Members Present: John Beard (Chair), Karen Aguirre, Janet Buckenmeyer, Vivian Ford, Amy Fyn, Dodi Hodges, Jim Luken, Chris Mee, Carol Osborne, Scott Pleasant, Nelljean Rice, Lee Shinaberger

Members Absent: Ellen Arnold, Kristal Curry, Margaret Fain, Jeannie French, Michael Latta, Megan McIlreavy

I. Welcome and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in the Dawsey Conference Room and welcomed all present. The minutes from the meeting on October 25, 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 Dodi Hodges, seconded by Karen Aguirre, and approved by the committee.

II. Evaluation Updates

A. Status of 2012-2013 College Assessment Reviews – All groups submitted their reports on time to the Chair.

B. Individual Group Updates – Chairman Beard asked each group to report and answer two questions. First, was the group able to reach a consensus, and in the case where a consensus was not easily achieved, what process did the group undertake to come to an agreement? Second, how many reports were rated for each category (Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, and Exemplary)?

1. Group A: Carol Osborne – The group reached a consensus easily and in cases where scores were disparate, a discussion took place as opposed to simply averaging existing scores. Group A rated two reports as high satisfactory/exemplary and two as needing improvement.

2. Group B: Mike Latta – Dodi Hodges represented this group and reported that an easy working relationship existed and any score disagreements were talked out. Group B rated two reports as exemplary and two as needing improvement.

3. Group C: Janet Buckenmeyer – In coming to a consensus, Group C opted to throw out the high and low scores and average the remaining two scores. This method worked well for this group. Group C rated three reports as exemplary and three as needing improvement.

4. Group D: Karen Aguirre – This group worked well together. One grader tended to score the reports higher than the other two group members. After the group met, this grader considered the scores and comments of the other group members and reconsidered the original scores. Group D rated one report as exemplary and two as needing improvement.

5. Group E: John Beard – This group worked well together and engaged in discussions where scoring differences occurred. This group felt that having discussions helped with the process and better feedback for report writers resulted from these dialogues. Group E rated one, maybe two,
reports as exemplary and four as needing improvement.

C. Plans for Final Distribution to Chairs & Deans – As all group reports have been submitted to Chairman Beard he will now consolidate the information into standard packets and distribute to college deans, associate deans and assessment coordinators prior to the Thanksgiving break. Department chairs will receive the results for their own department only.

D. Can We Maintain the Same Rubric Next Year? – A recommendation was made that the Analysis of Results section might be consolidated from two sections (reporting and summarizing results, interpretation and analysis of data) into one. The rubric used to assess the reports was modified by the committee last spring and it was decided at that time that continual modifications of the rubric should be avoided. Chairman Beard suggested that anyone who has suggestions for modifying the rubric send their comments to him via e-mail and further discussion can take place in the spring.

III. Organize Selection Process for Assessment Awards

A. Keep It In Committee or Send Outside Committee? – The Provost is agreeable to the committee submitting the top 3-4 reports for recognition.

B. How Many to Review? How Selected? – Several ways for selecting the top reports were discussed. The committee decided to follow the following process:

- Chairman Beard will list the reports from highest to lowest score. It is anticipated that a pattern will emerge and the top scorers will be evident.
- The names of top scoring reports, whether five or fifteen, will be sent to the committee members. The comments of the individual groups that already assessed the reports will be included.
- Committee members will read and score the reports.
- The committee will meet prior to the Christmas holiday break for final discussion and a selection of the top reports. Also included in the discussion will be consideration for recognizing "most improved" reports.
- The names of top reports will be submitted to the Provost for his review.

C. Dates for Final Selection Review? The committee will meet from 10:00-12:00 on December 17th for a final selection.

IV. Discussion Leaders for January 2014

A. Proposal to Adopt Some Standardized Testing – Chairman Beard requested a volunteer to lead a future committee meeting and conduct a discussion on standardized testing. Budget money may be available in the future and several tests have already been mentioned for consideration (ETS Proficiency Profile, CLA+). This committee should make a recommendation based on what is best for the institution. John Beard, Chris Mee, and Karen Aguirre will work on this project.

B. Suggested Ideas for Future "Assessment Plan" – Volunteers were also solicited to lead the
discussion concerning recommendations for the University assessment plan. To be included in the plan must be an explanation of the assessment process that is currently underway. The process must insure that all new programs (e.g. Ph.D. in Marine Science) be folded into the process. Jim Luken and Carol Osborne will work on this project.

C. Task List for Spring – Several committee members are needed to spearhead a discussion on the direction of the committee in Spring 2014. Much discussion has taken place about the assessment process; however, a need exists to discuss learning. Kristal Curry will be asked to work on this project. Dodi Hodges volunteered to work on this project.

V. Adjourn – Next Meetings @ 10:00 on Dec. 17

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.