

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for Friday, March 22, 2013
11:00-11:50 a.m., Peace Garden, Memorial Union

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Kevin Brooks, Ann Clapper, Julie Garden-Robinson, Bunnie Johnson-Messelt, Brenda Hall, Larry Peterson, Scott Pryor, Bruce Rafert, Elizabeth Skoy, Bill Slanger.
Recorder: Kelly Hoyt.

Unable to Attend: Jeffrey Boyer, Jennifer DeCock, Chad Ulven, David Wittrock, and Mary Wright

1. The minutes from the February 22, 2013 meeting as distributed by email on February 25 were approved.
2. Members reviewed the Updated Mini Progress Report Chart. Departments have made some progress as we now only have 13 units with no reports from either 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 as compared to 24 units on 9/28/12. The number of units with no reports from 2008-2009 or earlier is now at 9 as compared to 14 on 9/28/12.
3. Members discussed possible questions for the presenters at the Assessment Luncheon which will be at 11:30 on Thursday, April 11 in the Hidatsa Room.
 - What questions do we want them to address?
 - Six votes: How do they use their data to close the loop?
 - Four votes: How can the lessons they have learned and their practices be applied to all departments, not just those that are accredited and are required to do it?
 - Four votes: What impact has assessment had on students?
 - Three votes: What is the value of assessment for the department beyond accreditation and why is it valuable?
 - Three votes: How and when did they make the transition from treating assessment as an externally imposed burden to feeling that it's important and enjoying it? Was it a key person, a conference, etc. that caused the change?
 - Brooks: What is the value and impact of assessment? What was their history and process? What are the lessons they learned?
 - Peterson will forward Brook's three questions on value, impact and process to the presenters. He will include the other questions as appropriate examples of the Big Three. He will urge the presenters to discuss their presentations ahead of time to coordinate them.
4. Members discussed *Changing Institutional Culture to Promote Assessment of Higher Learning*, Richard H. Hersh and Richard P. Keeling's essay from NILOA to help us frame our work of revising and improving the assessment process.
 - Members liked their emphasis on changing institutional culture to help students connect key learning across departments.

- Slanger was pleased with their emphasis on actionable results, on measuring student learning in such a way that we can know why we get the results we do and how we can improve those results.
5. Members reviewed five examples of rubrics for assessing programs from the Assess listserv (Eastern Washington University, Mount Vernon Nazarene University, Pennsylvania State University, US Air Force Academy, and Virginia Wesleyan College)
- Most members liked the Penn State rubric because the check boxes would be easy for reviewers to use and would help the Committee build a composite picture of campus assessment.
 - Boyer, Clapper, and Hall will draft a reviewer rubric prior to the April 12 meeting for the committee to review that day.
6. Members concluded by discussing revisions for the Department Assessment Guidelines.
- Members suggested following up with departments on how this format worked from the previous year and if they changed anything.
 - Members also suggested that how information is being used from previous years should be included in the guidelines as well.
 - Previous discussions on the guidelines suggested
 - Encouraging departments to focus on what are they trying to accomplish, rather than on just what did they do
 - Including one outcome for each major in a department because of departments (Natural Resource Sciences, ADHM, etc.) with multiple non-congruent majors
 - Consider creating a checklist of the HLC 3.B.3 learning activities (“Every degree program 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.”) This checklist could be either part of the guidelines for departments or part of our own reviewing process.
 - Andersen and Peterson will revise the guidelines for April 12 and work with Boyer, Clapper, and Hall to ensure the guidelines and the reviewer rubric are synchronized.

NEXT MEETING FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 11AM IN MEADOW ROOM