

10-4-2016

## Assessment of Student Learning minutes 10/04/ 2016

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn)

---

### Recommended Citation

Assessment of Student Learning Committee, "Assessment of Student Learning minutes 10/04/2016" (2016). *Assessment of Student Learning Committee*. 24.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn/24](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn/24)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Assessment of Student Learning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

UMM Assessment of Student Learning Committee  
Committee Meeting Minutes: October 4, 2016  
1:00pm – 2:00pm Prairie Lounge

Committee Members

Present: Rebecca Dean, Kristin Lamberty, Nancy Helsper, Melissa Bert, Tricia Rohloff, James Wojaszek, Tammy Berberi, Rachel Brockamp

Absent: 1st year Student, Rachel Johnson, Rachel Brockamp, Steven Burks, Sheila Windingstad (new member).

Others present: Makiko K Legate (supporting staff)

Proceedings:

Meeting called to order at 1:00pm by Rebecca Dean.  
9/20/2016 meeting minutes were amended and approved.

Business:

1. Introduction of new member.
  - a. Sheila Windingstad, Business Office, joined as a new committee member. Absent from this meeting due to personal reason.
  
2. Update from Subcommittees:
  - a. Compliance committee
    - i. "Assessment of Student Learning" Moodle page is up & running.
    - ii. E-mail went out to each Division Chair, asking to disperse to discipline coordinators & faculty.
    - iii. Getting professors to sign up on Moodle site by self-registering as students.
    - iv. Nancy and Rebecca are currently the only instructors listed.
  
  - b. Workshop committee
    - i. Three workshops were set up for faculty to get their five-year plan done.
      1. 11/8/16: 1-2pm Imholte
      2. 11/12/16: 6:30-7:30pm Science
      3. 11/13/16: 2-3pm Imholte
    - ii. Questions-time & dates work for faculty? How many will come? How to strong arm them to attend? Should require RSVP?
    - iii. Encourage disciplines who have not completed three-year plans to attend the workshop. Direct e-mail to those disciplines?
    - iv. Should send Bart a list of disciplines who have not completed three-year plans.
    - v. Rebecca asked each Division Chair to forward a workshop notification e-mail to Discipline Coordinators. Rebecca will send follow up e-mail.
    - vi. If workshop does not work out as well as we hope for:
      1. Agree to work with faculty individually – may have better results.
      2. One of the committee members to hold office hours each week from x-y to have conversations with faculty/discipline about assessment.
      3. Or, visit a discipline meeting.
    - vii. However, the workshop method is: we should identify the completed three year plans and use as examples. We can suggest to work together among the

- disciplines and help each other using the completed plan as a model (e.g. – Sociology has yet to submit a three year plan, but anthropology is in great shape).
  - viii. Could make MN VALUE rubrics available in case faculty want to incorporate into their plan.
  - ix. Go through the chart step-by-step and use concrete examples.
  - x. Walk through the template, get started, then, ask/answer questions.
  - xi. Assessment work session as opposed to workshop?
  - xii. If we are already assuming that people are not coming to the workshop, should we have shadow deadline as of 11/1/16 (tentatively)?
  - xiii. We are literally making the plans (subcommittee will meet tomorrow).
- c. No other subcommittee update.

### 3. For Discussion

- a. Workshop with Barry McQuarrie
  - i. Currently scheduled on November 5<sup>th</sup> from 9am to 4pm.
    - 1. Are we supposed to invite faculty or recruit them?
    - 2. It has been difficult collecting the artifacts especially in written communication (limited classes – English).
    - 3. Should be able to use one student’s artifact for multiple rubrics.
    - 4. If faculty were to give “heads up”, they should be able to come up with some assignments which align with given rubrics
  - ii. Use this workshop to recruit faculty to bring in artifacts for this year’s rubric program
  - iii. Gear up toward using the rubrics to form the assignments
  - iv. First half of the workshop – Berry will talk about this experience with the quantitative literacy rubric and how he learned to calibrate those rubrics.
  - v. Afternoon session – Introduce new rubrics we are using this year: intercultural competence, ethical reasoning and civic engagement.
  - vi. Idea of this workshop is to bring in two groups of people:
    - 1. Who are interested in quantitative literacy.
    - 2. Who teach classes that involve the other topics.
  - vii. Bring these faculty together and teach them how to use these rubrics, how they can be helpful for program review, introduce them to the new rubrics, and hopefully, recruit faculty to start thinking about some of their activities to create assignments that could be artifacts for the MN VALUE project in the spring.
  - viii. Is Berry willing to discuss different rubric beside quantitative?
  - ix. Should we revise “Morning” session appeal to general population?
  - x. Should have separate session for different rubrics?
  - xi. Wes and Tricia went to the workshop two projects ago (for Critical Thinking) – Should we ask them to help out with the workshop?
  - xii. Can Bart fund the workshop – attract more attendants?
- b. Single Tenure Discipline – question about the only one full time faculty in his/her discipline, does he/she needs to do a five-year plan?
  - i. Should not have do so since he/she has done 3-year plan?
  - ii. Should offer those disciplines help to get 5-year plan?
- c. How should we give feedback on 5-year plan?
  - i. Need to start giving feedback on 3-year plan

- ii. Likely, plans won't align with SLOs
- iii. Need to start thinking about how we are going to break down these readings.
  - 1. Break it down by subcommittees or divisions.
  - 2. Discuss about ones that flagged.

4. Continued Discussion of FLGP – No discussion during this meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm