University Assessment Committee (UAC)
Wednesday, Dec. 4, 2013
1:30-3:30 p.m.
Gillham Hall Room 3050

Attendees: Alana Malik (AM), Emily Hickey (EH), Barbara Kopp Miller (BKM), Marlene Porter (MP), Scott Molitor (SM), Aimee Mendelsohn (AM), Laurie Mauro (LM), Ken Davis (KD), Chris Roseman (CR), Brian Ashburner (BA), Holly Monsos (HM), Sue Ann Hoch (SAH), Marilynne Wood (MW), Llew Gibbons (LG), Julie Thomas (JT), Connie Shriner (CoSh), Terry Romer (TR), Barbara Schneider (BS), John Barrett (JB), Mary Ellen Edwards (MEE)

PRESENTATIONS

Chris Roseman – College of Social Justice and Human Service

Laurie Mauro – College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Scott Molitor – College of Engineering

UAC CHAIR REPORT

Alana background mini presentation

AM – Alana provided background information on her formal education and experience of assessment.

Annual Report

Presentation schedule

BKM - See presentation order above for December 2013 meeting. There will be three presentations per UAC meeting from now until June 2014.

World Campus College Credit Plus

BKM – This came down from the state with House Bill 159. The audience for this dual enrollment is high school students. The University of Toledo has identified 17 courses for development in the program through three different modes. The three modes being developed include 100% online, blended mode with online and campus visits, and another mode with video conferencing and online. The University has meet with 4 schools. Washington Local Schools are interested in the blended version (Online/Campus visits). Toledo Public Schools are interested in video conferencing/online. Sylvania schools are interested in 100% online.

BKM – Cam Cruickshank is leading the project and wants to have resources available to faculty. The University Assessment Committee, with Alana’s name on the list, has been picked as a potential resource. If faculty members need help, would the UAC liaisons be willing to help them?

University Assessment Committee – Yes. How?
BKM – Out of the 17 courses identified, some already exist and have student learning outcomes, however, others need to be redesigned and will need new student learning outcomes. This is where UAC liaison could help.

BS - All Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) courses and need to meet student learning outcomes; new course we may need new strategies to reach existing outcomes. Questions – sometimes do assessment based off face-to-face presentations but can’t do that in a Distance Learning (DL) class. Courses are now being developed all with faculty member and chair.

OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT, ACCREDITATION, AND PROGRAM REVIEW

Blackboard Update

AM – The Blackboard Learning Outcomes pilot has been started thanks to Holly Monsos and Tony Edgington and faculty members from Art History. They have all started working on building goals into their assignments, developing their rubrics, and getting courses/program information organized within the system.

AM – Thank you to those who came to the Blackboard Learning Outcomes demo in November. We hope to get the resource rolled out to the additional pilot group this fall, depending on what happens with the initial pilot that is currently happening. We aim to start collecting and reporting data from the initial pilot programs in spring 2014.

AM – To avoid hundreds of people developing their own taxonomy within the resource, Alana’s role with Blackboard Learning Outcomes is to tag individual assignment outcomes to program/college outcomes and accrediting standards before everyone gets into the system. Alana has come up with a system of how going to organize the data using banner codes. Please send program/college outcomes and accrediting standards to Alana.

Liaison Reviews

AM – Swamped inbox with liaison review reports, thank you. As I’m working through the reports, please make sure that if you send a review of academic reports and service units for your college. Once I wade through all of the reports, I’ll send out emails of what is missing.

BS - When are we going to get those back?

BKM – Over break, Alana and I plan to spend one full day together to get information all together and organized. Once we’ve done that we will figure out the timeline.

CoSh - Are you going to give liaisons a summary from all various reporters, comments, etc.?

BKM – Yes.

SM - Essentially, we will give back two different reports. One report that goes back to the liaison about their reporting methods and the second report is for college/program/unit. I’ve sent the liaison comments about reports I’ve reviewed directly to the liaison, Alana, and Barb.

BKM – Yes, that is correct Scott.

Program/College level report data entry progress
EH – Data for academic programs and service units have been entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and now we’re working to clean up some areas and put together the procedure for reporting.

New meeting location for spring semester

AM – Our new spring semester meeting location is in the Student Union room 3018, however, they lock the union for rocket launches during the summer so we’ll need to find a different space in the summer. I’ll look into going back to Gillham in the summer since attendance is a little less than usual.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

JB – I called a meeting today at 11 a.m. to discuss the changes that general education is going through and the proposal made to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate’s Core Curriculum Committee is going to try and work out assessment issues relative to what’s happening in general education by the end of the year (2013) with the goal of piloting general education assessment in spring 2014. We’re going to try and come up with a set of student learning outcomes that are built out of the general statement of general education, then enable to departments to scan from the selected outcomes and identify their fit. We want to make sure the program is provided with assessment and that we create a rubric of assessment for general education almost as if it is a full program on its own. It doesn’t completely include tags or OTMs, however, if the department identifies any of those tags or OTMs that is ok. If the department feels the need not to use them that’s fine, too, however, the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) would like them to submit it to the CCC for approval.

JB – Most importantly, we want faculty buy in because not one size fits all. We are trying to avoid being beyond freaked out when the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) comes again they have to justify their continued existence. Our main goal is to set things up and have a functioning track record when the HLC arrives.

