University-Wide Assessment Committee
Student Learning
February 14, 2014
2:00 p.m., Kearns Hall 205

Members Present: John Beard (Chair), Karen Aguirre, Ellen Arnold, Janet Buckenmeyer, Kristal Curry, Margaret Fain, Vivian Ford, Jeannie French, Amy Fyn, Dodi Hodges, Michael Latta, Jim Luken, Megan McIlreavy, Chris Mee, Carol Osborne, Scott Pleasant, Lee Shinaberger

Members Absent: Nelljean Rice

I. Welcome and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in Kearns Hall 205 and welcomed all present. The minutes from the meeting on January 17th were included as part of the packet distributed to all attendees. The Chair asked if any modifications to the minutes were recommended. A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was offered by Karen Aguirre, seconded by Dodi Hodges, and approved by the committee.

II. General Updates

A. Closing Out "Executive Summaries" in TEAL Online – The last step of the 2012-13 TEAL Online process includes the completion of the Executive Summary (formerly the Dean's Executive Summary). To date most are complete.

B. Submit Drafts of 2014-2015 Plans: March 15 – An email was sent out on February 14th reminding those concerned of the upcoming March 15th deadline for 2014-15 assessment plans. Reports have been copied forward from 2013-14 and modifications can be made as needed (e.g. modifying dates, changing wording, adding new goals, etc.). Those writing plans can receive help by contacting John Beard or attending CeTEAL sessions.

C. SACS Visit Triggered by New Ph.D. Program – As a result of the new Marine Science Ph.D. program being offered beginning in Fall 2014, SACS will be visiting campus again in March 2015. Chris Mee shared that the University's application for a level change from level three to level five had been approved by SACS. Chris emphasized that the entire university is being reaccredited, not just the new Ph.D. program. Also important is the adherence to the October 1st deadline for 2013-14 assessment reports as they will be included as supporting evidence for several standards.

III. Discussion Topic: University-Wide Standardized Testing

A. Overview of Possible Benefits – Included with the meeting materials was the General University-Wide Standardized Testing document. A decision on whether to request monies for a new testing instrument should happen relatively quickly as budgets are currently being established for next year. Currently the University's assessment of student learning is
fragmented and this is something that should be looked at more closely.

B. Available Options – Several tools are being considered, specifically, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT), and the ETS Proficiency Profile (EPP).

C. Recommendation from Aguirre/Beard/Mee – The recommendation from this group is that 2014-15 be used as a planning year. During this year the following questions will be answered:

- What do we want to measure?
- How would we use the data collected?
- How would we choose students to participate?
- How and when would we administer the test?
- Which instrument would best suit our needs?

With this plan in mind, monies will not be requested for the upcoming year and may be requested in order to administer the selected instrument as a pilot during the 2015-16 academic year. The committee engaged in a brief discussion relative to standardized testing and it was agreed the conversation would continue at another time.

IV. Discussion Topic: A New Five-Year Assessment Plan

A. Likely Goals for the Next Five Years - Jim Luken, Carol Osborne and Margaret Fain offered a handout to begin discussion on ideas for a possible five-year Assessment Plan to guide campus assessment into the near future. Jim Luken discussed the Clemson University e-portfolio graduation requirement.

B. Actions That Should Help Accomplish Each Goal – The recommendation from this group includes the development of a plan to require students to create an e-portfolio. In the e-portfolio students would demonstrate core competencies and be better able to understand why they are taking general education courses. A committee could then assess the portfolios and in doing so assess the core. Additional benefits of e-portfolios include:

- the possibility that students will, due to the requirement, take all core courses before the end of their sophomore year
- the e-portfolios serve as a benchmark prior to students taking the majority of their major courses
- the ability for students to use the e-portfolio when conducting job searches
- the likelihood that students will keep examples of their work as opposed to throwing them away

C. Timeline and Sequencing of Goals

Further discussions concerning e-portfolios will take place at the next committee meeting. Anyone that would like to be part of this group should email Jim Luken.
V. Discussion Topic: Focus on Student Learning

Kristal Curry, Dodi Hodges, Mike Latta, and Ellen Arnold agreed to lead a discussion suggesting ways the committee might shift more focus to actual student learning. This discussion will occur at the next committee meeting. Anyone that would like to be part of this group should email Kristal Curry.

A. COHFA Confab Example – Included with the meeting materials was the COHFA Confab 2014: A Conference on Student Learning informational sheet. All are invited to attend.

B. Bringing Student Learning Forward – Not discussed

C. Target Report – Not discussed

V. Adjourn – Next Meetings: March 21 and April 25 @ 2:00

Included with the meeting materials was the Dissecting the Classroom article.

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.