University-Wide Assessment Committee  
Student Learning  
October 30, 2014  
3:00 p.m., EHFA 164

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

**Members Absent:** Jeannie French, Jim Lukken, Chris Mee, Nelljean Rice

I. Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Carol Osborne, Chair, convened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. in EHFA 164 and welcomed all present. The minutes from the meeting on September 29, 2014 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 John Beard, seconded by Megan McIlreavy, and approved by the committee.

II. Announcements

John Beard announced that the 2013-14 Executive Summaries are the last reports that are being added in TEAL Online. Typically these reports are completed in February, however, with the SACSCOC deadline soon approaching it was requested that these reports be completed early. With the submission of all Executive Summaries, the TEAL Online assessment cycle for 2013-14 will be complete.

III. Assessment of 2013-14 Reports

A. Top 12 Ranking Consensus – The ranking of the top twelve reports was included with the meeting materials distributed to all attendees. The group discussed the best way to provide recognition for the best reports. It was decided that instead of ranking the reports ordinally, the highest rated report for each college would be recognized. As it turns out, each college had a highly rated report. Reports selected for recognition are as follows:

- Business – Management
- Education – Special Education/Learning Disabilities
- Humanities - Philosophy
- Science - Information Systems/Computer Science
- Graduate Programs – MAT Social Studies

A motion to recognize these five programs was offered by Scott Pleasant, seconded by Karen Aguirre, and approved by the committee.

B. Review of Final Reports to Departments – The feedback received from each sub-group was put into a report that will be distributed to the reporting departments. It became apparent while putting these reports together that a consistent reporting method needs to be developed for next year. As all feedback was submitted in a variety of formats, a great deal of editing had to
be done in order to make the feedback understandable and usable for the recipients. The feedback reports were distributed to each sub-group and the groups were asked to reconvene and finalize the reports. An emphasis should be made to include more strength-based language and specific feedback for SLOs.

IV. Reviewing Reports Over Time – Assignments for Next Meeting

Committee members were asked to review the reports for three programs over the past three years. Assignments were included as part of the meeting materials distributed to all attendees. Based on this review, each member was asked to complete a short summary on how assessment efforts have improved or not improved over time. These summary paragraphs will be included with the 2013-14 feedback reports. It is important for those working on assessment to know that their efforts are being recognized. Both assignments are due before Thanksgiving.

V. E-Portfolios. What's The Next Step?

At the last committee meeting everyone was asked to speak to chairs and faculty in their area and solicit input on the interest level in the use of e-portfolios. Interest levels are as follows:

- Humanities – All chairs were very interested in the idea.
- Science – Science chairs liked the idea and since several areas are using e-portfolios for assessment, the idea of a campus-wide tool that is compatible with other University systems was well received.
- Business – Only one department showed an interest in e-portfolios.
- Education – This College already uses LiveText, which includes an e-portfolio feature. As such, the interest level was low, but the College would be open to considering other tools if they included additional features.
- QEP – Those working on the QEP are willing to consider an e-portfolio, however, a new director was recently installed and other programmatic considerations are taking priority.
- General Education – Very interested in e-portfolios.

The committee decided to recommend an ad hoc committee be convened to investigate the feasibility of implementing e-portfolios. It was recommended that a variety of products be evaluated and each college be represented. Margaret Fain offered to serve on the committee. John Beard suggested that Associate Deans would be smart choices to serve on the committee as they receive input from most members of their respective colleges. Committee members were asked to submit recommendations for individuals to serve on this committee.

VI. Other Goals for our Committee? A list of suggestions for future consideration by the committee was distributed. Discussion will take place relative to these suggestions when the committee reconvenes after the holiday break.

VII. Good of the Order – With no additional business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next committee meeting is scheduled for November 20th.