University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, November 30, 2011
3:00 p.m. in the Room of Nations in the Memorial Union

University Assessment Committee Members Present: John Bitzan, Kevin Brooks, Ed Deckard, Carolyn Grygiel, Bob Harrold, Bunnie Johnson-Messelt, Marinus Otte, Debb Pankow, Larry Peterson, Bruce Rafert, Bill Slanger, Donna Terbizan, Chad Ulven, Joni Wiebesick, Gary Totten. Recorder: Linda Dahlsad.

__Focal point for this meeting__: Learning about "Campus Labs", closure for the current semester.

1) Minutes:
    a. Minutes of the November 2, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

2) Additions to the proposed agenda and announcements:
    a. No corrections and updates to the proposed agenda.
    b. Announcements from members of this committee.
        i. Bill Slanger announced NDSU had 25 individuals complete the CLA Performance Task Academy on November 3 and 4. UND had 30. Very positive comments were received from the facilitators and participants.
    c. Announcements from related committees or activities (Gen Ed, Senate, others).
        i. During the Cohort Three workshop (November 16 – 18), representatives from the University of Wisconsin – Whitewater estimated a cost of $300,000 in faculty release time for their proposed improvement activity. Locally, North Dakota State College of Science and Alexandria Tech are collaborating on a project.
    d. No points of interest presented by members of this committee.

3) Unfinished business:
    a. Planning for Spring Semester activities.
        i. Deferred to the end of the meeting.

4) New Business:
    a. Web-based presentation on Campus Labs (facilitated by Bunnie Johnson-Messelt).
        i. The 20-minute presentation highlighted features and flexibility of the software. The depth of the program's applications for units in academic affairs has increased significantly in the last two years and a number of key features have been developed to address the needs and expectations of teaching faculty. The presentation had been customized for the NDSU audience as an example of the level of branding that would be possible. The members present expressed appreciation to Bunnie Messelt-Johnson for facilitating the demonstration and to the presenter for her depth of knowledge and her consideration.
        ii. Discussion after webinar presentation brought up some interesting questions. A major consideration was how to ensure that students complete evaluations. One approach might be to link it to their grades in that their grade would not be posted until the evaluation has been completed. Efficiency might be optimized by using a single learning platform and it is possible that the State Board could want a uniform platform across all institutions that it governs. Some of these questions might be presented at the academic affairs committee meeting next week. One suggestion was that perhaps we should get out ahead of potential state-based activities and collaborate with UND as the majority of NDUS students are enrolled at NDSU and UND. There was a concern about the cost and who would drive this effort.

b. Approach to assessment reporting used at Kansas City (Kansas) Community College.
   i. Instructors access a spreadsheet populated with the student enrollment in their class and rate individual proficiencies for the student outcome that they wish to emphasize for that term. A rating scale of 0 – 4 is used to assess the proficiency of each student for the individual student learning outcome.
   ii. During discussion of other options, Task Stream was identified as another assessment reporting tool. Clemson is an example of a campus that uses this software. The Group Decision Center and ITS were mentioned as examples of potential on-campus development of a focused electronic assessment system.
   iii. Extensive discussion followed with a number of considerations voiced. Example considerations included:
       • The potential problem of moving forward systematically,
       • identification of features sought in commercial software or desired in locally-developed tools,
       • Present as an approach to minimize reports.
       • Multiple options are available.
       • The probability that a decision could be made in the next year and a half.
       • Use the Higher Learning Commission meeting in March as an initial review of potential vendors and an opportunity to look at their products.
       • Seek additional Webinars as option to look at products.

       There was general agreement that the UAC committee should evaluate data-collection systems and either make a selection or develop a short list of preferred options and schedule the Century Theater for faculty discussion. It was noted that James Madison University has an office responsible for campus based assessment. The potential role of IT was explored.
c. Meeting schedule for Spring Semester.
   i. <u>Meeting Times:</u> The meeting times for next semester will be the second option. Friday, January 20, February 17, March 23, and April 20 from 11:30 – 12:20.
d. No items presented by members of the University Assessment Committee.

5) <u>Other pertinent items presented by members of the University Assessment Committee</u>.
   a. The University-Wide Assessment Plan was presented to the Faculty Senate with a favorable response.

6) <u>Adjourn</u>
   a. Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

- -

The meetings scheduled for the Spring Semester will be held on:
   Friday, January 20, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. in the Mandan Room.
   Friday, February 17, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. in the Mandan Room.
   Friday, March 23, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. in the Mandan Room.
   Friday, April 13, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. in the Peach Garden Room.