

## University Assessment Committee

April 15, 2016

9:00 AM to 10:30 AM

**Present:** Karen Andeen, Marilyn Bratt, Karen Evans, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Maureen McAvoy, Sharron Ronco, Guy Simoneau, Fred Sutkiewicz, Pol Vandeveld, Baolin Wan, Joyce Wolburg, Brittney Wyatt, and Jean Zanoni

The meeting was called to order at 9:00. Reflection by Marilyn Bratt.

- **Approval of minutes from April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting (attached).**

Minutes were submitted by Joyce Wolburg. Moved to approve by Noreen Lephardt. Second by Pol Vandeveld. Minutes approved.

- **Updates (Chair).**

Program Review: With regard to program review discussion from April 1, Sharron had another conversation with Linda Salchenberger to clarify how assessment fits into program review. Process: UAC members will complete the rubric for a given program and included with the rest of the data the program receives, to which the program can respond. Results: program needs to indicate what they are doing with their assessment results, what they have learned, have they changed anything based on assessment results. Both pieces are now in the program review guidelines. Next conversation: committee needs to discuss the when/who/how regarding submission of rubrics. Noreen suggested that we test out completing the rubric for programs that have recently undergone program as a practice run.

ARMS: Rollover has been done to academic year 2015-16. PALs have been notified. PALs also received the policy for assessing fewer than five students.

Webinar with CampusLabs on new Outcomes module: CampusLabs transitioning to new Outcomes module. Danny Smith (ITS), Stephen Guastello, Elizabeth Thompson, and Sharron sat through the webinar, which was very technical. ITS thinks that implementation will be a lot of work on IT side. Others were not impressed with the new module. There are no plans/no timeline for sunsetting the current Planning module. We could try to pilot Outcomes, but ITS still has to build the back end of it. We are in the first of a three-year contract right now.

Presentation at AALHE conference (Association for Assessment of Learning in Higher Education, June 6-8, Pfister): Maureen Lephardt, Karen Evans, Jodi Blahnik and Sharron Ronco are presenting. Mary Jo Wiemiller (PHAS) is also presenting on a panel (assessment piece of IPE). Sharron thinks she has funding for one more person to attend.

- **Feedback for Physics Dept. problem-based assessment plan (draft from last meeting is attached; Resource material from Peggy Maki's *Assessing for Learning* attached).**

Discussion of Physics Dept. assessment plan (presented at April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting): Plan seems logical, forward-looking. We could think of this as a potential pilot. Maybe UAC should monitor their progress so we can better understand what the challenges are. Would this be too burdensome for the program?

Concerns related to lack of learning outcomes were voiced. Will the program continue to populate ARMS with data? If so, how does the data fit into the system if there are no learning outcomes? Do programs that don't have external accreditation need more or a different kind of assessment-related support? Physics (for example) doesn't seem to have a set, standard body of knowledge upon which they could base learning outcomes.

Physics has had learning outcomes for the past 10 years and hasn't gotten anything out of that process. This is an effort to engage faculty and find something that works better. This has promise to improve student learning. Does this meet the criteria for what the expectations are for all of the other programs? Maybe this will bring about more program-level assessment customization, and assessment processes will evolve.

Physics faculty seem engaged and excited about this new plan. Buy-in will be enhanced, and the plan will hopefully lead to new, meaningful learning outcomes.

Are there things UAC could offer that would make a learning outcomes hiatus like this more palatable? For example, the timeline should be short. Perhaps a curriculum map should be required. Perhaps they should work on core content for a Physics major.

Is there a way to measure synthesis and integration of information among courses? Others on the committee noted that retention of information across courses is a common issue.

Question 1, part 3: Change from a yes/no question into one that asks what the practices are and how they can be incorporated into freshman and sophomore courses.

Recommendations:

- Collapse timeline: e.g. change "Year One" to "Semester One" - perhaps three years at the most (though the long timeline allows for collecting data from more students)
- Define core competencies for Physics majors, create a curriculum/content map to understand what concepts are taught where, design the exam (or

other agreed-upon measure – e.g. prior class portfolio or other existing data), design the alumni survey – Year 1

- We expect a new assessment plan posted to the assessment website by the end of summer 2016

- **UAC report to the University Academic Senate (draft attached)**

Recommend changing statutes to add a regular interface with the Vice Provost for Strategic and Academic Planning.

Vice Provost for Strategic and Academic Planning recommended that UAC wait to review and revise charter. This will be new business for 2016-17.

Is there a place for additional metrics or committee work? The committee is very productive, and some members thought the report doesn't seem to clearly show this. For example, we could put in the number of requests we approved for hiatus.

Future and unfinished business:

- Recommend that the committee explore alternative assessment approaches based on program needs.
- "Schedule" instead of "invite" programs on hiatus to present new assessment plans

Stress the need to integrate UAC work/assessment with other initiatives at the university (like we did with program review this year). Related, stress the need for the new Core director to attend UAC meetings.

Reference Institutional Assessment Report.

- **Content for 2015-16 Institutional Assessment Report**

Update from Sharron: Purpose of document is to share with public about student success. This year: will revise report to include story of assessment and change the tone to model the enthusiasm that we'd like the programs to have when they approach assessment. Appendices included (e.g. data on programs without assessment reports, programs identified for coaching, programs that attended peer review).

- Need to share this with Deans before it is made public.

Report will be ready prior to the next UAC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32.

Respectfully submitted,  
Laura MacBride