**Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Noon, March 20, 2018**

**211 Carmichael**

**In attendance:** Liza Wilson, Shari Gilbert, Karen Spector, Cynthia Sunal, Lisa Matherson, James Hardin, Judy Giesen, Philip Westbrook, Janie Hubbard, Stacy Hughey-Surman, Mark Richardson, Anne Witt, Claire Major, Stephen Tomlinson, Kathy Wetzel, Steven Yates, Holly Swain, Shanikia Young

**Summary of Meeting:**

1. Two guests—Juan (Millie) Xu (Associate Dean, School of Education) and Wei Huang (Assistant Dean, School of Language & Culture)—from Shanghai Normal University were introduced to the Committee.
2. **Approval of the Minutes:**
	1. Dr. Wilson asked committee members whether they had any corrections for the minutes from the last meeting (February 20th) that members received prior to the meeting.
	2. With no responses for corrections, Dr. Tomlinson made a motion to approve the minutes, which was properly seconded by Dr. Sunal. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

1. **Request for Faculty Participation in Research**
	1. Akeisha Young, a doctoral student in Higher Education Administration, introduced herself and presented an overview of her research project for Dr. Major’s College and University Teaching class to the Committee to ask for participation from faculty members in the College of Education. She discussed the benefits of participating in this study, including how the information can help the assessment committee with continuous improvement.
2. **Updates on Portfolio Development Process:**
	1. Dr. Hardin reminded everyone about the information that was covered during the previous meeting, which concerned the structure or model of the portfolio and what its purpose should be.

* 1. Dr. Wilson then asked the representatives from the different programs to share any feedback from faculty in their respective programs and departments. She reminded everybody that there will be a set of requirements for the portfolio that will be unit wide.
	2. Dr. Major discussed the benefits of a career-oriented/professional portfolio, emphasizing that this type of portfolio has meaning to students and that its purpose and usefulness extends beyond the classroom. She also stated that this type of portfolio allows students to document their progress and provides extra information not readily found in the standard application processes. Dr. Wilson added that students can use visitor passes in LiveText to permit interested parties like prospective employers or graduate schools to review their body of work.
	3. Dr. Wilson explained the group brainstorming activity related to generating ideas about the content and purpose of the portfolio. The committee broke into small groups and discussed ideas, focusing primarily on the purpose.
	4. After 30 minutes of discussion in the small groups, the Committee came back together and shared the main ideas that came up in their small groups.
		1. Dr. Sunal’s group proposed that the purpose of the portfolio should be a tool for providing two-way feedback between students and faculty. They also expressed interests in an integrative model that accounts for that purpose. She also expressed concerns about how unit-wide portfolio requirements will provide feedback to students and faculty.

* + 1. Dr. Witt’s group supported the idea of a professional showcase model being used for the portfolio. Along these lines, Dr. Hughey-Surman’s group agreed with Dr. Witt’s group concerning the use of the professional showcase model as the portfolio, adding that this portfolio could be used for graduate school applications.
		2. Similarly, Dr. Hardin’s group proposed using the career-oriented model or a hybrid model for the portfolio. They also suggested that two distinct models could be used—one for the undergraduate level and one for the graduate level.
	1. Regarding the platform for these portfolios, Dr. Spector noted that LiveText may have limitations for the career model portfolio. Dr. Major then discussed the Capstone Project as an example of a career model, which takes the place of comps for the master’s degree. She stated that this portfolio type allows students to demonstrate their growth in learning and ability in a creative format.

* 1. Dr. Hardin suggested that every program would have a template with unit-wide requirements. They could then tailor the portfolio to include program-specific requirements. Dr. Wilson reiterated that these requirements must be meaningful. Dr. Westbrook asked for clarification concerning the format of the portfolio regarding whether it was going to be a paper one, an ePortfolio, or continue to be in LiveText.
	2. When Drs. Hubbard and Tomlinson asked about examples of portfolios from other universities, Dr. Wilson discussed some examples that were shown during Dr. Kathleen Yancey’s ePortfolio workshop. To address concerns raised about LiveText as the platform, Dr. Hardin suggested showing the new LiveText platform and tools at the next committee meeting. He also noted how the current portfolio used in LiveText was modeled to fit and address the various required standards.
1. **Status Report on Dispositions Rubric Reliability Training**
	1. Dr. Giesen briefed the committee members on the current progress of reliability training for the dispositions rubric. Currently, 48 faculty members have been trained. These faculty members should have received emails from Dr. Giesen, Dr. Wilson, and Dr. Hardin (via LiveText) concerning the final reliability testing process and completing their assessment of the samples by **March 30, 2018**.
	2. Dr. Wilson stated that updates and reminders will be sent to program representatives to encourage and remind their faculty to complete their reliability assessment.
2. **Updates on Continuous Improvement:**
	1. Deadlines for Annual Reports:
		1. Dr. Wilson distributed handouts of the revised timeline concerning the deadlines for annual reports for the next year.
		2. She also reminded everyone that the timeline could also be found in the meeting minutes from February 20, 2018 meeting.
		3. Dr. Wilson again reminded everyone about the CAEP reporting process and 3-year data collection, which will begin next year (2019).
	2. CAEP Reports:
		1. Dr. Giesen reminded members that the CAEP reports are due by the end of April.
3. **CIEP Follow Up:**
	1. Dr. Wetzel discussed the CIEP workshop she attended in February and provided several handouts reviewed during the workshop for committee members to review.
	2. She encouraged committee members to share the information they received with the appropriate members in their program and/or department.
	3. She also reminded everyone to begin their alignment with standards now and not to wait until the last minute.
4. **Meeting Recap and Reminders:**
	1. Before summarizing the assessment committee meeting, Dr. Wilson asked committee members if any new business needed to be brought before the committee or if any announcements needed to be made to the committee. No one had any new business or any announcements.
	2. She then reminded everyone about the following next steps:
		1. Progress reports concerning completion of reliability assessments will be sent to program and/or department representatives
		2. Encourage faculty members to complete the reliability assessment
		3. Begin (or continue) conversation among the program and/or department faculty regarding the portfolio development process

**Adjourned at 1:00 PM.**