University Assessment Council Meeting Minutes

January 24, 2003

Noon – 1:30 PM    ~    RT 1716

Present: Ev Cataldo, Jeffrey Chen, John Lallo, M.Manoucheri, Earl Mortensen, Vida Svarcas, Peter Trumpower, Michael Wells, Marie E. Zeglen and Debra Sudy (clerk)

1. Minutes of the December 19th meeting were read and approved.

2. Review of Assessment Reports/Meetings on Assessment Reports: Dr. Zeglen thanked committee members for their efforts reviewing the assessment reports received from the colleges and units. Drs. Zeglen, Cataldo, and Mortensen have and are meeting with Division Heads and Deans to disseminate the final reports. The following update was given on the meetings held to date: Business and Student Life will revise their submissions. Education, Music, and History are excellent assessment plans worthy of emulation (Possible use of their plans as a template for other programs was discussed.) The University Library submitted a very good plan. Urban Affairs has shown improvement but is not at level 2 nor expected to be with current plans. Continuing Education is making good progress. Admissions and Registrars and several Student Services areas will need to work to improve their status (ie, Counseling/Testing and Mentoring.) Health Services has a good rating. University Studies is in good shape but needs improvement to reach Level 2. Law and Financial Aid have yet to submit an assessment plan.

Observations: In summary, overall not many of the programs/units are at level 2, but substantial improvements have been achieved from just over a year ago. Drs. Zeglen, Cataldo, and Mortensen as well as volunteers from the committee will work with departments and units to explore options and activities in line with their stated goals. The next step will include faculty support and involvement in the effort. The Provost will most likely request assessment report updates each semester listing of those not at level 2.

Strategies and Next Steps: A draft summary of programs/units with their current and prospective NCA levels was distributed. Errors in personnel listings were noted. Suggestions for improvement followed: add a benchmark column and an annual reporting column (to show results over time.) The document may be used as a progress report for CSU’s submission to NCA.

Several comments were made regarding the reviewing process: E. Cataldo commented that a better process to measure the impact of changes to programs and how/if the changes are affecting student outcomes would be helpful. E. Mortensen commented that in many cases a lack of information made it difficult to assess a program’s current NCA level. V. Svarcas and E. Mortensen agreed that a more consistent format of submissions would be helpful in the review process.

M.Zeglen reviewed the level criteria and reminded the committee that the NCA Report is due September 2005, and will need to include 2 years of results shown per programs/units. NCA level criteria is available at:


To paraphrase:

Level 3: All 7 steps including results that show change in student learning outcomes.
Level 2: Modifications have been made and results are measurable* but there is no demonstration in improvement in student learning outcomes.

*Each departmental/unit assessment surveys, reports and data will be included with the final report materials to be sent to NCA.

The next step in getting programs to level 2 will take place at the department level.

Other Business: A possible showcase of the best assessment plans (top 5) including an award ceremony (with a monetary gift to the department/unit) was discussed. M. Zeglen requested comments and suggestions for the showcase at the next meeting. Possible food item: coconut shrimp.

Next meeting: February 20, 2003, noon – 1:30 PM, in RT 1716