University-Wide Assessment Committee  
Student Learning  
November 20, 2014  
3:00 p.m., EHFA 164

**Members Present:** Carol Osborne (Chair), Karen Aguirre, Ellen Arnold, John Beard, Kristal Curry, Margaret Fain, Jeannie French, Amy Fyn, Jim Luken, Megan McIlreavy, Scott Pleasant, Lee Shinaberger

**Members Absent:** Janet Buckenmeyer, Vivian Ford, Michael Latta, Chris Mee

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 October 30, 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 Margaret Fain, seconded by Karen Aguirre, and approved by the committee.

II. **Announcements**

Thanks to Karen, John, and Jeannie for offering to do three-year longitudinal reports for those who could not. Thanks to everyone who has completed said reports.

III. **Assessment of 2013-14 Reports to Go Out First Week in December**

IV. **Programs with NI Ratings: Suggestions for the Next Step in the Process?**

John Beard spoke with the Provost to discuss options for dealing with programs with reports marked as "Needs Improvement". It is suggested that departments not be dealt with from a punitive approach, but instead be offered assistance for improvement. The Provost recommended an improvement plan be developed for units needing assistance. The committee was asked to offer input on how to proceed. Clarification was requested concerning whether the report needs to be improved or whether the assessment activities being engaged in by the unit need to be improved. Reasons why reports might rate poorly include: low student enrollment resulting in lack of meaningful data, assessment requirements from external accrediting agencies, and new programs with no longitudinal data. There are situations where units have received "Needs Improvement" rating over several years and it is the intention to assist those units in improving assessment reports, regardless of the reason they have been rated unsatisfactorily. One recommendation included inviting units to meet with members of this committee for guidance and suggestions for improvement. Although anyone is invited to consultations, units with a "Needs Improvement" rating for two of the three past years would be strongly encouraged to seek assistance.

In discussing the assessment process Jim Luken made a motion that TEAL Online be evaluated and suggestions for improvement be brought forth to Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis. Ellen Arnold seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by the committee. Jim will head up a sub-committee to discuss changes to TEAL Online.
V. Subcommittee for Reviewing Rubric and Format for Reports to Programs

Kristal Curry offered to head up a sub-committee to review and make recommendations for improvement to the rubric that is currently being used to rate assessment reports. Scott Pleasant and Jeannie French offered to work with Kristal on this endeavor. The group will meet and bring forth recommendations at the next committee meeting.

Megan McIlreavy offered to head up a sub-committee to discuss revising the process that is currently used to review assessment reports. One recommendation included inviting department chairs, assessment coordinators, and/or those familiar with the reports to the session where this committee reviews the report. In addition, this group will discuss potential modifications to the method that is used to give feedback to the units.

VI. Next Meeting: Week of February 16\textsuperscript{th}. Best Day/Time?

Carol Osborne suggested the next committee meeting take place the week of February Feb 16\textsuperscript{th}, 2015. Details will be sent out after the first of the year.

VII. Good of the Order – With no additional business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.