**Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Noon, April 10, 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, Kevin Richards, Anne Witt, Stephen Tomlinson, Kathy Wetzel, Steven Yates, John Myrick, Joy Burnham, Holly Swain, Shanikia Young

**Summary of Meeting:**

1. **Approval of the Minutes:**
	1. Dr. Wilson asked Committee members for any corrections in the minutes from the last meeting (March 20th) that members received prior to the meeting.
	2. With no responses for corrections, Dr. Sunal made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Dr. Spector. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

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. Sixty-one faculty members have been fully trained. The remaining faculty members will be trained sometime this week (April 9 – April13). Dr. Giesen also stated that she will run reliability analyses on 69 respondents upon the completion of training.
2. **Updates on Portfolio Development Process:**
	1. Dr. Hardin explained that there are three basic types of portfolios to consider and showed an example of each portfolio type to the Committee.
	2. Questions were asked concerning if (1) the portfolios could look like the examples shown to the Committee, (2) other platforms could be used in place of LiveText, (3) the portfolios could be built outside LiveText but be assessed via LiveText, and (4) there is a permanent link for the portfolios constructed outside of LiveText.
	3. Dr. Richards discussed the importance of getting buy-in from students and stressed the importance that the portfolio must be meaningful to improve buy-in among students. He suggested that one way to do so was to ask students about what they want out of the portfolio process and final product. Dr. Hubbard noted that most students would rather do the ePortfolio instead of a graduate exit exam.
	4. Regarding issues with LiveText, Dr. Hardin asked for clarification in terms of whether the issues were with the aesthetics of the portfolio in LiveText or with the structure of the current portfolio template and requirements.
	5. Dr. Westbrook shared his program’s experiences with new project formats related to the new online MA and EdS programs. He mentioned that they have been using the WordPress blog platform housed in the UA server environment. He suggested the possibility of housing such a platform in Blackboard.
	6. Dr. Burnham raised concerns about the fact that some programs have to use the assessment/accreditation model for the portfolio because their learning outcomes are tied to accreditation requirements. It was stressed again that the portfolio as a process and product must be meaningful to everyone involved.
	7. The Committee then discussed what the content of the portfolios should be. To determine what the content should be, it was agreed that feedback from the departments and/or programs is needed. One option to collect feedback relating to program-specific elements and needs was for departments and/or programs to send out a Qualtrics survey to all faculty members in that department and/or program.
	8. It was reiterated that monitoring student growth in learning and professional development is crucial. It was also noted that the portfolio is a way to show connections of learning across learning experiences.

1. **Updates on Annual Reporting – Development of Data Charts for 2018-19:**
	1. Committee members also received a handout of a T-Chart to be completed by the department/program. These entities are responsible for filling out what data/information they will be providing for continuous improvement annual reports and what data they need from the Assessment Staff to provide in their annual report. This document should be completed and submitted by **Tuesday, May 15, 2018**.
2. **Scheduling Assessment Committee Meetings during Summer:**
	1. The Committee discussed availability for meeting during the summer. It was agreed that no meetings would be held on a Monday or a Friday. It was suggested that there would be two meetings—one in June and one in July—where lunch would be provided. A survey will be sent to collect information on Committee members’ availability to meet over the summer.
3. **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. An electronic copy of the “Continuous Improvement Annual Reports: Data Sources for 2018-2019” will be emailed to Committee members. This T-Chart is to be completed by departments/programs and be returned/submitted by **Tuesday, May 15, 2018**.
		2. A survey (Doodle Poll) collecting information on Committee members’ availability to meet during the summer will be sent to Committee members to complete.

**Adjourned at 1:07 PM.**