HM – We already have the general education competencies and from the previous attempt and we have various things for each area. Now we’ll need to smush them together into student learning outcomes and go through another approval process.

CoSh – I will work with Holly Monsos to help draft.

BKM – I’d like clarification from the last meeting. How many classes do we have in the University’s core curriculum?

SM – General education? We have somewhere in the neighborhood of 150/160.

JB – Based on the discussion about general education at today’s meeting, there seems to be a bit of an ongoing confusion due to certain pressures from the state for general education to significantly fit with the OTM. UT has a very low general education requirement for a total credit hours compared to Ohio State University who has 42 credit hours. Transfer is unclear if whether you’re at 36 hours or less and you match OTM.

SM – I’d like to suggest that someone from the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) come speak with us about the confusion
JB - I’d be happy to coordinate with Peg Traband to bring someone up

Program/Service Template

BKM – When I filled out for my program, it took much more time than the last one but it made me think through the process a lot more

JT – I am new to process and maybe sometime it will come as second nature but when I met with college assessment committee and began looking at programs, it would be helpful if reports and rubrics could flow in the same order. Also, programs misinterpreted, on page 5, the number of findings they were supposed to report – read sample of 6 but then read next sentence and thought they really needed 9. I’d recommend we clarify that we’re looking for a total of six.

HM – For page 5, I noticed programs got a different read on the best, worst, and average results. Some thought they had to report best/worst for two different things. I’d recommend that the text be reworked to clarify.

CoSh – I think the biggest problem with page 5 is the ‘Actions to Improve Learning’ narrative. Programs would fill out the table first then pick out a few things in the column then pick their rational. How are those comments different than the narrative? I’d suggest to complete the table and directions with bullet points.

SAH – For service units and the circles, I had difficulty coming up with the page 6.

AM – The UAC came up with 6. Sometimes there is confusion between the result and survey instrument because 10 questions on one survey could potentially have 10 different results. We need to clarify how they collect data because a single item off of a single survey could be one result.

LM – I think some units are confused by the examples that are there; arbitrary scales without definition. I recommend that we take those off or provide definitions that would be more instructive because the table on page 5 does not provide the best examples.

BKM – Let’s pull some examples from the reports this year. AM – I took the same example and ran it through the whole template so we shouldn’t need an explanation of what target performance is because that should already be in the report with example.

CoSh – For page 8, what if we had two lists of activities? I think some are more appropriate for the program director to fill out and some are more appropriate for the assessment committee to fill out. I noticed program directors struggled because not all activities could relate to their program; they related more to the college level. For page 8 and 9, could we include the table in the liaison report from page 8? AM – Maybe we could clarify the language at top of page 8 instead of ‘department/division’ say ‘program’.

JT- Could the activities be reordered into categories? Maybe the Dean in the college that’s reporting things and we could rank them from big to little with prospective students toward the end? CoSh – I know what Julie means because of the table on page 9, program or college display assessment results, a program director would be unsure of
AM – We can take the same table and put it in the next report that they’ll pick up in next level report.

BKM - As a reader of these reports, I’d recommend that instructions be in red so the people could delete them easily.

AM – I am making a separate document with just instructions as a guide plus it will include all helpful extras. I aim to have it ready by the January UAC meeting.

BKM – Please email any other changes to Alana or myself sooner rather than later.

Peer Review Process

BKM- Marlene Porter has given us permission to share an experience with the Peer Review Process.

SM – The report provided to me from the library was not a liaison report so peer reviewers, Laurie and Scott, gave every category a 0. I responded by going directly to Marlene via email to let her know what’s missing. We then went back and forth to work it all out. Liaisons don’t need to be afraid to approach colleagues on UAC to gain a stronger understanding of why they reported what they did.

AM – A challenge to this situation is that the rubric was designed for a college level report so we didn’t require college level report from the library.

SM – We should have had the library fill it out. I filled out the information twice for engineering; giving my general analysis and feedback. Whether they have one program or thirty, the report should be completed.

HM- What about in some places where they are the same person? They would just be analyzing themselves, isn’t that a waste of time?

SM - But it is not the same thing because one is how they are doing with their methods and the other is an opportunity for them to be self-critical – I recommend that they use it as an opportunity for self-reflection.

SAH – I need clarification on my role peer reviewing reports because some of the students learning outcomes need a lot of work.

SM - That’s not your work as a peer reviewer. It’s the liaison responsibility to make recommendations or suggestions to the program on how to improve.

SAH – This is a problematic situation with a college that is new and doing this for the first time. I haven’t seen the liaison for this college in any meetings and the report came in very late. After looking at reports, it was hard to make some kind of comment.

JT – I had that college too and I used the program rubric to be able to give feedback.

SM – It is the college liaisons role to tell the college that they need the work. As a peer reviewer, we aren’t reviewing their programs, we are reviewing the liaison summary of the program.
October 1, 2014 – New Report deadline decided by UAC

UPDATES

Round Robin

**BKM** – Anything additional to report that would be helpful to the group?

**University Assessment Committee** – Nothing additional to report.

**UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Jan. 8</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Feb. 5</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 12</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 2</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 7</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 4</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, July 2</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU 3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Aug. 6</td>
<td>1:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rescheduled to 1/15/2013 due to snow days*