

Assessment Council Minutes

Spring, 2022

Contents:

[January 10, 2022](#)

[February 14, 2022](#)

[March 7, 2022](#)

[April 11, 2022](#)

[May 9, 2022](#)

Assessment Council Meeting Minutes

January 10, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Zoom <https://unco.zoom.us/j/98493211619?pwd=cmpQOE1GVDDdEYXILbG4zYWJrUUxQdz09>

Members:

Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair

Brian Dauenhauer, College of Natural and Health Sciences

Rachel Dineen, Undergraduate Council

Sherri Frye, Student Affairs

Donna Goodwin, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Allison Grant, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Aaron Haberman, Assessment

Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Tyler Jones, Instructional Design and Development

Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business

Brianne Markowski, University Libraries

Michael Martin, Monfort College of Business

Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success

Vacant, Graduate Council

Stephanie Wiegand, Faculty Senate

Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Welcome
2. Approval of December 13, 2021, minutes
3. Announcements and Updates
 - ILO Project Update
 - Save the Date – Teaching & Assessment Symposium, March 22 - 23, 2022
 - [Link](#)
4. FY23 Assessment Grants
 - Think about ILO allocations—do we want to continue the bifurcated process of allocating some funds for the ILO project and the remaining to our traditional grants, or resume the full allotment going to traditional grants.
 - Volunteers – Kim asked for three volunteers to review applications.
 - Brian Dauenhauer volunteered
5. Committee Chair Reports –
 - Chris & Stephanie—Chris said that she and Stephanie had created a draft and then asked the rest of their committee to provide input. That input made a “much better and stronger document”. She said that they still have a few issues that they will be discussing in their group today. One of the challenges they are facing right now is that they have a certain set of expectations for academic programs and a different set of expectations for student service programming. They need to make the language a bit clearer on where they can keep things together, and where they might need to separate

them. Their document is in the Teams site; once they complete their work today they will send the document to the other group and ask for comments.

- They started with what the purpose of the policy is, and then transitioned into our compliance with HLC and the specific areas within HLC criterion.
- In terms of their scope, they were really focusing on all programs at UNC of both the curricular areas and of the student services areas and also having their efforts tied into what the LAC has been working on in terms of assessment.
- Whose responsibilities things are in terms of unit leaders in terms of faculty and upper administration. They created some definitions to make sure that they were on the same page.
- Lyda – their group is working on the program assessment process—how programs actually collect their data, what they do with it, creating their assessment plans, etc. But also, wanting to think more broadly in order to address a few concerns that they have with assessment at UNC.
 - The first concern is that some programs have no program learning outcomes and do no assessments. That's where the policy document and this process mesh really well.
 - And some other programs simply collect and report data through program review or whatever the process has been in the past, but we don't actually use that data to do anything and make any changes to the curriculum so it's just sort of a task without much meaning.
 - They also wanted to think about how we provide flexibility for faculty to think about larger learning issues and their program outside of simply collecting data on the PLO's
 - The new process, as it is currently being thought about, focuses on programs going through a learning improvement project where they will pick the learning problem in their program development at some kind of intervention and then assess its impact. They have mapped this to the program review cycle.
 - As they are currently thinking about it, the project is part of program review and maps to that six year cycle so they will begin a project in year one and work on it for up to four years, depending on their intervention with a final report due in the program review report in year six that outlines the program's next project.
- Brian asked a question about how this will mesh for programs that are going through accreditation?
 - Lyda replied that this process is specifically for non-accredited programs, and that once we have that mapped out the idea is that those programs will report through program review as they do.
 - Kim commented that her experience with accredited programs is that because of what the accrediting bodies are asking that those programs are doing assessment in ways that insured the student learning is happening and that they are able to document that learning. Consequently, it seems a little piling on to ask those programs then to do another reporting process. She added that she is open to considering, if others feel that we want to ask more of accredited programs.
 - Kim's primary motivation is that accredited programs are held to pretty rigorous standards already and have a heavy documentation burden. We don't have anything consistent with that for our non-accredited programs so that's where our biggest gap is right now. That was her primary guidance to this group.

