Members present: Jennie Cassidy, John Beard, Whitney Comer, Allison Faix, Vivian Ford, Chris Mee, Caesar Ross, Michael Ruse, Pat Singleton-Young, Charles Whiffen, Tom Woodle

Members absent: Jean Ann Brakefield, Stephen Harrison, Michael Jacobs, Tara Josey, Aggie O'Brien-Gayes, Travis Overton, Geoff Parsons

Welcome

Jennie Cassidy, Chair, convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. in SNGL 112 and welcomed all present. Charles Whiffen, Math Coordinator in University College, was introduced as the newest member of the committee.

Progress on Previously Made Recommendations

Nothing to report

Reminder

Assigned 2012-2013 reports should be reviewed prior to the April committee meeting. Most groups have already met to discuss the reports. One rating consolidated report for each group should be submitted prior to the next meeting.

Discussion Items

Sharing Results With Others – The general concern with this topic is that not enough sharing of assessment results occurs. A discussion of better ways to share ensued, and the following suggestions were offered:

- Having more than one Assessment Day per year
- Scheduling Assessment Day in times other than the fall semester
- Encouraging those not directly involved with assessment to attend Assessment Day
- Identifying assessment activities and data available in other areas on campus. This topic relates closely to #7 (Exploring/Identifying opportunities for partnering in assessment both inside and outside of UWAC-SD) on the Discussion Items list included as part of the meeting agenda.
- Requesting input from others when developing assessment tools. As an example, Steve Harrison solicited input from colleagues when developing custom questions for the EBI survey.

Addressing Issue of Disregarding Data – Frustration can result when recommendations are made based on data collected and no action is taken. Often it is clear that the data is pointing in a certain direction and nobody takes it seriously. As an example, it was discussed that the University brought in a consultant to investigate retention issues. After the consultant left no information was shared with the University community. The
emphasis was on "why" we have retention issues. The process was halted before any recommendations were made; therefore, no changes took place. It was suggested that the new Provost supports data-driven decisions and a culture shift might occur as a result. One recommendation is to write high level executive summaries and target key individuals, often those in the position to make decisions, to receive the reports.

Developing a Reporting System to Get Feedback on Our Recommendations – In the past this committee has made recommendations and has received no response. It was suggested that all assessment committees (main committee plus three subs) schedule a group meeting with the Provost to discuss recommendations. It was suggested that when recommendations are submitted, a plan of action be included as well. Meeting face to face ensures that the recommendations have been received.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. with the agreement that exploring/identifying opportunities for partnering in assessment both inside and outside of UWAC-SD, addressing issue of disregarding data, and exploring how to move results to action outside of your own area will be discussed at the next meeting. In addition, a review of the results for the rating of the 2012-2013 assessment reports will be discussed.