

**The University of Southern Mississippi  
University Assessment Committee Minutes  
December 5, 2012**

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) met at 12:00 p.m. on December 5, 2012 in the International Center, Room 318, with Kelly Lester, Chair of the UAC, presiding.

The following voting members were present: Jewel Adams, Bret Becton, Phil Carlan, Kenny Christensen, Diane Fisher, Anne Marie Kinnell, Joohee Lee, Kelly Lester, Sarah Mangrum, Kristi Motter, Wanda Naylor, Lisa Nored, Bonnie Nicholson, Avonelle Pugh, Jennifer Regan, Sharon Rouse, Kyna Shelley, Chuck Tardy, Ellen Weinauer, Ursula Whitehead

The following non-voting members were present: Kathryn Lowery, William Powell

The following guests were present: Julie Howdeshell

1.0 *Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda, and Review of the Minutes*

The meeting was called to order by Kelly Lester, Chair of the UAC. Ms. Lester presented the agenda for the meeting (previously sent via e-mail) and the minutes from the last meeting held November 7, 2012. Both were approved by the UAC.

2.0 *Committee Liaison Reports*

GEC: The establishment of the General Education Curriculum Assessment Committee has been approved.

Staff Council: The Staff Council held an Open House yesterday and presented its annual Staff Excellence Awards.

3.0 *Old Business*

A draft copy of proposed amendments to the bylaws was shared for review to address the re-establishment of the College of Nursing and other needs related to stand-alone minors without home departments. The following wording for Section 4.1 was proposed:

Faculty members are appointed by the respective deans, with at least two representatives from each **of the five colleges** and one from the University Libraries. If a college has 35 or more academic programs **that require the submission of an assessment report**, additional members may be appointed by the respective dean at the ration of one additional member for every 15 additional programs or fraction thereof. **Every third year, beginning with 2013-14, the number of representatives will be reviewed and reallocated based on the number of programs.**

In addition, the President of Faculty Senate, the Chairs of Academic Council, Graduate Council, and the Council of Chairs will be invited to participate on the committee or they may designate a representative from their respective bodies. A representative from the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) Advisory Board Assessment Committee and a representative from Academic Council's General Education Committee will be invited to participate on the committee. **In the review of assessment reports, these members serve as university representatives and will be assigned departments as needed, independent of home college.**

After discussion, a motion was made for the College of Nursing, currently comprised of three departments, to have two UAC representatives. It was also recommended to move the last sentence (“In the review of assessment reports...”) to Section 3.2.3 and to omit the word “these” in “these members.” The motion passed.

#### 4.0 *New Business*

##### a. Discussion on improvements to rubrics and review process

Members were asked to discuss the following:

*Should the rubric be expanded to include evaluation of outcome, measure, and target quality and/or appropriateness?*

*Should the rubric be expanded to include evaluation of annual report field quality and/or appropriateness?*

Members discussed the importance of evaluating quality of the elements of the report, including the outcomes, measures, targets, and annual report. In the nascent stages of the UAC, the focus was on reviewing the plan, not the report. The focus later shifted to the report elements. The reviews should now try to mesh evaluation of the whole document in terms of planning and reporting. Members agreed that quality was important in reviewing the report fields. In addition, there was discussion regarding quality of the overall report and the need for a rationale to be presented as to why the outcomes and targets are appropriate to the program. Kathryn Lowery, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, will develop an updated rubric reflective of the ideas discussed by the membership.

##### b. *Discussion of adding fields to account for student achievement to WEAVE Annual Report*

##### c. *Discussion of SLO vs O/O in WEAVE*

Several programs have a “Career or Graduate School” type of outcome and associated job placement, graduate school placement, and career development measures. These measures were pulled for the SACS Fifth-Year report to support Federal Requirement 4.1. Some outcomes are labeled O/O and others as SLO. Some are included within the five student learning outcomes.

Federal Requirement 4.1, Student Achievement, requires the institution to “evaluate success with respect to student achievement” and “criteria may include enrollment data, retention, graduation, course completion and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.”

To decide in the spring semester:

1. How should these “career or graduate school” outcomes be labeled?
2. Should the Guidelines be amended to “minimum of five outcomes; four must be student learning outcomes?”
3. Should an annual report field be added to capture discussion on criteria listed in FR 4.1?
  - Programs could also capture this data within the report as the 5<sup>th</sup> outcome (or 6<sup>th</sup>, etc.)

#### 9.0 *Meeting Adjourned*

Administrative assessment representatives met separately after the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be January 23, 2013 in the Liberal Arts Building, Room 209. All meetings are held on Wednesdays from 12:00 – 1:00.