- Kim explained that she knows there are those points where we have to get both documents lined up and consistent with what we think the best practice is going to be. She thinks that where the process group has been going is good middle ground of shifting the focus from documentation while still ensuring that there is documentation for external audiences. So, by not requiring an annual report, but having some milestones in-between program review cycles that programs are engaged in assessment and providing documentation for that that kind of marries that external accrediting need with the reality that if we have annual reports probably programs are going to put most of their time and energy into that and may be not engaged in the learning improvement activity that we're kind of excited about.
 - There was a great deal of discussion regarding the report expectations of the accredited programs. Brian D, Brian J and Milan commented on their current accreditation reporting requirements and wondered if that could somehow be incorporated into the reporting expectations of this conversation.
 - Kim reminded the group that the process that is described in the planning document is really focused on non-accredited programs and cycle that's in that process is lined up with the program review cycle for non-accredited programs. It is her expectation that we will need to have some language similar to what we have in program review that says accredited programs are still doing assessment, but the process is aligned to their accreditation cycle and the requirements from their accrediting body. Something very simple and straightforward like that.
6. Committee Breakout Discussions—before Kim sent everyone to their breakout rooms, she said that both groups should plan on having a next-round polished draft before our next meeting. One of the things that she and the chairs have talked about is sometime in the next couple of meetings she will “mix people up” so that the planning group is meeting with Stephanie and Chris and vice versa, to have time for each group to interact with the Chairs of the other committee to give in-depth feedback before we move, after Spring Break, towards approving some documents and then thinking about next steps to get these adopted by the University.

AY 21-22 Committee Assignments

Assessment Policy	Assessment Planning
Chris Marston	Lyda McCartin
Stephanie Torrez	Donna Goodwin
Brian Dauenhauer	Brianne Markowski
Tara Wood	Aaron Haberman
Brian Johnson	Tyler Jones
Rachel Dineen	Allison Grant
Ku	Milan Larson
Stephanie Weigand	Sherri Frye

Assessment Council Meeting Agenda

February 14, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Zoom <https://unco.zoom.us/j/93353933142?pwd=Z1hsOGQ3V0tJWnlyak5RQIBuV1gyUT09>

Members:

Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair

Brian Dauenhauer, College of Natural and Health Sciences

Rachel Dineen, Undergraduate Council

Sherri Frye, Student Affairs

Donna Goodwin, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Allison Grant, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Aaron Haberman, Assessment

Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Tyler Jones, Instructional Design and Development

Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business

Brianne Markowski, University Libraries

Michael Martin, Monfort College of Business

Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success

Vacant, Graduate Council

Stephanie Wiegand, Faculty Senate

Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

-
1. Welcome
 2. Approval of January 10, 2022, minutes. Approved.
 3. Announcements and Updates
 - a. ILO Project Update – Kim met with the folks from HSS Student Success Center and they report they are making good progress. Kim & Aaron met with Chicano/Latina/LatinX folks to help them along so they could be a part of the program for this semester.
 - b. [Register now! Teaching & Assessment Symposium, March 22 - 23, 2022. Lyda gave some highlights from the schedule which can be found on the CETL website and encouraged everyone to attend.](#)
 - c. LAC Improvement Grants – UNC is just starting our HLC Quality Improvement initiative. They have linked the initiative to the Student First framework and specifically tied our initiative to improving student success through their academic experience in the classroom. As a part of that project, we secured some funding to provide some small grants for LAC improvement projects. We will have two years funding similar to our assessment grants--\$10,000 each year.
 - d. Organizational changes and opportunities—our current interim Provost is going to be advocating for the limited new position for FY 23 Assessment. Kim has done a job description for that position.
 - e. Kim met with Cedric Howard and with Gardiner Tucker and Chris Cobb—they are looking at making some infrastructure support in Student Affairs for assessment. Kim feels that there will be some room for collaboration in that.

