University Assessment Committee
Minutes of the February 3, 2012 Meeting
9:00-10:30 a.m., Raynor Library Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Lea Acord, Rebecca Bardwell, Jon Dooley, Kim Halula, Thomas Hammer, Todd Hernandez, Allison Kruschke, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Gary Meyer, Michelle Nemer, Chris Perez, Fred Sutkiewicz, Christine Taylor, Joyce Wolburg, Jean Zanoni, Call to Order and Approval of minutes
The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Sharron Ronco, and Joyce Wolburg provided the reflection. Minutes of the January 20, 2012 meeting were approved unanimously without correction.

Continuing Items

Review of second draft of assessment policy. Ronco provided the second draft in an attachment on email, which the members discussed. Dooley noted that he has added sections that will be included in Draft 3, and Lephardt noted that she will add information on benchmarking. Ronco asked that anyone who wants to make additions do so within the next two weeks so she can post them in Draft 3.

Feedback from users of Campus Labs. After the presentation of the webinar on Campus Labs Planning module at the previous UAC meeting, Ronco sought feedback from assessment leaders at other universities and reported various reactions at the February 3rd meeting. Members of the UAC Committee also provided feedback on the program. Most of the feedback was positive and included the following responses: intuitive to use, user friendly, sensitive to colleges that have accreditation by discipline, has a useful reporting feature, is a good value for the money, will integrate with other products in Student Affairs, may have other useful applications (e.g., strategic planning), and will be better than what we currently have. Concerns expressed were: unproven track record because it is new, faculty may be leery of it, may not work with requirements of professional accreditation organizations (e.g., American Dental Association), and may be labor intensive the first year due to data-entry but will be relatively simple in subsequent years. The committee generally agreed that MU needs a new system; the issue is whether or not this is the right one. The recommendation was to get buy-in from PALs at the upcoming workshop.

New Business

Review of student learning outcomes for masters’ counseling programs. The Committee reviewed the learning outcomes and made the following recommended changes:
1. Apply knowledge of bio-psycho-social-cultural foundations of behavior and evidence-based counseling approaches to diverse individuals and groups. (no change)

2. Apply professional, ethical, and legal standards to their counseling practices.

3. Advocate for the mental health care of underserved individuals and groups in urban settings.

4. Demonstrate a professional counseling identity which integrates self-awareness, counseling roles and reflective practices.

5. A. (School Counseling graduates) Lead the development and implementation of a Comprehensive School Counseling Program in culturally diverse, urban PK-12 schools. (The 5th item was unclear to the Committee. If the intent is to develop and implement a program, it should be changed.)

   B. (Clinical Mental Health Counseling) Provide clinical mental health counseling prevention and treatment services for diverse individuals and groups in community settings. (unchanged)

**Practice of reviewing assessment plans.** Ronco asked the Committee members how they want to be involved, particularly if questions regarding assessment plans come over the summer or between meetings and require a quick answer. The Committee noted that there is value of the group’s feedback on the assessment plans, but it is not always practical to meet. After some discussion, the Committee recommended that Ronco begin the process and email questions to the Committee to get better feedback. One or two members should weigh in on questions with Ronco if the whole Committee can’t meet.

**Feedback on Criterion 4.b.4 for HLC Self Study** *(Assessment methodologies and processes reflect good practice. Faculty and other instructional staff members participate substantially.)* Several members noted ways that faculty participate including the peer review meeting in November, the upcoming workshop, and the applications for mini grants. Many good stories can be told regarding the value of assessment in changing curriculum (e.g., nursing and dental). Since Jean Zanoni is collecting evidence for HCL, she will have access to many stories that can be used for this purpose.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Wolburg