University Assessment Committee Meeting

Minutes

March 12, 2015  9:00-10:00 a.m.

- **Attending** – Laverne Berkel, Brenda Bethman, Ruth Cain, Devon Cancilla, David Cornell, Crystal Doss, Jennifer Friend, Barbara Glesner-Fines, Caitlin Horsmon, Colleen Kelly, Sabrina Madison-Cannon, Ken Mitchell, Margaret Mullaly- Quijas, Jennifer Quaintance, Joy Roberts (for Kit Smith), Carol Sargent, Dan Stroud, Cindy Thompson, Christopher Van Ness.

- **Not Present** – Larry Bunce, Rhiannon Dickerson, Lynda Plamann, Chelsia Potts, and Da-Ming Zhu, Greg Vonnahme, Peggy Ward-Smith.

1. **Welcome** – Ruth Cain, Director of Assessment began the meeting and spoke briefly about her rewarding experiences in Colorado working as part of a site visit team with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

2. **Minutes**
   
   Motion was made by Barbara Glesner-Fines, seconded by Jennifer Quaintance to accept the minutes from the February meeting. Motion carried.

3. **Critique of the 2013-14 Assessment Report Review**

   - Ruth Cain asked the members to provide their thoughts concerning what they valued about the assessment plan review process and suggestions for modifications.

   - Sabrina Madison-Cannon spoke about how nice it was to be able to review the same programs for a second year.
   - Chris Van Ness concurred, despite the fact that he had changed partners in the review process.
   - Barbara Glesner-Fines wondered if meeting with the programs that each review team evaluated would make the process more relevant and effective.
   - Laverne Berkel suggested that the narrative as it is currently constructed might be outdated and that new prompts might freshen up the process.
   - It was learned that some groups worked together on program reviews, while others split their shared work load, reviewing them on separate fronts.
   - Margaret Mullaly- Quijas pointed out that the review process should be student focused and not faculty focused when comments are added to the review rubrics.
   - Sabrina Madison-Cannon suggested more praise be given for assessment performed rather than simply acknowledgement of reaching minimal standards.
   - Concerns were shared throughout the room that assessment spirit could be waning.
   - Ruth Cain suggested that perhaps a change or shift in the review rubric is necessary. She also mentioned holding norming sessions prior to next fall to make the process more seamless in the future. The consensus was to maintain the current team structure and program assignments for review of the 2014-15 plans, as well as not to modify the rubric.
4. **UMKC Assessment Plan Timeline (Five – Year Plan)**

Current plan runs through 2014-15. The UAC needs to develop goals plans for the next three years.

Ruth Cain asked the committee to review the UMKC Assessment Plan Timeline 2012-2015 for the next meeting to look for possible changes.


- Ruth talked to the committee about considering the handbook’s current framework and goals moving forward.
- It was suggested that the committee review its charge/mission.
- Margaret Mullaly-Quijas suggested that the handbook could be used more in directing the scope of assessment at the university. This might replace its symbolic presence as perceived in the past.
- Barbara Glesner-Fines also talked about improving the assessment website.
- Dan Stroud mentioned the need to look at building the UMKC assessment brand.
- Ruth Cain introduced some thoughts about how to make assessment more public in presence.
- Discussions concerning a timeline process for revising the handbook will continue at the next meeting.

6. **Next Meeting: April 9, 2015. 9:00 – 10:00 AM in Brookside AC.**