

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, September 10, 2014
3:00-4:00 p.m., Mandan Room, Memorial Union

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Jeffrey Boyer, Kevin Brooks, Ann Clapper, Beth Ingram, Chris McEwen, Shelby Moen, Jeremy Penn, Larry Peterson, Brandy Randall, Amy Rupiper Taggart, Elizabeth Skoy, Bill Slanger, and Chad Ulven

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to Attend: Julie Garden-Robinson, Brenda Hall, Beth Ingram, and Scott Pryor

1. Committee members introduced themselves and welcomed new member, Shelby Moen.
2. The minutes from 05/05/14 meeting as distributed by email on 05/08/14 were approved.
 - Follow up on the minutes from May – Larry met with the chairs to see about future due dates for assessment reports in the future. They all agreed that September 15th would be a good date. Starting in Fall of 2015, reports will be due on Sept. 15 for Academic Affairs.
3. Updates
 - Updated Mini Progress Report Chart
 - We completed 40 reports since June 2013.
 - We are totally caught up at this time with the reviews that have been distributed and the responses to departments.
 - There are two 2012-13 reports from the spring that need to be reviewed.
 - There are 26 new reflective reports that need to be reviewed. Two departments with a May due date have still not submitted theirs.
 - There were 29 departments with a September 1 deadline. Only sixteen have been turned in. Some may have been confused by the new 9/15 deadline that was discussed. Larry will follow up with them. There were 2 units that submitted reports that did not respond to our request.
 - The two departments that are most overdue (2011-12 and 2008-09) are still in process.
4. Assessment reports to review this fall—based on new procedure
 - At the March and April meetings last year we decided to have members review reports from the same departments they reviewed previously and to provide previous reports and reviews to reviewers.
 - We will need volunteers for those reports where no current UAC member has previously reviewed the department.
 - Larry will send out a list of the reports that are coming due, showing who will be reviewing them and which ones still need someone assigned/to volunteer to review.
5. Review revised Reviewer Checklist for 2013-14 Reflections on Student Learning and Development Reports
 - Five UAC members normed two reports this summer and agreed to suggest three changes.
 - Omit item 1.A.B because it seemed redundant with 1.A. C. Outcomes that are “observable and measurable” should “clearly state what students should know” (and vice versa).

- Revise 2.B.E because departments might include this information, but not in the matrix. Changed the word matrix to report.
 - Change the opening phrase of the supplemental checklist because we did not actually ask departments for “evidence.” Each item now begins with “Based on this report, students seem to be...”
 - The committee agreed with the above changes.
 - Larry will send these changes to Linda Charlton Gunderson so she can put them on the Qualtrics website.
 - Jeff asked if Linda was creating a notifying system for Larry so he gets a notification when someone completes a review. Jeff indicated that this is a feature that can be set up as he has done it on his own surveys in Qualtrics.
 - Larry will check with Linda on this.
6. Review draft of Reviewer Checklist for 2013-14 Student Affairs Reflections on Student Learning and Development Reports from Jeremy
- Jeremy said there is a group in SA that have been reviewing reports for about a year now, just to get a feel of how the reports are written and how to assess them. This year they would like to give some feedback on the reports. They would do a process similar to the UAC committee. There would be a lead reviewer and then Jeremy would review it and provide feedback to the SA unit on their report. They are looking at some different questions than what UAC looks at so there is an opportunity for them to share their feedback as well as on the sections that UAC will be reviewing. Last year there were some conflicting reviews between the SA feedback and the UAC feedback and this would give them a chance to see both and ask questions.
 - Larry asked if the intent was to have the SA units revise their report after the SA assessment committee looks at them, before they come to UAC.
 - Jeremy said he didn’t think so. He said SA assessment would be looking at the sections on operational effectiveness and retention efforts.
 - Larry suggested omitting those sections that aren’t relative to what the UAC will be assessing.
 - ✓ Chris McEwin agreed with this as he reviewed a number of SA reports last year and said that in reading all of the additional information it felt like trying to fit a square peg into a round hole.
7. Members discussed Qualtrics Summary of Academic Program Reviews in 2013-14
- Larry noted that there was not one category in Academic Affairs that anyone got 100% in.
 - 90% of them did report assessment results.
 - Only at 7% articulated the relationship between their goals and the university’s, however, we did not ask them for that information.
 - Only 28% had a clear articulation between student learning outcomes and the program goals.
 - These last two may be due to the shift in what we are asking departments to submit to us. We used to ask for course by course information. We sometimes still get that information. We don’t get any analysis of how this all fits together. Now we are asking departments to tell us how it all fits together.
 - Ann suggested that a luncheon or session would be beneficial to present this information to groups and explain to them the things that are going well, but also discuss the areas that need improvement.

- Brandy suggested doing a luncheon, but also having it be a workshop and have a committee member at each table to explain how to close the loop.
- There would have to be a session for Academic Affairs and a session for Student Affairs.
- Jeff thinks that this information should be shared with the committee each meeting so that we can see how the new reports are aligning with the new rubric. It would show reviewers when they are reviewing reports if there are any common themes among departments.
 - Ann said that this would be a good tool to see if there is any improvement or an increase in percentages over time.
- Brandy asked if the programs that did a good job, did a good job in the undergrad and graduate level or just one or the other (basically if the level mattered).
 - Larry said it's a struggle to get departments to do grad programs. But typically if areas do well on undergrad, they do well on graduate level also.

Next meeting is Wednesday, October 8th at 3 pm in Mandan room