

University Assessment Committee
Wednesday, May 2, 2018, 1:00-2:30PM
North Engineering 1022

Attendees: Alana Malik, Connie Shriner, Laurie Mauro, Dave McMurray, Geoffrey Rapp, Fuad Daraweesh, Ashley Pryor, Susan Pocotte, Dawn Sandt, Holly Monsos, Thomas Atwood, Shery Milz, Nancy Staub, John Plenefisch, Scott Molitor

Special Guests: Dr. Ayres and Dr. Hsu

Vice Provost Report – Connie Shriner

Committee on Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (CIEP) – Will be able to review a broader set of data and act as advisory to the Provost regarding data on student outcomes that would support the funding of initiatives.

Alignment of the Individual Program SLOs to the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

- Continue to work with your program directors – we adopted the learning outcomes last spring, but we still have an incomplete picture. We need that alignment in order to evaluate our institutional student learning outcomes.
- If you need help, Angela and Alana are available to talk about that process and offer assistance.

Chair Report

If anyone is interested in chairing or vice-chairing the committee, please let Alana or Nancy know.

Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Program Review Report – Alana

Value Institute

- Last time we met, we talked about putting together a plan for how to sample student work to submit to the Value Institute project. Alana wrote this up and submitted it to them. We will likely have to shift our data collection to the fall semester.
- As an institution, we are supposed to volunteer some of our own people to help with the review of all of this work. Mysoon Rizk from the Art Department and Alana will be trained this summer.

Assessment plans

- Go in and do your reviews – when you review them and the status is changed from ‘Needs Reviewed’ to ‘Reviewed’, that signals to Alana that she can go in and do a second review of their SLOs, to give them follow-up feedback over the summer.
- Some service units have outcomes that need reviewed, too. Most have operational outcomes.
- The assessment plans are our evidence of our aligning of our student learning outcomes to the institutional student learning outcomes, to provide to the Provost.

Defining performance indicators – Holly

- Handout on indicators. All will be developed after the framework is approved by Faculty Senate.

Discussion with Dr. Hsu and Dr. Ayres

- From our January data retreat, we generated some challenges we noted from the data and put that in a letter to Dr. Hsu. Packet included the list of questions for Dr. Hsu.
- Dr. Hsu: From a student survey, after discussion with the VP from Student Affairs and the VP for Student Enrollment, we have found that students responded saying that they do not feel like they have a good experience on campus, all the way from interactions with admissions staff to registrar to faculty/advisors, etc.,

UAC meetings are digitally recorded to assist in developing accurate minutes. Recordings are not used for any other purpose and are deleted each month.

and through the assessment data analysis, that was also discovered as an issue to work on – to make sure students have a positive experience, to avoid losing students.

- Very happy to see what the UAC has suggested and identified as priority areas for improvement.
- We are at the beginning of addressing the issues brought up in last year's letter and assigning task forces – more concrete evidence and data provided to Dr. Hsu could be helpful.
- Original UAC was responsible for assisting with assessment at the college level. At the 2002/2004 HLC visits, it changed to assessment at the academic program level, so the UAC larger group was brought together and assessment plans at the program level were initiated with the program directors.
- At the last HLC visit, we were asked to go beyond the program level for compliance – gather data and improve processes at the level of the institution. We are now still in the process of getting the right data on the right things and making recommendations to Dr. Hsu that can inform allocation of resources with student success at the forefront.
- Dr. Ayres: The UAC has a direct line to the program-level student learning assessment data that the CIEP does not have. The CIEP is looking at data at a broad, overhead level – the UAC has access to the data and information on the ground at the base level and the CIEP relies on the data assessed at the UAC level.
- Dr. Hsu: Department Annual Report templates have been created - Data is input before they are given to departments, so, perhaps program assessments could be linked to the annual reports so that all of that data is also available with the assessment plans. Then, we could work with IR so that data needed by the UAC is linked with departments and programs.
- One question that is in the assessment reports – if you have made changes in response to your assessment, what were the results of those changes? One thing the UAC could do is to share what were the effective or ineffective changes that affected student outcomes within programs/colleges to be able to share with other programs what has worked and what has not. This could be useful for the annual data retreat – looking at the program assessment reports with the departments' annual report data.
- Next question – How to improve the UAC role with the Deans. The assessment reports, just this year, now have a portion for reviewer comments, so all reports and reviews can be forwarded to Associate Deans and Deans, when necessary, to keep them in the loop. The second-level reports can also be shared with the Deans, to keep them informed on, at least, a yearly basis.
- Connie and Alana spoke with Dr. Ayres about meeting with the Deans as a large group to discuss the importance of the UAC and how it fits in with other things – Committee thinks one-on-one meetings would be most effective.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

September 5, 2018	1:00-2:30pm	NE 1022
October 3, 2018	1:00-2:30pm	NE 1022
November 7, 2018	1:00-2:30pm	NE 1022