Assessment Input Group
Wednesday, May 2, 2018
11:00am to 12:00p.m.

Meeting Notes – FINAL

Present	Not Present	Guests
Dr. Brian Brown	Dr. Minerva Cordero	James Stoner
Dr. Sergio Espinosa	Dr. Jim Grover	(Substituting for Molly Albart)
Katie Gosa	Dr. Timothy Henry	
Dr. David Gray	Dr. Diane Lange	
Dr. Julie Gray	Dr. Brady Minor	
Dr. Greg Frazier	Melissa Thompson	
Dr. Douglas Klahr		
Dr. Mick Lewis		
Dr. Rebecca Lewis		
Dr. Beth Mancini		
Dr. Andy Pagel		
Dr. Lynn Peterson		
Dr. Glenn Phillips		
Dr. Les Ridingin		
Heather Scalf		
Natassia Tyler		
Dr. Sonja Watson		
Dr. Debra Woody		
Laura Wolf		

Call to Order	Meeting called to order at 11:00am. by Dr. Rebecca Lewis

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/ Actions/Follow-up
Sign-in	No individual introductions were made, but attendees signed in.	
SACSCOC Accreditation Update	• Response for the 17-18 cycle is due to SACSCOC on September 7, 2018. • Data from the 17-18 plans will be collected over the summer. • IER has started working on a draft response to accompany the reports.	
UEP Updates	• All units are currently submitting 18-19 plans. • 18-19 plans should be finalized by the end of May 2018. • How can IER assist units in better incorporating improvements with UEP data?	

	(a) Continuity amongst units (teams or committees)
	(b) Meeting with all units prior to and during a cycle
	(c) Assessing improvements that have already been made (creating a cycle)
	(d) Educate faculty on SACSCOC and the UEP process
	(e) Change the reporting structure so that units use the UEP process in a more meaningful way
	(f) Consider changing the timing of the UEP
	(g) Institutional assessment language vs faculty language (universal translation)
	(h) Automated notification system for plans that are ready to be reviewed
	(i) Connect assessment with faculty annual performance evaluations or consider other stick/carrot incentives
	
	• What can we do to motivate faculty/staff who complete the UEP process?
	    (a) Reduce the amount of outcomes required in order to produce interesting and measurable outcomes
	
	• Biennial Cycle vs Annual Cycle
	    (a) Largest concern revolves around timing of the annual cycle – attempting to plan for the next cycle without having data from the current cycle to make decisions.
	    (b) Annual would allow units to assess improvements already made.	

Core Objective Assessments	• SACSCOC off-site committee members noted the core objective assessment process as well-developed and research based. • Scoring day data suggested that student were meeting the core objectives. Over time, data will be examined for trends in student improvements. • Scoring day data can also be used for the UEP process.	
Surveys	• Exit Surveys and NSSE Surveys will continue to be sent out.	

	• Adjust categories of survey answers to be broader and more accurate. • Improve granularity of salary question • Time to degree (include half years) • Show differentiation between colleges for students who belong to more than one, and will have different experiences in each. • Include student loan data • Graduate exit surveys should be use campus-wide and separate from NSF. Questions can be copied from the undergraduate survey, and adding questions relating to the thesis/dissertation. (Departments can add their own questions to the surveys).	
Questions/ Discussion	No questions.	

Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.