4. FY23 Assessment Grants
5. RFP (see Teams>General>Files>Assessment Grants>2022-2023 Grants). Kim shared the document. She asked for comments regarding her recommendation to return to the traditional funding model. There was no feedback so Kim assumed approval of the recommendation.
6. Kim also asked if we wanted to continue to focus our grants on assessment of student learning outcomes (there are other aspects that we could consider) or open them up to other aspects of assessment? Aaron asked for some examples of assessment but not specifically student outcome based. Kim said that it could be “related” but not specific to SLO. For example, if a program looked at the D-F-W dashboards and said we want to either reduce overall D-F-W rates in a course, or we want to eliminate equity gaps, the solution to that could be something that was not specifically related to Learning Outcomes assessment but would still be a benefit to students and actually lead to program improvements. Based on comments, Kim added language in the document to reflect this idea of broadening the scope to include other assessment options.
7. The next question was regarding the scoring process—do we still want to assign priority points and if so are the ones listed in the document the right ones or do we want to make some adjustments? Chris asked if the current focus on retention and graduation rates could be added as a priority point? Another question was should we be referencing Student First efforts? Kim also asked if we want to continue to prioritize collaborative projects? It was agreed that the priorities for collaborative projects, and for proposals specifically related to *Rowing, Not Drifting* 2030 would be eliminated, and we would award up to two priority points for proposal from new applicants and for proposals directly tied to Students First Efforts.
8. No changes were made to the *Eligibility Requirements, Award Requirements, Allowable Costs, Proposal Process and Deadlines, nor Sample Budget* sections. Kim did question the dates for submission. Chris suggested making the deadline April 6 which would allow this invitation to propose to be announced at the Teaching & Assessment Symposium and give applicants two full weeks to submit. Brian asked what the deadline for decisions would be and Kim said it could be anytime before the May meeting so that recipients could be notified before they go off contract for the summer. Brian said that timeline should be fine.
9. Kim said she would update the rubric to reflect the priority point changes
 - a. Need 1-2 additional reviewers—Brianne Markowski & Ku volunteered.
10. Committee Breakout Discussions

AY 21-22 Committee Assignments

Assessment Policy	Assessment Planning
Chris Marston	Lyda McCartin
Stephanie Torrez	Donna Goodwin
Brian Dauenhauer	Brianne Markowski
Tara Wood	Aaron Haberman
Brian Johnson	Tyler Jones
Rachel Dineen	Allison Grant
Michael Martin	Milan Larson
Stephanie Weigand	Sherri Frye

Assessment Council Meeting Minutes

March 7, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Zoom <https://unco.zoom.us/j/96339029231?pwd=aHFVMnJCM1NZM3FmWkltRFJJRTBuUT09>

Members:

Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair

Brian Dauenhauer, College of Natural and Health Sciences

Rachel Dineen, Undergraduate Council

Sherri Frye, Student Affairs

Donna Goodwin, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Allison Grant, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Aaron Haberman, Assessment

Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Tyler Jones, Instructional Design and Development

Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business

Brianne Markowski, University Libraries

Michael Martin, Monfort College of Business

Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success

Vacant, Graduate Council

Stephanie Wiegand, Faculty Senate

Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

-
1. Welcome
 2. Approval of February 14, 2022, minutes. Approved.
 3. Announcements and Updates
 - a. ILO Project Update—no updates.
 - b. [Register now! Teaching & Assessment Symposium, March 22 - 23, 2022](#)
 - c. FY23 Assessment Grants – The announcement went out for call for proposals. So far, none have been received yet, but the deadline isn't until April. A reminder will be sent out right after Spring Break.
 - d. Membership changes for AY22-23? Please let Kim know so she can reach out to the area you represent so we can have representation.
 - e. Staffing requests to support Assessment in FY23 – Kim reviewed the staffing requests she has submitted:
 - f. Full-time Director position—the rationale for this position is that there are no dedicated staff positions for Assessment
 - g. Faculty Liaison positions—these positions would be somewhat different than the previous Faculty Fellow positions as they would be working on different projects related to working on the HLC audit.
 - i. One would be working on helping collect and review the program review learning outcomes and then working with UR to make sure that we have all of those posted on the website (that is one of the things that reviewers really expect to be able to see.) Kim is also hoping that that person could work with the Assessment council to

create some rubrics moving forward. If the Council has an elevated role in program review of reviewing the assessment part this person could help to create some rubrics to help make that process go more smoothly.

