Present: Carol Sue Butts, Ben Collins, Shane Drefcinski, P.B. Ravikumar, Matthew Roberts, Amanda Trewin, Marge Karsten, Evelyn Martens

Guests: Heidi Tuescher-Gille, Dawn Drake

1. Approval of 11/10/08 minutes
   • Matthew Roberts asked that the minutes be changed to reflect his remarks more accurately. He explained that he had suggested to the International Exchange Programs representatives that 1. They more clearly define their desired outcomes and 2. That they use the same pre- and post test data in measuring outcomes.
   • Amanda Trewin moved to approve and the minutes were approved unanimously, with the changes.

2. Announcements
   • Provost Carol Sue Butts noted that she has appointed a Budget Review Task Force made up of 23 representatives from campus and that they hoped to meet two times before the semester break to review operations as the campus awaits news of the anticipated state budget shortfalls. She said that her latest information is that the campus will not know the full impact of the shortfall until February.

3. Prospective Student Services Assessment Review – Heidi Tuescher-Gille, Recruitment Manager, presented the department’s current assessment plan. Highlights from the plan are as follows:
   • The department evaluates nine different areas of its operations through formal surveys and informal methods: daily campus visits; Pioneer Previews; Student Shadow Days; Wisconsin Educational Fair; Holiday Visit Program; High School Visits; New Student registration; Marketing Materials; and Campus Tour Guide. Tuescher-Gille explained that prospective students and their families make up the majority of the population they serve and that all indications are that they are serving them well. As evidence, she shared results of the spring 2008 Campus Visit Feedback survey, which was overwhelmingly positive.
   • Tuescher-Gille also noted that while they are serving prospective students well, the department has found areas for improvement, such as preparing current students to be more effective tour guides, office assistants, and peer mentors.
   • The department has made some changes, specifically in the area of evaluating tour guides, as a result of its assessment efforts. The staff selected skill sets from the “Guide to Pioneer Life” handbook and used them as the basis for new evaluation questions. That has allowed the staff to target skills for further coaching and improvement. Tuescher-Gille pointed out the changes to the tour guide evaluation on the Campus Visit Feedback form. Prior to the change, the form would simply ask the visitor if his/her tour guide did a “good” job. Now the form breaks the questions up into 5 separate areas of inquiry.
• Following the presentation, P.B. Ravikumar asked about the results of Question # 8 on the Campus Visit Feedback Form: “If you were recommending UW-Platteville to your family and friends, what would you say is UW-Platteville’s best feature(s)?” Tuescher-Gille said generally comments noted the following areas, in ranked order: 1. friendly people 2. safety of the campus 3. grounds/physical features 4. Faculty visits. Tuescher-Gille also noted that students and their parents increasingly seem to find the faculty interaction very beneficial during the campus visit.

• Butts asked if the survey asked additional questions to measure reaction to the faculty visits. Tuescher-Gille said that so far they had not done so and planned to meet with the deans of the respective colleges to get their feedback about what to measure.

• Matt Roberts suggested that the department might want to “tweak” Question # 10 on the Campus Visit Feedback form in order to gain a better sense of the impact of the visit on the student’s decision about attending UWP, such as “Based on your visit, are you more or less likely to attend UWP?” Roberts also suggested that the department look into qualitative response software which could sort and categorize the comments people make on the surveys. Butts agreed that that would be a good idea and suggested they check with Mark Mailloux in Institutional Research to see if we have access to such a program through UW System.

4. Distance Learning Center Assessment Review – Dawn Drake, executive director, presented the Center’s current assessment plan:

• Drake began by noting that, like all distance centers, UWP’s Distance Education program operates like a mini university, providing all services for its students, from registration and cashiering to recruiting and faculty services, and so it has much to assess.

• She explained that the center conducts assessment through three methods: surveys; committee work; and individual work.

• An example of their use of surveys is when they asked their students about UWP’s staffing/hours of operation. The survey results suggested that students would like to have staff available during later hours. However, when the center began to stay open until 8 p.m., there was no statistical difference in usage from the previous operating hours and after three months, they returned to their old operating schedule.

• An example of assessment through committee work is the Assessment Committee, which reviews all the methods of assessment and related practices. Drake said, for instance, that the committee would like to increase the rate of returns on all assessment surveys, though she noted that UWP’s return rate is a full 10 percentage points higher (40%) than the national average (30%) for DL Centers.

• Assessment through individual work comes in the form of anecdotal student feedback to individual staff and faculty members, which is passed on and considered as part of outcomes.

• Following the presentation, Marge Karsten commented that the DLC assessment approach seems “comprehensive and integrated.”

• P.B. Ravikumar asked if the work in assessing communication efforts with alumni included all UWP alumni or just DL alumni. Drake clarified that the work only included DL alumni.
Amanda Trewin asked when the DL Constituency Chapter of the Alumni Association had been formed and Drake said that it had been established this fall (2008).

• Butts and Shane Drefcinski asked if the DL Assessment measures had been formatted according to the Assessment Outcomes and Tools grid, but it had not been. They suggested the DL put it in the form of a grid and post it online.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.