University Assessment Committee
Wednesday, Oct. 2, 2013, 1:30-3:30 p.m.

Attendees: Ming Liu, Alan Malik, Emily Hickey, John Barrett, Barb Kopp Miller, Marlene Porter, Scott Molitor, Connie Shriner, Andrew Sadouskas, Drew Scales, Julie Thomas, Kristen Keith, Chris Roseman, Laurie Mauro, Ken Davis, Barbara Schneider, Susan Pocotte, Holly Monsos, Brian Ashburner, Cory Stine, Mary Ellen Edwards, Llew Gibbons, Marilynne Wood

Introduction of new members, AAPR intern and GA

Drew Scales – Athletics

Mary Ellen Edwards – Faculty Senate General Education: Education

Kristen Keith – Faculty Senate General Education: Social Sciences

Mingyang Liu – AAPR Intern

Emily Hickey – AAPR GA

Office of Assessment, Accreditation and Program Review Report

Blackboard Update – UAC members invited to Blackboard Outcomes demo on November 13, 1-2:30 p.m., Field House Room 1060

On site visit postponed until November 12-14

English Composition and Art History faculty to participate

Summit

Completed an Assessment Summit for approximately 70 Student Affairs staff members on September 17th. Alana will send out evaluations soon.

Program Reports

If program reports are completed and in their final form, please upload them to the shared drive prior to October 15 deadline and we’ll begin inputting data into the SPSS file. Those with larger colleges in need of help, let Alana know and she can help once they are all in.

Shared Drive Reminder

How to access the shared drive ...
Start menu> My computer> Network locations>
Shared drive> Provost folder> Assessment folder>View all college/service unit folders

New Faculty Orientation (1:40 minutes for faculty audience) – October 18

Alana will be presenting to faculty in a few weeks. Does anyone have thoughts on topics that would be most useful with this larger audience?

Step-by-step instruction for what faculty members need to do

How do we reach faculty members that aren’t the choir?
Opening up to all faculty member because of attendance; assessment topic of enough value to open up to all; audience most likely won’t be all new faculty/new hires

Important of how orientation is advertised – suggested for faculty new to assessment and can begin at the beginning level; topics - assessment and test construction, too.

Ask attendees if they have seen program assessment plans, determine what elements are involved, if no plan they can learn how to become part of that

**Assessment Institute** hosted by IUPUI – October 2013

Cover broad brush of assessment (General education, student affairs, etc.)

Attending pre-conference workshop by Barbara Walvoord – “Assessment Clear and Simple” author. Alana will use it as an opportunity to research best practices for general education assessment.

**Program Review Update**

Completed all orientation programs for all that are being reviewed this cycle.

Each program complete self-study report; external review team will be selected by program or chancellor and site visits determined by everyone.

Questions still under development.

Program review happens one year prior to accreditation; one member on external team is a site visitor to help program learn more about how to improve future accreditation. A majority of programs being reviewed this year are from COB! because accreditation-wise they are evaluated by college, not by specific program and that will be happening next year. Other program reviews are determined by annual workload and need; reviewed to provide a strong self-reflective process to continuously improve.

**General Education Assessment Update**

Attending workshop hosted by HLC on general education in St. Charles, Illinois; Pre-conference program. Hoping to pick up on what’s happening at other schools for general education assessment. Also planning to send a group in the spring conference to focus on an actual project, probably the general education assessment piece.

Still waiting to hear back from Faculty Senate about modifying the competency rubrics.

**Curriculum Tracking Update**

Faculty Senate Ad hoc committee met in Sept. to discuss; wrote back to Dr. Scarborough, Dr. Gold and Dr. Barrett and came up with a list of recommendations and requests.

**Requests and recommendations:**

1. A current list of everyone with signatory authority on curriculum tracking forms.
2. Tracking numbers associated with submissions to avoid confusion over multiple versions of course and program submissions.
3. A faculty advisory group to work directly with IT staff on these issues.
4. Redesign of the submission forms by faculty and the Provost Office.
5. Modification of the curriculum tracking system to include an active working side and a final archived, signed side.
6. Since the Provost is the Chief Academic Officer and responsible for all academic programs and curriculum on the main campus, it is our recommendation that a person in the Provost’s Office who has a working knowledge of OBOR requirements and processes regarding academic programs and courses, and a working knowledge of our current University of Toledo curricular processes and procedures, be identified to work with the Faculty Senate on matters related to curriculum tracking.

However, there is also somewhat of a disconnect on training and skills rather than what’s in report. Deliberate design elements included in the tracking system (User vs. Administrator view conflicts). Need to clarify and dialogue with Faculty Senate on how to make it better. Suggested to create a help box for users. Suggested to connect the Graduate Studies Council and Faculty Senate for additional input; other bodies should be included as well.

