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

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Jeffrey Boyer, Kevin Brooks, Jennifer DeCock, Julie Garden-Robinson, Bunnie Johnson-Messelt, Larry Peterson, Scott Pryor, Bruce Rafert, Bill Slanger, Chad Ulven, David Wittrock. Recorder: Kelly Hoyt.

Unable to Attend: Ann Clapper, Brenda Hall, Elizabeth Skoy, and Mary Wright

1. The minutes from January 18, 2013 meeting as distributed by email on January 18 were approved.

2. Updated Mini Progress Report Chart – Two new reviews of reports have been submitted by UAC members since this report was sent out.

3. Scott Pryor reported on some of the highlights from the 13th Annual Texas A&M Assessment Conference
   - Many programs and campuses are engaged in curriculum mapping.
   - It was refreshing to be around a group that was excited about and interested in assessment.
   - Socializing new faculty about assessment is a goal NDSU should try to attain.
     - Implementing a mentoring program to do this might be helpful.
   - Faculty need to intentionally teach students how to work in teams/groups if we expect teamwork to be a learning outcome.
   - Peterson will send out Pryor’s report on the conference to all committee members.

4. Follow-up on assessment issues from January 18 meeting
   - Peterson received positive responses about the plan agreed to on January 18 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”) by having the UAC mine the capstone information collected by CULE for evidence that programs engage students in these learning activities.

   - An Assessment Luncheon is scheduled for 11:30 on Thursday, April 11 in the Hidatsa Room.
     - Presenters will be from Counselor Education, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Pharmacy Practice
     - What questions do we want them to address?
       - What is the value of assessment for the department beyond accreditation?
         - Why is it valuable?
       - 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?
       - How their assessment system developed and how did they overcome any faculty resistance to it?
What do they do with those not who are not as willing to participate?
✓ 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?
  o Was it a key person, a conference, etc. that caused the change?
✓ How do they use curriculum mapping?
✓ How do they work as a team?
✓ What impact has assessment had on students?
✓ How do they use their data to close the loop?

Kelly will send the list of questions/suggestions to committee members to get a narrowed down list as there are too many to be discussed in the allowed time of the luncheon.

5. Peterson distributed additional copies of the DQP and members discussed Peter Ewell, The Lumina Degree Qualifications (DQP): Implications for Assessment as an additional reading to frame our work as we think about revising and improving the assessment process later in the semester. Key themes we discussed included: aligning assignment and rubric templates to create embedded assessments that can be used for grading and collaborating in multi-institutional ratings.

6. Things to be thinking about for our March 22 meeting:
   • Should we create a checklist of the HLC 3.B.3 learning activities, either as part of the guidelines for departments or as part of our own reviewing process?
   • Revising the Department Assessment Guidelines and the UAC Reporting format
     • Meaningful for departments and units (#1 priority)
     • Not just one major per department because of departments (Natural Resource Sciences, ADHM, etc.) with multiple non-congruent majors
     • Greater consistency (inter-rater reliability)
     • Trend data (longitudinal and comparative) for departments and campus
   • Before the next meeting, Peterson will distribute the latest NILOA paper on creating a culture of assessment and the current discussion on the assessment listserv about rubrics for assessing programs.
   • Boyer suggested the Guidelines should encourage departments to focus on what are they trying to accomplish, rather than on just what did they do.
     • Clapper suggested previously that we should be revising our reporting form for assessment reports as a rubric.

NEXT MEETING FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 11AM IN PEACE GARDEN