University-Wide Assessment Committee  
Student Learning  
March 22, 2013  
2:00 p.m., Edwards 164

**Members Present**: John Beard (Chair), Ellen Arnold, Amy Fyn, Tom Hoffman, Jim Luken, Vivian McCain, Chris Mee, Carol Osborne, Scott Pleasant, Barbara Ritter, John Steen

**Members Absent**: Kristal Curry, Margaret Fain, Dodi Hodges, Michael Latta, Nelljean Rice, Dennis Wiseman

I. Introductions and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in Edwards 164 and welcomed all present.

The minutes from the meeting on February 28th, 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 Amy Fyn, and approved by the committee.

II. TEAL Online Updates

A. Submitting 2013-2014 Assessment Plans – Reminders were sent out requesting those responsible for departmental and unit assessment plans review them in preparation for the 2013-2014 academic year. These plans which were due March 15th are considered preliminary and modifications may be made until November 1, 2013.

B. College Review of Submitted Plans? – Reminders were also sent out requesting that preliminary assessment plans be shared with all departmental members, not just those responsible for writing the assessment plans and reports for the unit. Input from all is important.

C. New Assessment Audit Tool – The TEAL Online Assessment Audit is now available online. Until now only those sitting on certain committees or directly involved in assessment had access to departmental reports. This new online tool provides access for all faculty and staff. The available information is password protected. Also included on the site is information describing how the report assessments were conducted every year as these processes did change from year to year.

III. Review Plan for Fall 2013 Evaluation of Reports

A. What, if Anything, Needs to Change in the Rubric? – A new rubric was used to rate the 2011-12 departmental assessment reports. As with any new rubric, suggestions for modifications to the rubric were discussed throughout the rating process. To facilitate the process associated with modifying the rubric, the scoring guides that were sent back to the departments were distributed to all committee members. It was suggested at an earlier meeting that the comments included in these guides might show places where the rubric is lacking and
Discussion turned to specific recommendations for the rubric. Recommendations were as follows:

- Change the scale used for the Relationship of Assessments Used to SLOs section to match the scale (0-10) used for all other sections.
- Consolidate the Continuous Improvement section from three items to two.
- Consolidate the Analysis of Results section from three items to two.
- Include along with the overall rubric score the individual scores for each SLO. This would be particularly helpful for departments that have multiple SLOs.
- Continue the assessment of both SLOs and Goals acknowledging that the academic departments place a greater emphasis on SLOs.
- Change the groupings of the rubric as follows: Needs Improvement 0-5, Satisfactory 6-8, Exemplary 9-10. This change was based on the idea that too many average reports were being rated as Exemplary when they were, in fact, not. A wider band for Needs Improvement was recommended in order to encourage report writers to continually improve their assessment reports. It was decided that this change will be in effect for at least three years in order to have consistent data collected over that period.

Chairman Beard will incorporate the recommended changes into a revised rubric and distribute to the committee for feedback.

B. Will the Timing of This Review Remain the Same? – The timing of the review was agreed to be adequate. It was also agreed that this committee could not complete the review process any faster.

C. Will the Organization of the Groups Change Any? – Not discussed

D. What Will Help Certify the Quality of Any "Awards?" – A future discussion will take place to consider the process used for deciding on the awards. One recommendation included not requiring each sub-group to submit two potential winners. It was suggested that the sub-groups submit the names of the best reports with a cap on two. In some cases a sub-group might not make a recommendation.

IV. Recommendations for Next Year

A. Copy of 2011-2012 Recommendations for 2012-2013 – Included with the meeting packet was a copy of the UWAC – Student Learning Recommendations 2011-2012 document from last year. Several of the recommendations set forth were completed during 2012-2013.

B. Suggestions for Next Year: 2013-2014 – At the April meeting the committee will discuss the activities that took place during the current year, and based on this discussion make recommendations for next year.

V. Best Practices for Summarizing Student Learning Results

A. College Reports from Individual Committees – Making an overall campus
recommendation based on the consolidated departmental results remains a challenge.

B. Each College's Executive Summary in TEAL Online – Not Discussed.

VI. Adjourn – Next Meeting: April 19, 2013

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.