<u>**University Assessment Committee**</u>
**Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, September 4, 2013**
9:00-9:50 a.m., Peace Garden, Memorial Union

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Jeffrey Boyer, Kevin Brooks, Ann Clapper, Julie Garden-Robinson, Brenda Hall, Chris McEwen, Jeremy Penn, Larry Peterson, Scott Pryor, Bruce Rafert, Bill Slanger, and Chad Ulven.  Recorder: Kelly Hoyt.

Unable to Attend:  Andrew Montgomery and Elizabeth Skoy

1.  Committee introductions and welcome to new (or returning) members: Chris McEwen, Andrew Montgomery, Jeremy Penn, and Brandy Randall.

2.  The minutes from April 26, 2013 meeting as distributed by email on April 30, 2013 were approved.

3.  Review materials and guidelines
    - UAC Responsibilities from Faculty Senate Bylaws – Larry spoke with Julie and Chris Boerboom over the summer about how to do an assessment of Extension Service to be in compliance with the bylaws as this needs to be done as one of the committee's responsibilities and for accreditation.  They provided good direction in how to go about doing this.
    - 2012-13 Annual Report – If anyone has any comments or questions, please forward on to Larry.
    - Updated Mini Progress Report Chart – Larry will remind the 14 units that have not turned a report in for the past year or so to do so as soon as possible.
    - Recommendations from the HLC Assessment Workshop Team (Boyer, Penn, Peterson, and Tangpong) - A question to consider…Can we make our assessment report more meaningful or useful?
        - ✓ Possibly reframe the nomenclature as Student Learning and Development (not assessment) and use this language throughout.  Everyone agreed this might be beneficial.
        - ✓ Cluster due dates for reports by colleges to encourage cross college communication. It was suggested to talk to department chairs if they want to change their due dates, if they think this would help to have the same due dates across the departments.
        - ✓ Put focus on student learning and development with new guidelines.
        - ✓ It was suggested to leave the departments alone that are diligent in getting reports done in a timely fashion.  Doesn't make sense to punish those that are doing what is asked of them.
        - ✓ Some of the feedback Larry gets on guidelines is that it's not very clear or confusing. Larry and Peggy will create a new document to lay new guidelines out better.

4.  Batches of assessment reports to review this fall
    - Kevin Brooks – Unit 1
    - Julie Garden-Robinson – Unit 2
    - Chad Ulven – Unit 3
    - Liz Skoy – Unit 4
    - Jeremy Penn – Unit 5
    - ??? – Unit 6

5. I'd like your thoughts on revising the process for providing feedback to departments. I tried this two-step process with two reviews this summer:
    - I will send a draft cover letter and the primary reviewer's response to departments and ask for corrections or feedback within a ten working days. This process might all be done electronically.
        - I sent this message to Computer Science and Business. "Please let me know within ten working days (by Month, Date) if there are any errors or misinterpretations you want to bring to my attention. If I do not hear from you by then, I will send the letter and overview to you in their present form and send the Dean and copies of the cover letter."
    - If the department wants corrections or changes that any of the three parties (the department, the primary reviewer, or I) feel could not be satisfactorily resolved via emails, then we could have a face-to-face meeting to see if we could work out a mutually agreeable solution, realizing this may not always be possible.
        - ✓ The committee thought this was beneficial as it gives the departments a chance to have "dialogue" with Larry in terms of things they may disagree with in the report so they can be discussed before the final letter is sent out.
        - ✓ Some of the feedback Larry gets on guidelines is that it's not very clear or confusing. Larry and Peggy will create a new document to lay new guidelines out better.

6. Report from "listening meetings" with heads and chairs in various colleges in which I asked two questions, "What can be improved in assessment and general education?" and "What questions do you have about assessment, general education, and accreditation?"