

University-Wide Assessment Committee
Student Learning
February 28, 2013
8:30 a.m., Dawsey Conference Room

Members Present: John Beard (Chair), Ellen Arnold, Kristal Curry, Tom Hoffman, Jim Luken, Vivian McCain, Chris Mee, Carol Osborne, Scott Pleasant, Nelljean Rice, John Steen, Dennis Wiseman

Members Absent: Margaret Fain, Amy Fyn, Dodi Hodges, Michael Latta, Barbara Ritter

I. Introductions and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. in the Dawsey Conference Room and welcomed all present.

The minutes from the meeting on January 18th, 2013 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 Carol Osborne, seconded by Dennis Wiseman and approved by the committee.

II. Confirm Remaining Meeting Dates and Times

Meetings for the remainder of the semester will be as follows: March 22, April 19, and May 10 at 2:00. The May 10th meeting will be held only if committee business for the year has not been completed.

III. New Evaluation of "Other" TEAL Online Reports

Chairman Beard thanked the committee for undertaking the evaluation of thirteen assessment reports that had not been previously reviewed. Categorizing these reports as academic, administrative or student learning has been a challenge and as a result they have not been reviewed and feedback provided to the author until now. Four sub-groups met and submitted one consensus report and score representing the opinion of the entire group.

A. Updates from Groups: A, B, C, and D

Group A: The group quickly came to an agreement on the score for each report. The emphasis was then placed on providing useful feedback for the report editor. It was agreed the Honors program was more academically aligned, and as such may have benefited more by being assessed with the rubric designed for student learning. The reports for the Centers provided more of a challenge. The Burroughs and Chapin Center for Marine and Wetland Studies report was difficult to assess due to the complexity of the report. The other Centers were more straightforward yet getting a clear grasp of the goals and objectives of the units was a challenge. It was agreed, however, that some feedback was a step in the right direction and a helpful starting point. It must be considered, however, that the readers of these reports were
very unfamiliar with the mission of the Centers and as such may have provided limited feedback.

**Group B:** A consensus was easily reached by this group as well. Again, due to the unfamiliarity with the mission and workings of the units being assessed, providing feedback was a challenge. Objectives that seemed vague to the group members might, in fact, not be vague to those familiar with the unit's function. It was agreed, however, that providing some feedback was better than none at all. As comments were not included as part of the report submitted to Chairman Beard, group members will forward comments for inclusion prior to the feedback being returned to the unit.

**Group C:** Again, unfamiliarity with a unit's purpose made providing truly meaningful feedback a challenge. This group focused on the structure of the report. For example, an objective might be clearly stated with supporting data provided. If, however, it was unclear as to how this data might be used going forward, this was noted. The Celebration of Inquiry report had survey data; however, several of the other reports did not have data and reported more on what was accomplished.

**Group D:** Scores and comments were sent to Mike Roberts to be compiled. It was reported that all group members submitted very similar feedback and had no difficulty understanding the mission and objectives of the units. This group discussed the rubric being used for the assessment and it was agreed that the shorter rubric was desirable over the longer rubric used to assess the academic reports in the fall.

**B. Consensus Rubric Forwarded to Each Editor** – Chairman Beard requested that any comments that have not been submitted yet be sent to him as soon as possible. He will send feedback to report editors within a day or two after receiving the committees' additional comments.

**C. Cover Letter Explains Basis for New Report** – Letters will be included with feedback and editors encouraged to ask questions if they so desire.

**D. Possible Creation of New Site in TEAL Online: "Outreach"** – As the units being discussed do not neatly fit into one of the TEAL Online categories, future discussions may occur regarding adding a new site (category) in TEAL Online.

**IV. Evaluation of the 2011-2012 Core Curriculum Report**

**A. Consensus Rubric Results from Three Committees** – In addition to the thirteen reports assessed by the four sub-committees, the Core Curriculum report was also included for review. Core Curriculum is part of TEAL Online student learning, however, due to the complexity and length of this report no group was assigned to review it during the fall semester when the groups had more reports to review. It was decided to request the four sub-groups assess the report and provide feedback.

**B. Determine Final, Single Rubric Results for Report** – The core curriculum report consists of eight distinct goals, some of which are not reported on every year. The sub-committees submitted consensus reports that considered the core curriculum report holistically or by each
individual goal. One sub-committee did not submit feedback and will do that within the next several days. Chairman Beard will gather all feedback and will compile a summary report to submit to Margaret Fain. It was suggested that in the future this report be broken down by goal and each sub-committee assess several goals as opposed to all eight.

V. Use of Academic Rubric Results from Fall 2012

A. Review Results to Determine Changes in Rubric Itself – Included in the meeting materials was a copy of the feedback reports returned in the fall to all departments. Departments also received a blank copy of the rubric used in the assessment. These reports may be used to evaluate and recommend changes to the rubric that was used in the assessment of the academic reports. It was requested, however, that these reports not be shared with anyone not serving on this committee. Prior to the end of the academic year it would be advantageous for the committee to modify the rubric as necessary and distribute the revised rubric back to the departments. Having the rubric may be beneficial for those who will be writing the assessment report over the summer. The committee will commit an entire meeting to the discussion and revision of the rubric.

B. Review Results to Determine Any Committee Recommendations for Next Year – Time permitting at the next meeting the committee will discuss recommendations to be included in the year-end report that is submitted to the Provost on an annual basis.

VI. Adjourn – Next Meeting

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.