How is this related to assessment? Committee asked for an update just for information to take a look at the bigger picture of what’s going on at UT.

**UAC Chair Report**

PT site visitors came in on Sunday and left today. First thing they asked, how do your students know what the SLOs are for your program? End results, they’ll get published even more. Successful site visit. Another visit in a week and a half for speech.

**Annual Report**

Alana and Barb are working on Annual Report. Issues fixed, updated report given to Barbara and John. Thin but next report should have much more data.

**Liaison Rubrics**

*Goal*: Create a set of rubrics (standardized system) that the report committee members will evaluate the reports that the liaisons submit to the full committee. (When reviewing others reports)

*Goal*: Give guidance to UAC and about how to put together your liaison analysis/summary reports. (When writing report)

Everyone will get 3 reports to review. Every report will be reviewed by 3 different people.

Number ranking overview; zero allows us to identify that liaison isn’t getting what he/she needs; one is the base level; two and three are meant to represent best practices. (Levels of the rubric)

HLC coming back in 2015/2016. Accreditors are going to look even deeper into assessment due to federal pressures.
Confusing language as service unit assessment.

Page 2 of each template. Part II Instructions. In attempt to from document, language from liaison report was submitted. Clarify language.

Uncertain of ambiguity of exceeds expectations and best practices. Rubric for each bullet point within rubric level. What does “Most programs” or “All programs” mean? “Detailed notes” or “Notes”?

Any comments have on structure of rubrics is welcome.

Internal rubric; not meant to be external or sent to dean.

Created from last year’s review and side notes on the table.

Peers but also volunteers. Be careful of the weight given to last two documents. If we think that there is something we’re not getting; how do we ‘crack the whip’? Rubrics only meant for internal organization. Used to help write the letters’ to the deans but will not be attached.

Important that we identify where our problems are; liaison is not the one creating the problem. Once problems are identified, how do we go about solving them without pushing liaisons to white wash issues? UAC meant to protect liaisons.

Are we going to lose the program data that is exemplary? >> that information is specifically addressed in the program report – up to the liaison to include in report. Goal is to add a level of review the make sure that we inform liaison of the information we need to be at that level.

When we look at the liaison reports? Can we go back and look at the files from the college through the shared drive? >> Absolutely use for reference to provide liaison with representative example of programs.

Last page. Identify exactly what the best practice is if that is checked. Identify the rationale for what makes it a best practice.

Difficult to find best practices for service.

Drastic gap between does not meet and meets.

Will become a part of the discussion as we start using this ... Does not meet but is showing improvement? Does not meet and shows no interest? Can be decided as we move forward.

Important to remember that we can revise information - If there are issues or concerns for the liaison to go back and change, they can.

Reports all due by October 15 and need to be on the Shared Drive; extra two weeks from original. Next steps are to assign the liaison to other reports with a deadline of November 1.

Preferences and list of those not willing to review to Scott Molitor by next Wednesday, Oct. 9.

First to look at the report is the liaison before it is sent to the dean.
Evenly distribute beginners and non-beginning reviewers for each college.

Letter to the Deans/Directors from the Vice Provost Office to let them know that the process has begun and that a report will be coming and that we expect them to do something with it.

Is there an area where dean/director can respond to last year’s letter at the college level? Yes. Important part of closing the process.

Service Unit Part VII. Trying to capture a response to what the program has done. Recommend we build it in a little stronger for the next year.

**Presentation suggested guidelines**

Suggested guidelines for liaison presentations:

1. Limit the presentation to 10 minutes, and 5 minutes for group discussion/questions
2. Provide the following content:
   a. Brief explanation of college/unit
   b. Review the activities of the college/unit assessment committee (if applicable) and provide information about the make-up of the membership
   c. Describe the process for gathering and reviewing the program reports to write the summary and evaluation report
   d. Highlight good practices from their college/unit
   e. Provide insights into your challenges as a liaison and what you may do differently next year

**Current template question/concerns**

Some places it’s been working great and other places it has been the cause of frustration.

Receiving lots of pushback from faculty; finding the request to provide comparisons between last year and this year difficult because we didn’t ask for percentages last year. A lot of programs rely on qualitative data vs. quantitative data. Faculty feeling pressured to get reports done. Due to cuts, some high volume programs have very few faculty members. Simplify the reports for next year; less time consuming.

Want us to assess well but do not have the resources to do it; need more help from higher up to improve the quality of assessment.

Report: Have instructions and categories on separate documents.

Where ask for example of 6 findings and ask for best/worst average; most reading that as they need to come up with a total of 9 instead of 6.

Heard a lot that this report better stay the same and many did agree.

Next meeting: Wednesday, Nov. 6, 1:30-3:30 p.m., Gillham Hall Room 3050