University-Wide Assessment Committee
Student Learning
October 25, 2013
2:00 p.m., EHFA 164

Members Present: John Beard (Chair), Ellen Arnold, Janet Buckenmeyer, Kristal Curry, Jeannie French, Jim Luken, Megan McIlreavy, Chris Mee, Carol Osborne, Scott Pleasant, Nelljean Rice, Lee Shinaberger

Members Absent: Karen Aguirre, Margaret Fain, Amy Fyn, Vivian Ford, Dodi Hodges, Michael Latta

I. Welcome and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in EHFA 164 and welcomed all present. The minutes from the meeting on September 20, 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 Nelljean Rice, and approved by the committee.

II. Brief Updates

A. Status of 2012-2013 College Assessment Reports

Humanities – Per Carol Osborne all Humanities reports are ready to be reviewed.
Business – Per Lee Shinaberger 75% of the Business reports are ready to be reviewed.
Education - Kristal Curry reported that Janet Buckenmeyer is better informed regarding the status of the college reports. All reports have been submitted, however, final edits may still be in process.
Science – Per Jeannie French all Science reports will be complete as of Nov. 1st.
University College – Per Nelljean Rice the University College reports are ready to be reviewed.

B. Do We All Understand the Task of Reviewing? – As there are several new faculty members serving on this committee a short review describing the review process took place. The purpose of this committee reviewing the reports is to provide some useful feedback from those outside the academic area. Rubrics are used to review reports and numerical ratings assigned. Feedback of particular importance to report editors may be the comments reviewers make concerning the reports. Committee members have been put into groups and assigned specific reports to review. Group members will first review reports on their own then get together with other group members to arrive at a consensus rating. Consensus results, hard copy or electronic, will then be forwarded to Chairman Beard prior to the Nov. 15th deadline. It is anticipated that report feedback may be delivered back to the chairs prior to the holiday break in December.

C. Final Consensus Rubrics Complete by Nov. 15 – Consensus results should be forwarded to
Chairman Beard prior to the Nov. 15th deadline. It is anticipated that report feedback may be delivered back to the chairs prior to the holiday break in December.

The Division of Labor handout that was included with the meeting materials was reviewed and departmental reports emphasized in bold print were recognized as being ready for review. Individuals whose names are underlined are responsible for scheduling the individual group meeting(s).

D. All "Approvals" Occur by Nov. 01, 2013: 2012-2013 Reports and 2013-2014 Plans – As in previous years these due dates are in effect. Exceptions may be made to the plan deadline; however, this should be the exception and not the rule. Chris Mee mentioned that College of Science plans should be carefully reviewed and revised where needed as they will be used for the planned SACS review in 2015.

III. Planning for 2013-2014

A. Selection Process for Assessment Report Awards – Last year individual groups had no problem coming to a consensus in reviewing reports. Groups also had no problem selecting the top few reports. The problem arose in that by chance, some groups were asked to review better (or worse) reports than others. In one case a group had more than two reports that were considered worthy of recognition and another was not comfortable submitting any names. A better approach might be to select the top ten reports, regardless of which group reviewed them.

A suggestion was made that the top ten list might be forwarded on to:
- the main UWAC
- Dr. Byington
- An outside person or group

and request that they select the top 3 reports. Another suggestion for narrowing down the list of reports included that the top 20 high scoring reports be considered by the entire committee. This approach would provide for everyone's opinion being considered for the top reports, regardless of the group that originally reviewed the report.

A discussion concerning the use of the rubric took place and it was agreed that reviewers should be better trained on using the rubric.

B. Use of Standardized Testing for Overall Assessment – A discussion took place concerning skills assessment outside the discipline. Chairman Beard asked the group to consider standardized tools available through ETS or CLA. Information describing each test was included as part of the meeting materials.

C. Determine Components of New "Assessment Plan"
   1. What Expectations for Five Years Out?
   2. Which Parts Are Weakest Now?
   3. Which Parts Most Likely to Change?
IV. Adjourn – Next Meetings @ 2:00 p.m. on Nov. 15

The committee member taking notes left the meeting at 3:20 p.m.