Present: Laureen Cantwell, Katie Dreiling, Ann Gillies, Carmine Grieco, Olga Grisak, Dan McClintock, Kelly O’Connell, Suzanne Owens, Kurt Haas, Aparna Palmer, Chris Penick, Tim Pinnow, Markus Reitenbach, Bette Schans, Jun Watabe

Not Present: Tyler Anderson, Alison Harris, Jeanine Howe, David Weinberg

1) February 2 meeting minutes reviewed and approved – no corrections.
2) Discussed Faculty Senate Meeting response concerning the proposal for the new Personal and Social Responsibility SLO:
   a. Proposal was accepted and will move forward.
   b. Feedback was expressed that the assessment process is “too burdensome.” The following suggestions were discussed on how to respond to this feedback:
      i. Make assessment more “individualized” or flexible for each program (i.e., let programs have a little more freedom and control over how they do assessment). However, it was also mentioned that too much flexibility could pose problems concerning consistency, campus-wide standardization, and HLC requirements.
      ii. Continue to communicate with our respective departments to dispel misconceptions and clarify expectations from Assessment Committee (e.g., the length of reports).
      iii. Actively seek feedback on what faculty would like to see from Assessment Committee.
      iv. Readjust the subgroup assignments (for 3-year summaries, new plans, program reviews) so that committee members will be able to work more closely with their own department, thereby opening the lines of communication more with faculty. Committee members agreed to this strategy – Suzanne will reassign groups.
3) Discussed the spring reviews for the 3-year summaries and new plans:
   a. Group leaders are to upload their summary reports/feedback to the R Drive (save in your own “team folder”).
   b. Group leaders are to send their feedback to the programs within the next month and extend an invitation to meet with them.
4) Discussed the spring reviews for the program reviews:
   a. Groups should complete these prior to the April meeting.
   b. Groups were advised to provide feedback (a brief paragraph) focusing on “how to make assessment more efficient and useful to them.”
5) Discussed Essential Learning Assessment and HCL feedback:
   a. CMU has met the appropriate components and criteria for HLC.
   b. One area for improvement included “consistent language” about SLOs on Essential Learning syllabi – will be reviewed this spring.
   c. Received positive feedback from HLC regarding program assessment.
   d. Received feedback regarding SLO alignment with CMU’s mission (the new Personal and Social Responsibility SLO will address this concern).
6) Next meeting: April 6, 2018, Lowell Heiny Hall #302, 10:00am.

Submitted: March 2, 2018 by Katie Dreiling (Assessment Committee Vice-Chair)