- ii. The second would be supporting the Liberal Arts Council in implementing an assessment plan.
- iii. The third person would be an assessment methodologist who would be a consultant for programs on designing assessments that are sustainable and reflect good practices in measurement.

4. Discussion Items

- a. Venue for April and/or May meetings – as a result of the mask mandate being lifted at UNC, Kim wonders if the Council would be interested in meeting face-to-face for one or two of the last two meetings for this year? She asked that everyone give this some thought and she will send out a poll sometime in the coming days/weeks. She suggested that we could make the last session a celebration of the work that has been completed this year.

5. Committee Breakout Discussions (see table below for breakout groups)

March 7 Breakout Groups

Assessment Policy	Assessment Planning
Chris Marston	Lyda McCartin
Stephanie Torrez	Brian Dauenhauer
Donna Goodwin	Tara Wood
Brianne Markowski	Brian Johnson
Aaron Haberman	Rachel Dineen
Tyler Jones	Michael Martin
Allison Grant	Stephanie Weigand
Milan Larson	Heng-Yu Ku
Sherri Frye	

Assessment Council Meeting Agenda

April 11, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Zoom Link [in meeting invitation](#)

Members:

Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair

Brian Dauenhauer, College of Natural and Health Sciences

Rachel Dineen, Undergraduate Council

Sherri Frye, Student Affairs

Donna Goodwin, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Allison Grant, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Aaron Haberman, Assessment

Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Tyler Jones, Instructional Design and Development

Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business

Brianne Markowski, University Libraries

Michael Martin, Monfort College of Business

Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success

Vacant, Graduate Council

Stephanie Wiegand, Faculty Senate

Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Welcome

2. Approval of March 7, 2022, minutes. Approved as written.

3. Announcements and Updates

- a. ILO Project Update – Aaron said he is working with Allison and Canvas trying to figure out ways to process the data coming from the Fall which will then hopefully set up a procedure for what we will do with the current cohort as well.
- b. FY23 Assessment Grants—received 12 proposals. Looking forward to the committee reviewing those. Kim will be in touch with the committee after this meeting. She has prepared a folder with all of the materials the committee will need for scoring the proposals. Hopes to have the results and a slate of candidates available by the May meeting; the recipients will be contacted after that with information regarding their funding status.
- c. May meeting venue survey coming—Berniece will send a small survey to send to the Council. (The survey was sent and the outcome was a virtual meeting for May).

4. Discussion Items

- a. Membership changes for AY22-23—Kim hasn't heard from anyone planning to withdraw from the Council. If you are not planning to continue your membership on the Council, please let Kim know as soon as possible.
- b. Faculty Assessment Liaison position announcement (see document in Teams > Files > Faculty Liaisons 22-23 Position Announcement.) Kim's plan is to bring on 3 faculty members to fill these positions. Kim explained that she looked at the results of the evaluation that the Council did last year on where we are as a campus with our HLC criteria related to

