University Assessment Council  
October 11, 2010, 1:00 p.m.  

Minutes

Members Present: Drew Clark (Chair), Donna Angarano, George Crandell, Susan Hubbard, Leonard Lock, Nels Madsen, Sharon McDonough, Paul Patterson, Constance Relihan, Karen Rogers, Juliet Rumble, Greg Somers, Tin Yau Tam, and Iryna Johnson.

Guests Present: Paul Kittle and Libba McMillan

The meeting started with coverage of Brigham Young University Center for Teaching & Learning website featured by National Institute for learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). This website exemplifies promising practices in online communication of expected learning outcomes.

Drew Clark asked for feedback on scheduling the Performance Task Academy for April, 28-29, 2011, Study/Reading Days. Another possibility was to schedule the performance Task Academy for fall of 2011. The preference of the group was 28-29 April, 2011.

The group discussed assessment grant proposal from the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work. The proposal requests funds of $1,500.00 to send a faculty member to the Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) Conference “The Nuts and Bolts of BSW Education: From Basics to Competency Assessment.” Members of University Assessment Council (UAC) recommended that, if grant is approved, the information about the conference and ways it affects assessment practices at the department is shared with other departments in College of Liberal Arts. It was also suggested that the department or college should put in some of the funds to demonstrate the importance they place on this conference. Under condition of matching funds from department or college, University Assessment Council (UAC) approved use of assessment funding to support sending one person from the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work to the upcoming Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) Conference.

A possibility of expanding UAC to include a representative from the Division of Student Affairs was welcomed by the group. It was suggested that involvement of other units, such as Educational Support Services, Out-of-State Retention Council, International or Outreach Programs, should be also considered. One of the positive aspects of involvement of these units is that it opens up opportunities for departments to bring in students from other colleges. Members approved expanding University Assessment Council (UAC) by adding representatives from Division of Student Affairs and Educational Support Services.

Progress report on assessment report submission was distributed. It was noted that certain colleges made an outstanding progress in report submission. Drew Clark asked Constance Relihan to share practices from College of Liberal Arts that contributed to a significant progress in report quality and report submission. Constance stated that the college-level assessment group meets monthly. The next meeting is in a week and a half. Graduate assistant is helping with implementation. Each department has one person responsible for assessment. A few departments have more than one representative in the assessment group. Departments receive feedback from the assessment group or from the Dean’s office. The assessment group also looked at good and bad examples of assessment. Leonard Lock covered practices at the College of Education. There is an Assessment Committee. Some of the challenges that College of education is currently dealing with are: implementation of TK20 and
alignment of AU assessment reporting and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) reporting. Susan Hubbard mentioned that at College of Human Sciences they hold individual meetings on assessment with department heads. Paul Kittle covered assessment practices at the Division of Student Affairs.

T.Y. suggested that, in lieu of upcoming accreditation, it would be helpful for each department to have a checklist of what should be done to meet accreditation standards. Drew responded that conducting meaningful assessment for each degree program is most important. It is also important to justify and document qualifications of faculty members teaching each class section.

At the request of UAC members, the timeline of the accreditation process was briefly outlined. Compliance certification is due in September of 2012. Off-site peer review will be conducted in November of 2012. Quality Enhancement Plan is due 4-6 weeks in advance of on-site review. On-site peer review will be conducted in January – April of 2013. Review by the Commission on Colleges is in December of 2013. Currently two separate groups work on Compliance Certification and Quality Enhancement Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.