The meeting was called to order by Scott Chadwick at 11:05 a.m.

Present: Scott Chadwick, Craig Dallon, Katie Huggett, Jim Knudsen, Mike Monaghan, Joan Norris, Stephanie Wernig

Absent: Barbara Braden, Gail Jensen, Fran Klein, Phil Meeks, Tom Meng, Rich Rossi

1. ***Review of prior meeting's minutes.*** (Everyone)
   The minutes of the March 14, 2006 meeting were approved by the committee.

2. ***Reports from committee members***:

   --Website (Gail Jensen)
   Gail reported they are developing the structures for the website but data has not been entered. The website should be ready for viewing for the April 25 UAC meeting.

   --**Rewording options for Alumni Survey** (Stephanie Wernig)
   Stephanie reported that she had shared electronic copies of the new survey with the contributors but had not made changes or additions to the survey. She asked the committee to provide copies of the survey their schools are currently using for their alums. Joan Norris noted that the School of Nursing includes ten questions that are used by other Jesuit Schools of Nursing in their survey.

   --University-level brown-baggers, speakers on assessing values/dispositions (Jim Knudsen)
   Jim explained that he had misstated his idea and deferred ideas for brown-baggers or speakers to AEA. The question he was asking the committee was should the committee have responsibility for assessing those areas of the university that are not assessed by individual units and are not included in a feedback loop? Following the meeting the Scott sent a message to the committee that included the following list of questions from a template used by Cleveland State University for peer review of assessment practices.

Regarding Jim's comments about the UAC taking a more proactive role in assessment issues, I have a copy of a peer review template used at Cleveland State U. I've emailed the owner of the template, asking for permission to use or modify it and asking for an electronic copy of it. Offering peer review of assessment practices and reports seems to me to be a useful service to provide. I'll replicate the questions used on the template below, and then forward the file if/when I get it. Each question has standard answers (e.g., yes, no, partially, not applicable) and room for comments. We can discuss this more at our 4/25 meeting.

1. Are there significant gaps between the 2005 & 2004 report?
2. Are the goals clearly stated in terms of student learning?

3. What evidence is there that faculty helped set the goals?
4. Have the goals been modified as a result of assessment?
5. Are the outcomes clearly stated in terms of what students know, or be able to do?
6. What evidence is there that faculty helped set the outcomes?
7. Have the outcomes been modified as a result of assessment?
8. Are the research methods clearly defined?
9. Are the research methods appropriate to the outcome being assessed?
10. Are multiple methods including indirect and direct measures used?
11. Is data collection systematic?
12. Is data collection ongoing?
13. Are the data analyses appropriate?
14. Are the 2005 results compared to earlier years?
15. Is there evidence the data are shared with faculty on an on-going basis?
16. Have any actions been taken to modify the curriculum, program, or services?
17. Have any actions been taken to modify the assessment?
18. Are the actions taken a logical result of the information acquired?
19. Is there evidence of the integration of the goals, outcomes, and assessment activities?

Strengths:
Limitations:
Recommendations:

3. ***Student learning, assessment, and accreditation-from the HLC*** (Everyone)
Scott distributed copies of <u>Student Learning, Assessment, and Accreditation</u> from the Higher Learning Commission that outlines the five fundamental questions used for conversations about student learning and the role of assessment in improving learning. Following the meeting, Scott sent the following link to Fr. Schlegel's 2004 Convocation speech that includes the five expected outcomes of a Creighton graduate for the committee's review.

Here are the five "expected outcomes" Father Schlegel articulated in his 2004 Founders Week Convocation (http://www2.creighton.edu/administration/president/speeches/2004convocation/index.php). When I think of university-level assessment, I start with numbers 2, 3, and 5 below. I believe outcomes 1 and 4 fall under the purview of the individual schools and colleges.

In preparing these remarks I sketched out five expected outcomes of the Creighton graduate:

A disciplinary competence and/or a professional proficiency aided by a liberal education and a global perspective;

1. Ethically competent and values centered;
2. Possess a disposition towards service and an engaged civic responsibility;
3. An ability to communicate-written, verbal and technical; and
4. A disposition towards life-long learning.

As you generate suggestions for what we could focus on for our HLC Assessment Academy proposal, feel free to start with those outcomes or generate your own ideas. As we agreed to in the meeting, let's shoot for having those to Michele (mking@creighton.edu) in the next 2 days so we can compile them and

get them back out to you for your review and consideration before our next meeting. For those of you who were not able to attend today's meeting, you can download a copy of the HLC Assessment Academy document at http://www.ncahlc.org/download/AssessAcadOvrvwFeb06.pdf . It is our intention to apply for acceptance into that program.

4.   *HLC Assessment Academy* (Everyone)
        Scott provided a handout explaining the Commission Academy on Assessment of Student Learning and explained that seventy schools are interested while only fifteen slots are available for participation. A team of 5-8 people will select a problem or an intriguing or problem area to assess. The team will work with other schools to further develop assessment efforts to improve or move ahead. Ideas for consideration could include direct evidence of behaviors for values assessment or the percent of involvement in service-learning projects.
        Scott asked the committee to provide suggestions of other areas of focus we should look at in addition to values. Those suggestions should be sent to Michele King by April 12.

5.   Other
        Scott asked the committee to ask their deans if they would be willing to participate in building a standard accreditation website for fall 2006. He suggested that the committee refer to the Iowa State website as an example. Following the meeting Scott sent the following message to the committee which includes additional information on the ISU web pages and complete instructions for accessing those web pages.

Here are the ISU web pages to which I referred:

http://www.academicprograms.iastate.edu/assessment/soa.html (This page is a landing page from within the Overview of their Self-Study [it's online]).

Click on the College of Business link (http://www.bus.iastate.edu/HLC/LearningTeaching/COBoutcomes.asp) and you'll see the five HLC accreditation criteria listed on the left side. ISU abbreviates them as Mission, Planning, Learning and Teaching, Knowledge, & Engagement and Service. As you browse that site, I think you'll see that the information is presented in summary form, and all of it is appropriate for anyone outside the university to see. The VetMed site at ISU (http://www.vetmed.iastate.edu/about/accreditation/overview.asp) also does a good job of displaying information. However, if you look at their College of Arts & Sciences (http://www.las.iastate.edu/academics/assessment/) you'll see that they buried the information in their normal web site. That seems rather messy and unfocused to me (at least from the perspective of who the audience is for these pages (i.e., the site visit team members for starters)).

So, take a look at those pages and see what you think about what you like, what you and the Dean you represent think we should do, and find out how willing they are to participate in the development of such a site.

        There was no additional business. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.