University Assessment Council  
November 20, 2013, 1:00 p.m.  

Minutes

**Members Present:** Drew Clark (Chair), Vince Cammarata, George Crandell, Dan Givens, Susan Hubbard, Paul Jungnickel, Abbygail Langham, Ed Loewenstein, Nels Madsen, Paul Patterson, Juliet Rumble, Bret Smith, Susan Villaume, Chelsea Ellithorpe and Iryna Johnson.

**Guests Present:** Takishia Beverly

Drew Clark called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Minutes from the last UAC meeting on October 11, 2013 were approved.

Drew introduced Chelsea Ellithorpe, the new Assessment Analyst at the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Drew also provided several informational items. (1) A review committee composed of representatives of Auburn University and institutional research and effectiveness experts from other universities conducted a review of Auburn’s current assessment reporting procedures on October 28-29. Recommendations have not been provided yet. (2) Three weeks from now SACS will announce the commission’s decision on Auburn’s accreditation. Drew also provided an update on work of Core Curriculum and General Education Committee and University Writing Committee.

The rest of the meeting was devoted to Auburn’s success stories. Susan Villaume shared the experience of College of Education. One of the challenges College of Education faces is that the same kinds of information have to be provided to SACS and NCATE. To make sure that faculty do not have to enter the same information twice, College of Education developed their own assessment reporting tool. College of Education also provided data support and disaggregated data collected via Tk20 to the program level. Faculty members were invited to attend a training session that covered both technical information about the assessment reporting tool and expectations concerning assessment reports. After reports were submitted, the Leadership Council of College of Education decided that the first feedback to programs will be provided by three doctoral students. Doctoral students were trained and received a very structured checklist of items they should be looking for in assessment reports. After doctoral students complete their feedback, department chairs and OIRA will review reports. Susan asked what is expected of programs after feedback is provided. Drew responded that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) is offering programs an opportunity to revise their reports and hope that units will choose to revise their reports based on OIRA comments. The expectations for programs would be set primarily by the Dean’s office.
Iryna Johnson shared examples of exemplary reports that were identified during the review process. It should be noted that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment is still in the process of review of assessment reports; and these reports were selected among those that have been reviewed so far. The selected reports included Art History, BA; Interior Design, BS; and Nursing, BS. Members of the Council reviewed the reports and shared their impressions of these reports.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.