Agenda			
ULM SOP Assessment Committee			**Date: 1.17.2017**
MEMBERS: Gina Craft (liaison), Jennifer Smith (chair), Amal Kaddoumi, Seetharama Jois, Michelle Zagar, Scott Baggarly, Amanda Storer, Hilary Tice, Adam Pate		**MEMBERS ABSENT:**	**TIME CALLED TO ORDER: 12:05 pm TIME ADJOURNED: 12:50pm**
AGENDA ITEM	**DISCUSSIONS/CONCLUSIONS**	**RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS WHAT/WHEN/WHO**	**PRESENTER**
1. Committee updates	•	•	Jennifer
2. Meeting minutes	• Approval of meeting minutes from 11.15.16 a. Online voting: 6 to approve, verify with full committee	Motion to approve- 2nd: Vote to approve: Approved (online)	Jennifer

3. Taxonomy comparison	• Discussion of taxonomy comparison/recommendation submitted by subgroup (document on Moodle)
	    a. Provided summary of background for why subcommittee chose to recommend Miller's based on available information, both from ACPE and AACP SIG papers
	    b. As example, if we use Miller's, most didactic will probably be classified as knows or knows how; some lab work/OSCEs might be in shows how or does
	    c. Some concern expressed about having the same problem with current taxonomy, in that faculty must be "on the same page" when coding questions to make it work, but ultimately will hopefully be more straightforward if we have some examples and faculty development on it before implementation.
	    d. Miller's is less focused on an item-specific analysis; idea is that is shows a sequential progression to "build" a pharmacist
		• Will hold vote online via Moodle
		• Update: poll closed on 1/27; unanimous to approve; forwarded info to Dr Craft for presentation at future date at a faculty meeting
			Jennifer/Michelle/Gina

4. Internal faculty survey	• Focus group planning: discussion of top 5 questions from everyone
	Combined responses - top 5 questions:
	
	36: The college/school uses programmatic assessment data to improve the curriculum.
	   • Maybe combine with 8
	   • Maybe combine with 34
	8: The assessment processes are effective.
	   • See above (?combine with 36)
	
	9: The curriculum oversight processes are effective.
	
	Same # of votes (2):
	21: Funds are available to support faculty development.
	25: The college or school has a sufficient number of staff to effectively address programmatic needs.
	   • Maybe combine with 30
	30: The college/school has a sufficient number of faculty.
	   • Maybe combine with 25
	34: The curriculum is taught at a depth that supports understanding of central concepts and principles.
	   • Maybe combine with 36 (above)
	
	After discussion:
	   • Q1: combine #36 and #8
	   • Q2: combine #9 and #34
	   • Q3: combine #25 and #30
	   • Q4: #21 and expand; since everyone is aware funds are limited and probably not going to change drastically; maybe ask for ideas to better use what we have; either for things that faculty could do/use individually or for the faculty as a whole.
	   • Q5: General "wrap-up" type question – what needs to be assessed? Any other concerns you have related to assessment that have not been discussed?
		• Jennifer will compile final list and share with committee prior to next meeting
		• Confirm other details at next meeting (who, when, where)
			Jennifer

5. Open discussion	• Other comments/questions? a. Michelle shared plans of faculty development programs to try to better understand all the pieces of CAPE, programmatic changes, etc in relation to what we're doing…the "big" picture and how it relates or is important to individual faculty members. Upcoming session on CAPE Outcomes by Dr Lindsay Davis on 1/26/17.		Committee