

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for Friday, April 12, 2013
11:00-11:50 a.m., Meadow Room, Memorial Union

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

Unable to Attend: Jennifer DeCock, Bruce Rafert, David Wittrock, and Mary Wright

Guest: Jerad Binstock, a Pharm. D. student on his last rotation of the program.

1. The minutes from the March 22, 2013 meeting as distributed by email on March 26 were approved.
2. Members reviewed the Updated Mini Progress Report Chart. For those nine departments that are seriously overdue, we are asking for any report at this time. It does not need to cover all the missing years. The Committee would just like to receive something and go forward from this point.
3. Members discussed the April 11 Assessment Luncheon
 - Members noted that the evaluations of the presentations were quite positive.
 - Hoyt will get a list from Don Schwert of the people who registered and the date they registered so we can review which departments were represented.
 - Members made the following suggestions for future assessment luncheons:
 - One or more assessment luncheons next year, but ask non-accredited departments, such as English, to present
 - Presentations focused on particular assessment tools, such as surveys
 - Writing department learning outcomes
 - Aligning learning outcomes for courses with those for the department
 - Surveying department chairs to learn what assessment topics they would find most helpful or what they see as the obstacles to assessment.
4. Follow-up on assessment issues from March 22 meeting
 - Report from the Reviewer Rubric Subcommittee (Boyer, Brooks, Clapper, Hall)
 - They will be meeting next week to discuss what can be done in the short amount of time before the end of the year.
 - Peterson suggested that they send their final draft to members via email and committee members can provide feedback via email as well.
 - The rubrics and the revised department guidelines will need to be linked.
 - Members discussed the report from the Department Guidelines Subcommittee (Andersen and Peterson) and made the following suggestions:
 - Do not list four possible deadlines as it will allow departments to think they can submit their reports at the next deadline if they have missed the previous one.
 - ✓ Create a table the UAC can use that shows when and how many reports are submitted and what deadlines they most closely meet. Then departments can be notified of their deadline based on this information. That way the

committee is able to spread out when reports are received and the number that need to be reviewed at one time. There can still be some flexibility of when reports are due, but that will not be “advertised” to the departments.

- Change the wording in the first bullet about the principles on page one to “how they are aligned” instead of “how they are linked.”
- Use consistent vocabulary throughout the guidelines.
- Include a glossary to define key words.
- Include a graphic depicting the hierarchy of how the outcomes from courses and departments fit together.
- Emphasize that the UAC is asking departments to evaluate student learning outcomes for the department, not for individual faculty courses.
- Andersen and Peterson will look at the items discussed thus far and re-word accordingly.

**NEXT MEETING FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 11AM
PRESIDENTS ROOM, OLD MAIN 102**