Members Present: John Beard (Chair), Kristal Curry, Margaret Fain, Amy Fyn, Dodi Hodges, Tom Hoffman, Jim Luken, Vivian McCain, Carol Osborne, Brianne Parker, Nelljean Rice

Members Absent: Ellen Arnold, Michael Latta, Chris Mee, Barbara Ritter, John Steen, Dennis Wiseman

I. Introduction and Approval of Minutes

John Beard, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:30 p.m. in the Dawsey Conference Room and welcomed all present. The minutes from the meeting on October 19, 2012, 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 Brianne Parker, seconded by Tom Hoffman, and approved by the committee.

Chairman Beard reviewed the Review of 2011-2012 Departmental Assessment Reports document included with the handouts.

II. Updates on Subcommittee Work

A. Group A – Carol Osborne reported that Group A was able to reach a consensus. One report, Psychology, was not able to be scored as the report and plan did not match. Tom Hoffman indicated that that report was not yet finalized; therefore, scoring should not be completed. Jim Luken mentioned that changes in department chairs, in some cases, affected the quality of the report. Department chairs should not be solely responsible for reporting on the data, and as such, a change in this position should not negatively affect the departmental report.

B. Group B – Dodi Hodges reported that one report, Health Administration, was not completed. Chairman Beard reported that that particular report was removed as there were no students enrolled in the program during the 2011-2012 academic year. It was reported that a general consensus was easily agreed upon concerning the rest of the reports.

C. Group C – Chairman Beard reported that too much time was spent on the first several reports and consequently final results for each report were not complete. This group was scheduled to meet again on Monday, November 19th, to complete its work.

D. Group D – Brianne reported input was received by group members. Anomalies between reviewers were identified and discussions followed. She reported that the top choices were easy to identify. One report, however, containing only one SLO was not included for consideration as it did not contain a "variety of assessments".
III. Questions About the Evaluation Process

A. After Separate Scores Are Reported, How do We Reach Consensus – What Method?

A discussion occurred relative to using average scores versus summaries. As one rubric item is based on a 20-point scale and all others on a 10-point scale, there was concern that averages were not correct. As all groups used the same rubric, it was decided that the calculation of averages would be comparable between the groups, therefore acceptable to use. Still, an actual sum will be shown on final reports.

IV. Subcommittees Meet Again

A. Select the Best Two Reports for Awards Consideration and Forward to Beard

The two top recommendations for each group should be sent to Chairman Beard as soon as possible. Each group is to keep in mind that these recommendations do not necessarily have to be the two highest numeric scores (although they certainly could be.) Groups have the leeway to use their best judgment in making their selections. The list containing the eight reports being considered will be distributed to all committee members within the next several days, and all should read these eight “finalists.”

B. Establish Specific Comments for Each Report

Each group should arrive at a mutually agreeable score for each report. Groups are encouraged to include specific comments identifying specific positive and negatives aspect of each report. These comments will be provided as feedback to those who wrote and contributed to the report.

C. Finalize One Final Rubric Form for Every Report

Each group is asked to submit only one spreadsheet containing the results for each report.

V. Adjourn – Next Meeting

The next meeting for this committee will be to identify the top three reports. A notification will be sent out with the day and time of the meeting. With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

The UWAC – SL did meet on Friday, November 30, 2013, after all had read the eight “finalists.” After a long discussion in executive session and several votes, the committee was able to agree on rankings for the top three awards, as well as for the rest. Originally, we were asked to recommend First, Second and Third Place Awards, although the Provost eventually allowed for a Fourth Place Award as well. The remaining nominees would receive Honorable Mention as “finalists.”