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

Unable to Attend: Jennifer DeCock, Elizabeth Skoy, and David Wittrock

1. We approved the minutes from the November 16, 2012 meeting as distributed by email on November 19.

2. Follow-up on action items from the November 16 meeting.
   - Update on meetings with departments with very late assessment reports – Peterson reported he has met or will meet with all the departments with overdue assessments. 
   - Paul Fisk and Bill Slanger from the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis demonstrated the Compendium showing all the categories of essential data it contains and can display. There is a link to Assessment Documents that will take a user to the Assessment report and cover letter for each department. 
   - Peterson asked if there was any other information that committee members thought would be helpful to include in the Compendium. It was suggested that it show which programs are accredited by having a hot link to jump to this information. Peterson stated that it might link to the information stored at the Electronic Repository through the Library. It was also suggested to include the statistics such as mean, median, and range for each college and the university to make it easy to compare to other colleges/departments.
   - Another suggestion was possibly include the GPA’s of students, their ACT scores, and the scores from national exams that students take.
   - If members have other suggestions, they are encouraged to contact Slanger.

3. Peterson reviewed the following areas in the new Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Criteria which relate most directly to assessment.
   - Criteria for Accreditation: Guiding Values
     4. A culture of continuous improvement (Page 3, column 3)
        • Especially paragraphs 2 and 3
   - Criterion Three. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support
     3. B. 3. Every degree program’s learning outcomes (Page 6, column 2)
   - Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement
     4. B. Ongoing assessment of student learning (Page 7, columns 2-3)
   - Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness
     5. C. 2. Assessment of student learning linked to evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting (Page 8, column 2)
   - Assumed Practices
     C. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement.
        C. 6: "Institutional data on assessment of student learning . . . address the full range of students who enroll." (Page 10, column 3)
• Peterson stated that he is planning to form a small committee in the Spring of 2013 to prepare for the re-accreditation visit that will be done in spring 2016. The report will be due Fall of 2015.

4. Peterson highlighted some of the items in his report from the 2012 Indiana Assessment Institute he thought the committee should be thinking about in regards to what other schools are doing. NDSU is most similar to K State and Purdue
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NEXT MEETING FRIDAY, JANUARY 18TH AT 11:00AM, PEACE GARDEN ROOM