- assessment and tried to pull out some different big topic areas that would benefit from having some dedicated support from a faculty member to help us with these. She landed on the 3 areas that you will find in the document, one being a learning outcomes and curriculum mapping liaison, a second being a LAC assessment liaison, and third being an assessment methods liaison.
- c. For the first one, one of the “low hanging fruit” kinds of things that we can do to have a positive review by the HLC is making sure that all of our academic programs have articulated learning outcomes and that they have curriculum maps in place showing where learning is intended to occur so this position would be responsible for working with us in terms of collecting all of that information next year so that we can make sure that everybody has them reviewing it for quality, and then also assisting any programs that have at this late date not developed these and helping them get those learning outcomes in place and their curriculum maps in place. One other thing about this position: Kim thought this person could actually also help us develop some rubrics for evaluating program learning outcomes and curriculum maps. We have talked about with at least one of our subcommittees that in the future having a more formal role for the Assessment Council in our Program Review process, and one of the things that programs are being asked to submit now are their learning outcomes and curriculum maps so if this person could help us create some basic rubrics for that that would support the work of the Assessment Council once that new process comes into place.
 - d. The next position is an LAC Assessment Liaison. This is a major area of concern because we don’t have any systematic regularly occurring assessment of our general education program and our options are to do it now and get something in place or to wait until after our review and be cited for it and have to do a follow-up action or possibly visit if they are extremely concerned with that. It’s a heavy lift to do this work and that’s why she has requested support to actually appoint a faculty member who would then work with the Assessment office and Liberal Arts Council on creating a process. One of the things that she is proposing that it is possible to collect program level learning outcomes in Canvas and if we were to implement that as part of our formal process that is something that could be centrally supported and wouldn’t be dependent on whoever happens to be the chair of LAC and their capacity to keep that work going. That is a proposal right now; there is nothing fully fleshed out or developed. This work would start in the Fall, working with the LAC. Tara’s comment is that she is super grateful that this role is being created. It is indeed a very heavy lift to design this in a way that applies to all of the units under the LAC umbrella, so it is sorely needed, and this is going to help a lot. She also really likes the idea of somebody that is both linked to the Assessment Council and the Liberal Arts Council. Kim commented that she thinks it would be very important to have representation from the Liberal Arts Council on the Assessment Council or vice versa to keep that connection going. Allison asked for a little bit of compassion in expectations of her analyzing the history data that Aaron has been sending to her on a yearly basis. That is not a “5-minute task” and what we need to do is figure out ways to scale this up and that isn’t something that Allison can solely support. We need to get IM&T on board understanding the process by which these individual programs put in their outcomes and what are the cut points and how are we going to report this? The consistency in data input is going to be really critical for ensuring that centralized support is possible. Kim commented that this is one of the things that is valuable about having done the ILO project is it has given us some insights into what we know doesn’t work. One of the things that would happen next year is that this position would be kind of a liaison between the various areas that need to be represented and helping us work through that and then

we would do a pilot to do some additional testing for that so that everybody who is in the meeting is aware, Tara and Kim have met with Sonya Brandon who is the Director of Institutional Research and also with Matt Goetzel who is the Director of Business Intelligence that does the data reporting and they are aware of this project and are supportive of it in terms of understanding that we are going to have to work with them to make it actually happen. The question was asked whether it will be possible to download data that was collected in Qualtrics into Canvas or will we be looking to have to create new measures to make them Canvas compatible? Kim said she doesn't think this would be the case. This would apply only to our General Education undergraduate program.

- e. The last position is an Assessment Methods Liaison and in Kim's mind this would be somebody who has some familiarity with program evaluation and social science methods who would be available to provide some expert consultation to both instructors and programs on either developing or improving the instrumentation that they use for collecting assessment of learning outcomes data, helping with the development and training for people if there is a need for that and potentially expanding into using Canvas as a data collection similar to what Aaron does and assuming that we are able to create that back end infrastructure that doesn't require an individual spending more time than they have available to do that. The other thing that she sees once we begin rolling out the Assessment Learning Improvement projects that this person would be available to serve as a consultant and resource for departments that are doing learning improvement projects.
 - f. Kim's goal is to get this posted by the end of the week and ideally give people time if they are interested in applying. Ideally we would have these positions appointed so that we would be able to get started at the beginning of Fall Semester. Kim asked for volunteers to look at applications that come in during the month of May to assist in the selection of these folks.
 - 1. Lyda, Chris & Tara volunteered to look at the applications
5. Kim has also gotten a green light to hire a Director (or Coordinator) of Assessment.
6. Final Committee Breakout Discussions (see table below for breakout groups)

March 7 Breakout Groups

Assessment Policy	Assessment Planning
Chris Marston	Lyda McCartin
Stephanie Torrez	Donna Goodwin
Brian Dauenhauer	Brianne Markowski
Tara Wood	Aaron Haberman
Brian Johnson	Tyler Jones
Rachel Dineen	Allison Grant
Michael Martin	Milan Larson
Stephanie Weigand	Sherri Frye
Heng-Yu Ku	

Assessment Council Meeting Agenda

May 9, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Zoom Link [in meeting invitation](#)

Members:

Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair

Brian Dauenhauer, College of Natural and Health Sciences

Rachel Dineen, Undergraduate Council

Sherri Frye, Student Affairs

Donna Goodwin, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Allison Grant, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Aaron Haberman, Assessment

Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Tyler Jones, Instructional Design and Development

Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business

Brianne Markowski, University Libraries

Michael Martin, Monfort College of Business

Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary

Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success

Vacant, Graduate Council

Stephanie Wiegand, Faculty Senate

Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Welcome
2. Approval of April 11, 2022, minutes. Approved as written
3. Announcements and Updates
 - a. ILO Project Update—Aaron reported that the two programs that are doing it this semester, English and Globe, are fully set up so it is just assuming that they are doing their assessment right now or have already completed it so we'll just check up on that in a couple of weeks to verify and go from there.
 - b. FY23 Assessment Grants – thank you to Ku, Brian and Brianne for reviewing the proposals. We had 12 proposals. the decision was made that we fund the 9 in the upper two scoring areas and give the third group the opportunity to address concerns and re-submit.
 - c. 89-97 – 4 proposals; 79-87 – 6 proposals; 60-70 – 2 proposals
 - d. Option 1 – fund all; Option 2 – fund only those above a cut-line; Option 3 – fund those above cut-line and invite those below to resubmit with revisions to address reviewer concerns. The decision was made that we fund the 9 in the upper two scoring areas and give the third group the opportunity to address concerns and re-submit.
4. Recognition of Members Ending Service with the Council
 - a. Rachel Dineen, UGC Representative. We appreciate Rachel's contribution
 - b. Donna Goodwin, PVA Representative – 5 years of service – we will mail Donna's plaque as she couldn't attend today.

- c. Aaron Haberman, Senior Faculty Assessment Fellow. Aaron is moving into the Chair of the History Department and has chosen to step away for a time but he said he may come back at some point. We would welcome him at any time.
5. Discussion Items
- a. Review and approval of Assessment Policy (document is in the Teams Meeting documents folder) – the things that Kim appreciated about this policy is that it addresses the HLC requirements, but also recognizes the work that has been done on this campus as to how we approach assessment. She also appreciates the clarification of roles and responsibilities that is much needed around assessment and the definitions for that. She expressed appreciation for the work that was done by this committee and if anyone does have any final substantive comments for change please put them in the document and the Kim will work with Stephanie & Chris to finalize it before we send it to our incoming Provost.
 - b. Review and approval of Assessment Process – Lyda thanked the group for taking us from a very intricate process to an actually easy to understand process. There are far less steps, far less tables and confusing things. They tried to get from collecting data for data's sake to thinking about major projects and to focus on learning and a question that they were really interested in. She feels that we have that with the Learning Actions Projects so hopefully we can see it implemented. Kim addressed the fact that the document ends with a couple of questions and acknowledged that we are not going to resolve these questions today in our last meeting of the academic year but it has been a little bit on her mind so one of the things that she would like to recommend be considered from an implementation standpoint is that we will have a cohort of programs completing program review in Spring 2023. They will have completed their program review and getting ready to start a new cycle. That's also around the time of year when we begin launching our mini-assessment grants. We could reallocate our assessment grants, or a portion of those grants as an incentive for those programs who have completed the review process to get some funding to start a learning improvement project. We could say that it is a pilot to test prove a concept and how this would eventually work and we're looking for some volunteers and we could either pull that from programs who have recently completed in 2022-2023, or we could open it to programs that completed this year so they wouldn't be too far out of the cycle. That is something we can decide in the Fall.
Kim addressed the fact that much of the extent of the implementation of this process will depend on the Provost's approach for how you advance that culture change. Do you have the long game to try to get there or do you have an abrupt "we're going to do this" and help people adjust to that more abrupt change?
 - c. It will also be an opportunity for the Council to shift roles because previously the only decision-making we have had has been around the allocation of grants. This is a step towards changing the role of the Council on campus.

6. Next Steps-- We will revisit all of this in the Fall. Kim feels that all of this work will move forward and it is just how it moves forward in a way that we achieve our actual goals of continuing to advance the culture of assessment at UNC because we have made a lot of progress, but we still have room to grow.

Kim thanked both committees for all of their work. She feels we have very solid recommendations for our incoming Provost around how to improve assessment and she is looking forward to meeting with her whenever that is once she gets settled on campus.