

University Assessment Committee
Feb. 5, 2016
Raynor Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Karen Andeen, Susan Bay, Jodi Blahnik, Karen Evans, Stephen Guastello, Noreen Lephardt, Maureen McAvoy, Laura McBride, Andrew Oswald, John Su, Guy Simoneau, Fred Sutkiewicz, Pol Vandeveld, Baolin Wan, Joyce Wolburg, Brittney Wyatt, Jean Zaroni

Absent: Marilyn Bratt

I. Meeting was called to order by Sharron Ronco at 9:00 a.m.

II. Reflection offered by Susan Bay

III. Minutes approved from Dec. 5, 2015.

IV. New business: Campus Labs from assessment software is imposing a new platform for ARMS and will be introducing it at a seminar on March 9, 2016 10:30-11:30 AM. MU is in the beginning of our 3 year contract we can maintain the Planning Module. A benefit to the new platform is that we may be to scaffold and integrate data across organizational units of our assessment process. Anyone on the committee is invited to attend this seminar although it may be very technical at this point so it may be more useful to attend later training seminars.

V. Updates:

Status of new co-curricular outcomes assessment

- a. Jodi Blahnik reported that the current programs reporting in ARMS will during the spring semester of 2016 outline program services, the populations served, and align them with Learning Outcomes.
- b. Jodi and Sharon will complete a curriculum map by spring of 2016 and then during AY 2016-2017 collect data and expand to other student services.
- c. Deadlines: By Feb. 12 identify major student services given that some of these activities enable student learning. By April 2016: Review to ensure they are on track; Align with Student Learning Outcomes, Identify gaps and who is responsible for assessment.
- d. Hiatus approved for Student Educational Services.

VI. Assessment for programs with fewer than 5 students, continued. Sharron reviewed the programs with small program enrollment and where data was confusing, e.g., higher enrollment and lower assessments; lower enrollment and higher assessments. She provided examples in the EDPL program and English.

Discussion included sending a message to those being assessed not to those who may be assessed and asking how their assessment plans are laid out and if they are being followed? Ask the Department why so few are being assessed. If there are PALS assigned then where is

the data being housed and where are the explanations? Instructions need to be clear about what and where data is to be housed.

Recommendation: Send an annual message to those responsible for inputting data into ARMS to provide an explanation as to why they are not doing an assessment and when they will be doing it.

VII. Future directions for the UAC. (Marya Leatherwood and John Su)

Dr. Leatherwood shared how she utilized UAC information to formulate the University's strategic plan. The information helped her to identify effective assessment of Learning Outcomes and then to formulate a plan, implement a plan, and assess outcomes of the plan. She used the Academic Excellence outcome as an example. The objective is to make our University highly attractive by enhancing the quality and rigor of the undergraduate and graduate programs. The two tactics to achieve this objective are: 1) continually assess our academic programs and 2) refine and strengthen academic improvement beyond the classroom and requisite faculty development.

The question was asked: What role does the UAC play in achieving these objectives? Dr. Leatherwood stated that people pay attention to what is measured and rewarded. If the University is serious about curricular and co-curricular assessment then the results should drive the charges of the UAC. She believes the UAC plays an integral role ensuring effective assessment processes are in place.

The question was asked: How and who can empower the UAC to ensure accountability for the assessment process? Dr. Leatherwood suggested a systems approach for collaboration and comprehensive interface with the Program Review Committee and to examine ARMS data to analyze and understand the total student experience. Then gaps can be identified. She thinks the Provost needs to be involved to decide the next steps for the UAC. She also wondered what the incentives and rewards there are for completing the assessment process. She recommended sending a report to the Senate regarding who is complying with the assessment process to ensure accountability. Dr. Leatherwood wondered if faculty understood the pay-off for them and students when effective assessment is done instead of seeing it as a chore or an additional task. It was suggested that more faculty development is required for this to occur. John Su agreed with Dr. Leatherwood's comments.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen McAvoy