

University Assessment Committee
March. 4, 2016
Raynor Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Karen Andeen, Jodi Blahnik, Karen Evans, Stephen Guastello, Noreen Lephardt, Maureen McAvoy, Laura McBride, Guy Simoneau, Pol Vandavelde, Joyce Wolburg, Britt Wyatt, Jean Zanoni, Marilyn Bratt, Susan Bay, John Su

Absent: Andrew Oswald, Fred Sutkiewicz, Baolin Wan
Recording: Britt Wyatt

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

II. Reflection offered by Jodi Blahnik

III. Minutes from Feb. 5th, 2015 approved by Jodi, seconded by Noreen.

IV. New business:

- a. ARMS has finished the rollover process and 2014-2015 has been transitioned to the 2015-2016 academic year and it is available. An announcement will be made shortly to the assessment leaders. The evidence and relations do not get rolled over for the learning outcomes description.
- b. The assessment process rating guide has been approved and will be in use for next fall. It will be sent out to the PALs next year and a subcommittee from the UAC will provide ratings and give them back to the programs.
- c. From the conversation that stemmed from Marya Leatherwood's discussion with the UAC
 1. Taking into consideration what Marya talked about, the committee has been recommended to not independently take on the charter. Sharron will continue this conversation with Marya on the ways that the charter can evolve and the committee's role in shaping the charter.
 2. In the meantime, there should be incorporation of the structure of assessment and assessment leaders in the institutionalized assessment report.
 3. Additionally, committee members should begin to gather more information or talk to those individuals who are in charge of assessment for their college on ways to make communication of assessment more efficient.
- d. In relationship to Marya's conversation and the leverage the committee has to hold assessment leaders accountable, the idea of creating a more direct link between the assessment leaders and the UAC was brought up.

- e. There are four new majors in Arts & Sciences. They should post assessment plans on the website and start to enter information into ARMS. When we develop new programs is there a requirement that they formulate ideas on how they are going to assess their programs?

V. Updates:

Campus Labs.

- a. 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 in CTL Conference Room 330.
- b. 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. Will probably get on board with this software, but it will be a step by step process.

Follow-up from last meeting's discussion with Marya Leatherwood.

- c. There were some topics that seemed to need clarification. There is a need to have the provost involved and a clearer rationale for assessment moving under Marya's office (Noreen). In addition, what leverage do we have as a committee to hold assessment leaders accountable? It seems that the committee is the means of providing information but is not the enforcing component of assessment (Jodi).
- d. From Marya, what is measured is what counts. There needs to be a better understanding of how we measure metrics for the university, colleges, and departments (Guy). The strategic plan may be able to help us with this as it does have metrics and tactics associated with the learning goals.
- e. Assessment should be more comprehensively handled through all committees. This is an effort that will involve more than one committee and more communication and interface will be needed between other committees.
- f. It was suggested to think about the people who are involved in assessment should have more meetings with each other within their college (meet once or twice a year) then have a representative on the UAC so that there's a more direct connection between the committee and those who are doing assessment within their program. A more direct relationship could help with "enforcement". Some programs already do this, and some programs may benefit from this form of organization.

Status of new co-curricular outcomes assessment

- g. Jodi Blahnik's Update: co-curricula are in the process of having programs link services to specific learning outcomes. Part of this entails outlining programs and what services they offer, identify specific learning outcomes, and whether or not those learning outcomes were intentional or a by product. They are looking at designing assessment to make it intentional and finding ways to make assessment standardized across the large number of programs.
- h. By April 1st the first draft of program services and how they link to the learning outcomes and if those learning outcomes are intentional or not will be completed. They will also identify what they have assessed for far so they can look what needs to be assessed next year. Co-curricular assessment contains a wide range of services and translating that to the academic area is a very dynamic process.

Draft wording for assessment of programs with fewer than 5 students.

- i. Draft wording stated:

For all programs: When reporting assessment results, do not include student names or other identifying characteristics.

For programs assessing fewer than five students: Please describe the assessment results in narrative rather than tabular form, and avoid any language that would potentially identify the ratings of individual students. Although descriptions of how students were assessed should be reported every year, you may wish to collect assessment results for several years before reporting aggregated results and drawing conclusions from the data.

- j. Committee's suggestion on what to state:

Regardless if you do or do not have enough students to draw assessment conclusions, every year you should be reporting on the status of your program's assessment. For programs that are assessing fewer than five students, every year you need to report assessment results in a narrative rather than tabular form, and avoid any language that would potentially identify the ratings of individual students. If you are unable to draw conclusions from a small number of students, it is recommended that you aggregate the results till you reach a larger collection of student assessment. When you are able to draw conclusions from the larger sample size, it is expected that you will report on your results.

- k. This will be going out to the PALs. We do not know the exact number of programs who this will apply to but it included programs that enroll fewer than five students or those who are reporting on assessing fewer than five students.

Status of follow-up with programs' AY 2015 assessment reports.

- l. Sharron has contacted the programs except for engineering.

Meeting adjourned at 10:33 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Britt Wyatt