether the University's process for assessing students demonstrates that they have attained levels of knowledge, skills, and competencies that are consistent with the University's goals and whether students at graduation have achieved goals that are appropriate for higher education and that reflect the vision of Ignation education. Five (5) questions were considered when looking at this purpose. One of the questions is what evidence demonstrates that the information gained through the assessment of learning is being used to improve education at the University and to

support its vision of Ignation education. A strength of this is those departments that have assessment plans are using them to guide changes in curricula. A weakness is that not all departments have assessable plans (goals are too vague and ill defined to assess in any systematic fashion).

The strengths and weaknesses of the five (5) questions were discussed.

3.2 Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The purpose of evaluating standard #7, Institutional Assessment, is to determine if the University's assessment adequately evaluates its overall effectiveness in providing the resources and support necessary to provide its students with an excellent education that is consistent with its vision of Ignation education. Questions 1, 2, and 3 relate to Mission and assessment of it in promoting the University's "vision of Ignation education." A strength is that the University has many practical ways of promoting the Ignation vision, whether through Campus ministries or other activities, and the institution is rich in such activity. A weakness is that assessment is more difficult.

Questions 4-11 focus more on institutional assessments and move away from the mission issue. A strength is that we have PAIRO, an office devoted to data collection. Another strength is that accrediting agencies in KSOM and PCPS have ensured that those colleges have implemented assessment plans. A weakness is that CAS has been more difficult in terms of assessment.

3.2 Standards 1&2: Mission, Goals and Planning

It was stated that all consideration of Assessment at the University could proceed under the umbrellas of three questions: What kind of assessment data do we want? Are we getting enough of that kind of data? Are we using the data effectively to spur progress toward our goals for improvement? It was noted that we are getting a great deal of information, principally from formal surveys. This data should be supplemented by more statistics which track the amount and kinds of Mission-driven service activity contributed by staff and faculty. Student service is already quite well documented. The group also believes that the depth of the students' understanding of our Jesuit Mission and their commitment to it by asking them more probing, open-ended questions about what they have learned, perhaps in exams given in a revamped Freshman Experience program. It was also stated that major efforts are being made to build questions derived from the themes of the current Strategic Plan, into the Planning process at every level, and therefore into assessment procedures. It was suggested that this effort could be enhanced if PAIRO and the office of the Vice President for Mission were to collaborate to produce a set of indicators and benchmarks designed specifically to assess progress toward our Jesuit Mission and Goals.

3.2 Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcome assessment. The group explored the following question: Do we acquire, maintain and deliver resources as planned? A list was generated showing the types of assessment currently being done in this area. Some examples of the weaknesses in this area are that the pot of money to fill FIP requests is unknown. Another issue is the lack of a central repository for information.

4.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m. The conversation will continue for the remaining standards that were not covered at this meeting. The next meeting is [Tuesday, April 10th, 2007 at 8:30 a.m. in the Estate, Planning Conference Room 302.](#)

cc: H. Baillie
J. DeSanto