

**University Assessment Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for Friday, January 18, 2013**  
11:00-11:50 a.m., Peace Garden, Memorial Union

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Jeffrey Boyer, Kevin Brooks, Ann Clapper, Brenda Hall, Bunnie Johnson-Messelt, Larry Peterson, Scott Pryor, Elizabeth Skoy, Bill Slanger, Chad Ulven, Mary Wright.  
Recorder: Kelly Hoyt.

Unable to Attend: Jennifer DeCock, Julie Garden-Robinson, Bruce Rafert, and David Wittrock

1. The minutes from December 7, 2012 meeting as distributed by email on December 7 were approved.
2. Members reviewed the Updated Mini Progress Report Chart. Peterson and Brooks reported about a spontaneous positive review they received yesterday from a department member, indicating that individuals in his department have started talking positively about assessment.
3. Eight batches of 21 department reports were distributed for review this semester
  - Unit 1 – Brenda Hall
  - Unit 2 – Bunnie Johnson-Messelt
  - Unit 3 – Elizabeth Skoy
  - Unit 4 – Ann Clapper
  - Unit 5 – Scott Pryor
  - Unit 6 – Chad Ulven
  - Unit 7 – Peggy Andersen
  - Unit 8 – Kevin Brooks, Julie Garden-Robinson, and Jeff Boyer
4. Follow-up on assessment issues from December 7 discussion
  - Should the Assessment Office create an electronic template for curriculum mapping to collect evidence for HLC Criterion 3. B. 3. (“**Every degree program** [emphasis added] offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments”)?
    - Peterson asked for feedback about the following scenario.
      - ✓ Programs could record which student activities in which courses engage students in these learning behaviors.
      - ✓ Automatic interface with existing systems (Atlas, E\*Value) would be ideal.
      - ✓ We will need feedback and buy-in from the Chairs and Heads.
      - ✓ Any template should be piloted with variety of departments.
      - ✓ Challenge will be how to gather the most useful information with the least resistance.
        - Just courses where these happen?
        - Include type of student activity (menu driven—research paper, team project, poster presentation, etc.)?

- Include level of activity for each course—introduced, reinforced, emphasized?
- Pryor stated that one of the values of our current approach is that departments choose the student learning that they think is most important to assess and they get feedback. A template seems to throw the report in a black hole that doesn't mean much to anyone anymore.
- Anderson believed this template would be really helpful – especially for the College of Business.
- Clapper said that Atlas has helped the School of Education show which courses meet their outcomes. Regardless of what program is decided to utilize, an electronic solution will be beneficial.
- Skoy expressed concern that Atlas maybe requires too much front end work that is very time consuming.
- Pryor suggested focusing on capstones to show the learning outcomes of students and that they are able to do what they are supposed to upon the completion of a program. Peterson noted that CULE has collected a great deal of information about the capstones recently, and this could be a good start. However, this may not provide sufficient evidence for the long run.
- We agreed that the goal is to get a systematic program in place to track and analyze this information, rather than having it scattered and not compiled. It should help programs align their learning outcomes in courses with those for their program, their accreditors, and the new learning outcomes and the Six Core Questions.
- Peterson will present a three-step program to the chairs and heads for their feedback.
  - ✓ UAC will rely on the capstone information collected by CULE for evidence that programs engage students in these learning activities.
  - ✓ UAC members will consider creating a checklist of these learning activities, either as part of the guidelines for departments or as part of our own reviewing process
  - ✓ Eventually, we need something more robust that provides this information, but does not force departments to duplicate efforts they already make for program review and professional accreditation.

- Peterson urged members to forward any additional thoughts on this topic to him.
5. Members briefly discussed some readings to frame our work as we think about revising and improving the assessment process later in the semester.
- “AAHE Principles of Good Practice”
  - “AAHE Principles of Good Practice: Aging Nicely”  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/PrinciplesofAssessment.html#AAHE>
  - *Using Assessment Results: Promising Practices of Institutions that Do It Well*, Baker, Jankowski, Provezis, and Kinzie  
<http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/UsingAssessmentResults.htm>
    - Especially the “Reflective Questions and Resources” (pp. 12-13)
  - As we discussed one of the “Reflective Questions” about sharing examples of good assessment, we decided to plan an Assessment Luncheon this spring to showcase departments who are doing well with assessment or who are having good department conversations about assessment.
    - We discussed Electrical Engineering, Pharmacy Practice, and Natural Resource Sciences as possible presenters.
  - We also discussed including a place on the reviewer template to note exceptional areas or examples to remember and share with others.
6. New business
- Skoy asked if there was any possibility of having a center for teaching, learning, development, etc., where faculty could go for assistance with things. Boyer indicated he is on the search committee for the director of the Center for Instructional Excellence and Innovation which would provide those services.

**NEXT MEETING FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 11AM IN PEACE GARDEN**