University Assessment Council
July 30, 2013, 10:00 a.m.

Minutes

Members Present: Drew Clark (Chair), Cecilia Champion, George Crandell, Dan Larocque, Abbygail Langham, Ed Loewenstein, Nels Madsen, Paul Patterson, Jenny Schuessler, Bret Smith, Skip Bartol, and Iryna Johnson.

Guests Present: Nancy Noe and Kim Walls

Drew Clark called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Minutes from the last UAC meeting on May 1, 2013 were approved.

Drew informed that the planning module of Campus Labs has been licensed. We do not know whether it will be available to use in October 2013. If it is not available, Word templates will be distributed to educational programs, administrative, academic, and student support services.

Drew also informed that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has begun search for Assessment Analyst position. The person in this position will provide support and expertise to academic and other campus units as they develop and implement their own planning and evaluation processes.

Drew provided an update on the results from Collegiate Learning Assessment at Auburn.

Paul Patterson asked a question about routing mechanisms for feedback to units. Drew asked to return to this question later, after the discussion on possible contributions that the University Assessment Council can make to Auburn University.

Drew asked members and guests of the University Assessment Council to write down and then share with everyone their answers to two questions:

1. What is the most important contribution that the University Assessment Council can make to Auburn University?

2. On the basis of answer to question 1, what should we work on in the coming academic year?

Skip Bartol suggested that the most important contribution is to develop a culture that understands and appreciates the value of assessment. In the coming academic year the UAC should work on helping faculty to understand and appreciate assessment of outcomes.

Nels Madsen suggested that the most important contribution is to create and continue conversations with faculty and units that we started this summer. Meetings should be coordinated from the Office of
Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). Drew expressed a concern that it might be not sustainable due to the volume of meetings. Within the past two months, OIRA had 51 meetings with educational programs. This is not counting meetings with administrative, academic, and educational support services.

Bret Smith suggested that members of UAC should help connect assessment with the body of knowledge in the discipline.

George Crandell suggested that UAC should encourage units to conduct assessment.

Abbygail Langham pointed out that UAC should clarify expectations on how assessment reports should look. Perhaps, a rubric that helps evaluate an assessment report should be created.

Going back to an earlier question from Paul, Drew suggested several options for routing mechanisms for assessment reports:

- Require Dean’s offices to review the reports and sign off
- Have the reports come directly to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Paul Patterson indicated that a preferable option would be to have the Dean’s offices review reports before submitting them to OIRA. Dan Larocque agreed that it would be preferable for colleges to review the reports prior to submitting them. Dan also suggested the need to actively pursue cross-communication among colleges. Other members of the UAC agreed that the UAC should be directly involved in leading assessment activities across campus. The UAC meetings will be aimed at helping UAC members in this leadership role.

The deadline for 2013 assessment reports was briefly discussed. Colleges can impose an internal deadline; and the deadline for submitting the reports to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment could be moved to the end of October.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.