

University Assessment Coordination Committee

9:00-10:30am, Tuesday, June 11, 2013, McKenny 350

Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Bin Ning, Doug Baker (CAS), Peggy Liggitt (FDC), Barb Scheffer (CHHS), Wade Tornquist (COT); Ellen Gold (SSAC); Jon Margerum-Leys (COE);

1. Update and progress check (All)

a. Academic Program Assessment Institute 2013 (Peggy & Doug)

The Institute was held on May 16 and 17. Twenty-one program directors and faculty members participated in the first day and 18 attended both days and completed action plans. The event provided a productive venue for training, discussion and interaction among participants. Feedback about the event was overwhelmingly positive. For next year's institute, Peggy will work with the Committee to design a clearer approach for recruiting participants.

b. Student Success Assessment Council—Assessment Institute 2013 (Ellen & Peggy)

Another successful assessment event led by Ellen Gold was the Student Success Assessment Council—Assessment Institute 2013 held on May 22. Forty-two participants representing 22 out of 23 departments in student affairs and student support services attended the one-day event. Through the event, participants learned the overall picture about assessing student learning outcomes in student affairs and support services areas, and then developed their strategic assessment plans in their respective departments.

Bin indicated that he would like to work with the Committee and annualize the above two events. Bin will also work with Peggy and Ellen to build a showcase on the web for those two events.

c. Other updates and discussions

Wade raised the question about the next steps of adopting technology to support assessment. Highlights of the discussion include:

- CAS is still looking at cost/benefit factors before making decisions
- COE will continue to use LiveText as its portfolio and assessment system
- COB is investigating a new software for assessment for meet AACSB requirements
- CAS, CHHS, and COT are interested in continuing the conversation about introducing technology into the assessment process. More discussion is needed to ensure that we

choose the right tool (software) and the broad buy-in by program directors and faculty members.

- Peggy may want to contact CampusLabs to see what new features its assessment module has since our last demo a year ago.

2. Document submission (All)—the deadline is approaching!

All members indicated they are prepared to submit the required files by June 30th. One clarification was made regarding the difference between highlights of achievement in assessment and examples of program assessment report. The former is a kind of editorial (summary) from the college level to summarize the overall achievement in assessment from the college perspective. The latter can be the original assessment report from the program/department.

Special Thanks:

The Committee wants to thank both Barbara and Jon for their contribution to the work of the groups. We wish both of them the best of luck during their next chapters of career.

Next Meeting:

Monday, August 12 at 9:00-10:30am in McKenny 350