

University Assessment Committee
December 4, 2015
Raynor Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Susan Bay, Jodi Blahnik, Marilyn Bratt, Karen Evans, Noreen Lephardt, Maureen McAvoy, Laura McBride, John Su, Fred Sutkiewicz, Baolin Wan
Brittney Wyatt

Absent: Marta Magiera, Andrew Oswald, Guy Simoneau, Pol Vandavelde, Joyce Wolburg,
Jean Zanoni

- I. Meeting was called to order by Sharron Ronco at 9:00 a.m.
- II. Reflection offered by Noreen Lephardt
- III. Approval of minutes from October 30th: Noreen Lephardt moved to accept; approved by unanimous vote; no additions or corrections.
- IV. Updates from General Counsel Regarding FERPA and Assessment Reporting
 - A. Conversation included the discussion around how to report data due to small numbers of students in certain programs. Legal counsel was questioned whether there would be enough detail to be able to tract back to specific students.
 - B. Legal Counsel Response: This is not an issue if we report aggregated data even with small numbers of students as long as the data are de-identified. Past conversations with Jeff Kipfmueller were that if there is enough granularity in the data that we could identify the students it is not appropriate.
 - C. Threshold: It was determined that data from a minimum of 5 students is the threshold.
 - D. A question was raised regarding an option to report data in a narrative form. Is it possible to enter narrative that states that there were not enough students to report and then report once the data can be aggregated at the threshold?
 - E. **Decision:**
 1. Programs fewer than 5 do not need to report their data. They need to provide a narrative that they did not have enough student data to report. Once they have an aggregate of 5 or more they will need to report.
 2. Every program needs to write a reflection about what they are doing in regards to assessment. Programs will need to identify on an ongoing basis how many students were assessed in the program.
 3. These programs will need to identify how they are continuing to assess these students even if they are not reporting any outcomes.
 4. We need to identify clear reporting criteria for programs that have less than 5 students.
 5. Sharron will identify what programs fall into the category of less than 5 students and will develop a policy about how this reporting should take place. The overarching policy needs to highlight the reporting criteria to guide programs that have less than 5 students to report on. This policy will identify what each program needs to do and their specific reporting requirements. This will be brought back to the next meeting for discussion.

V. Announcements

- A. John Su has been appointed as the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will assume that role on January 1, 2016. A new Director of the University Core of Common Studies will be appointed.

VI. Peer Review Session Debrief

- A. Sharron thanked all those who participated.
- B. General perceptions were that the co-curricular areas liked being together. They had rich and substantial conversations.
- C. There needs to be improvements in the best-practices presentations. The process was good but some presentations got too long (were allowed 5 minutes but went over). Perhaps there should be a focus on key exemplars and present less topics? Is there a way to solicit input from the participants what they want?
- D. Overall content was well received and participants had good dialogue. A key take away was that participants valued having time to talk amongst each other.
- E. There was some feeling that the *Assessment Process Rating Guide* was not helpful. Next year we need to send it out earlier to the PALS so that they are aware of the expectation for assessment. It is not to be used to assign a grade or be punitive; it should be used for CQI assessment practices. Since the guide is evolving perhaps UAC should use for our own assessment and test it. Sharron will continue to edit it and use it as a consistent document regarding expectations. Questions were raised: Possibly tag certain items as critical? Programs use it as a self-assessment? Sharron will work with PALS within the college or departmental level to use the guide. HLC has an expectation that we use the guide and continue to work on it. They encourage looking for more innovative approaches to assessment.

VII. Guests at Future UAC Meetings

- A. Physics coming in March
- B. Provost has been invited; no confirmation of data. There is a need to discuss with him the continuing use of ARMs, compliance with assessment, how he will support the process, and how can we incentivize programs.
- C. Marya Leatherwood, Vice Provost for Strategic and Academic Planning, is willing to come and discuss assessment in relationship to the strategic plan. Date not confirmed.

VIII. Survey of First-Time Freshmen

- A. Laura McBride circulated the summary report. There was a 97% response rate. Results are available/college. We have 4 years of data and can see consistent trends. Tuition and fees are at the top of the list as student concerns.
- B. It is unclear of how we can use these data. Jodi Blahnik has presented it to various stakeholders to identify strategies that address freshman concerns and manage their unrealistic expectations and normalize their perceptions. Colleges and departments need to discuss how to use these data. In February we will have survey data from graduating seniors that address what they actually did; incoming expectations vs. actual behaviors.

IX. Hiatus requests

- A. The following areas have requested assessment hiatus
 1. Resident life; AMU; campus ministry; medical clinic; digital story-telling certificate program

2. All requests looked appropriate to accept
 3. Motion to accept by Karen Evans, seconded by Jodi Blahnik; all approved
- X. AALHE Conference
- A. The 6th annual conference will be held June 6-8 in Milwaukee at Pfister with approximately 400 attendees. Sharron is on the conference planning committee and is working on proposals to submit. She would like us to present at the conference. Cost is \$425 for 3 days and Sharron has funding for 4 participants to attend.
 1. Maureen will work with Sharron on peer review session; possibly the evolution of peer review at MU?
 2. Jodi could present on co-curriculars
 3. Sharron on problem-based assessment
 4. Karen and Noreen will also help
 5. Sharron will work with Karen, Noreen, and Maureen on developing proposals for the conference.
- XI. Next meeting: February 5th: Need subcommittee to review the charter/functionality of UAC
- A. Need volunteers to work on this charter/functionality of UAC;
 - B. Noreen suggested that Dan Meyer needs to be on board; will invite Dan and Marya to this meeting to get their perspective so to inform our work.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Bratt