

11-1-2016

## Assessment of Student Learning minutes 11/01/ 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 11/01/2016" (2016). *Assessment of Student Learning Committee*. 17.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn/17](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn/17)

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: November 1, 2016  
1:00pm – 2:00pm Welcome Center

Committee Members

Present: Rebecca Dean, Kristin Lamberty, Nancy Helsper, Stephen Burks, Tricia Rohloff, Tammy Berberi, Rachel Johnson, Sheila Windingstad

Absent: Abou Doumbouya, Rachel Brockamp, James Wojaszek, Melissa Bert

Others present: Makiko K Legate (supporting staff)

Proceedings:

Meeting called to order at 1:03pm by Kristin Lamberty  
10/4/16 meeting minutes were corrected and approved.

Business:

1. Introduction of new members
    - a. Sheila Windingstad – Business office
    - b. Abou doumbouya – 1<sup>st</sup> year student (Absent)
  2. How will we give feedback on 5-year plans?
    - a. Goal – Need to present all the feedback to disciplines by end of the semester
      - i. We have not received 5-year plans as many as we would like.
      - ii. E-mails were sent to disciplines who have not submitted the plan.
    - b. Way of giving feedback.
      - i. Option 1 – Each 5-year plan is read by both members of the ASLC from same Division.
        - Pro: People are better able to comment on the content of the actual plans.
        - Con: Does not include all the members of the committee, staff and students. Programs may benefit from those outside perspectives. There is also only one person in one division in some cases.
      - ii. Option 2 – Each 5-year plan is read by one member of the committee from the same division paired with one member of the committee from different division.
        - Pro: Allow for all members of the committee to be included and programs can benefit from those outside perspectives.
        - Con: May not have a much insight on the content.

\*Tricia preferred second option – gives multiple perspectives. Tammy agreed. Be able to obtain perspectives from non faculty.

    - iii. Any alternative?
  - c. Feedback – What to look for? The committee members' workload?
    - i. Task is more of checking the plan & identify mistakes, lack of language, and descriptions
    - ii. Should make the list of items that need to be checked on (check points).
    - iii. Discussion of a rubric so that the comments are universal amongst the committee.
3. Update from Subcommittee.

- a. Compliance - 18 programs have not turned in 5-year plans. Division Chairs have been notified, and help has been offered. So far, no one has yet contacted for help.
  - b. Workshop - Moderately successful. 9 programs attended the workshop, yet not all of whom have actually turned in their plans.
    - i. We can start feedback process 36 plans - 6 plans per person ave.
    - ii. Feedback due by end of this semester.
    - iii. Should pair up committee members (Rebecca will pair them up).
    - iv. Should designate one of our committee meeting as review session
    - v. Each pair should complete one plan for a review session by next meeting
  - c. No other subcommittee update.
4. Continued Discussion of FL GenEd proposal
- a. Any update? - Positive outcome from assembly.
  - b. 2 semesters are pretty minimal area to do assessment. Not fiscally reasonable for 4 semesters.
  - c. Good idea for endorsement from the committee.
  - d. Questions - Do we as committee support changes? What data speaks to this issues (do we have any data to support this requesting proposal)? What kind of data do we have? What are we assessing? - very different from Math & Symbolic reasoning.
  - e. Is this change going to hurt the recruitment of new students? - Should be small %
  - f. Back to the questions - does the committee support the changes? Relative to assessments?

Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm - Discussion continued for a few minutes among 4 committee members.