University Assessment Committee  
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, March 22, 2016  
2:00-3:00 p.m., Peace Garden Room, Memorial Union


Recorder: Kathy Hoovestol

Unable to Attend: Melissa Vosen Callens, Rosalinda Connelley (graduate student representative), Brenda Hall, Beth Ingram, Scott Pryor, and Elizabeth Skoy.

1. The minutes from the 02/16/16 meeting were approved.

2. Regular Updates:
   - Overdue Assessment Reports Log
     - On 03/01/16 Larry reminded John Miller in the Music Department and we should be getting something this week.
   - Mini-Progress Report
     - Two reports have come in since the agenda went out, so we have two primary reviews received and needing a secondary review, and that means we are down to twenty four academic reports still out there.
   - Qualtrics Report
     - Qualtrics summaries are included both from student affairs and academic affairs. At the end of the year, Larry will try to provide more trend data with questions that we have asked over multiple years. Can we see if we are making progress? In general, the quality of reviews and reports are getting better. One question is if we are seeing improvements in trend data?

3. De-brief Workshops on Monday, March 7
   - Larry stated that the workshops went really well. There was literally standing room only at the first session, with 36 people attending the first session. Over 41 people attended one or the other workshops, with 22 people attending both of them. Shafiqur said the sessions were very helpful and very good sessions. He suggested adding on a half hour for questions and discussions as the time they had was too short. Jeff was surprised at the turnout and did not expect that many people. It made him realize that there are more things to focus on than what we are able to communicate in 50 minutes and part of that is the time frame because it works within the academic schedule we had. It might make more sense to hold these on Tuesdays and Thursdays instead, as that will give us a little bit more time. It felt a bit rushed. Ann stated that those that attended last spring are building on their skills. Larry stated that last spring we targeted departments that did not have accreditation. Jeff said there were different people there this time. Larry said there was a better mix of departments at these sessions from those that attended last spring that don’t have any external standards. Ann said that mapping your curriculums is a precursor. Jeff stated that you need objectives in the first place and try to connect those to evidence in your classrooms which is a precursor. Really there could have been a series of three sessions. One to focus on objectives, the second
one is to ask what are the types of evidence, and the third one is how do we sync those together. That is a big time commitment. Ann said that technically the front end is a larger conversation around your programs. You have the hierarchy ones that guide us and then we have a set of objectives or outcomes that are really going to be important and where are they attached in your courses and then you have to unpack them. We have a lot of things that need to be observable and measurable. You have to be able to have them written out so the student understands. If you don’t have that then everything else you do is kind of off. Larry feels that we are making progress. Performance indicators are being developed that are much more like learning outcomes and some have succeeded in that they gave measureable and observable specific examples.

4. Demonstration of Strategic Planning Online Software

- Emily gave a demonstration on SPOL (Strategic Planning Online). The State has purchased the software at the system level. They are expecting us to use it for the Strategic Plan that the chancellor and the presidents of the colleges have put into place and we are expected to use the budget component to some degree. The training that has happened with this program included about 30 people from various campuses for a day and a half of training. Right now they are focusing on the planning and budgeting. The software is less than 10 years old. There is a consultant that will help us with the product as a group or individually to help everyone use this product to the degree we want. You can work on programs, outcomes, tie them to institutional goals, look at courses, program assessment maps, rubrics, and then there is the ability to do some things with documents. You are able to tie the various components of the system together. For example, for the programs that are accredited, you could be entering data in the assessment portal and then use the accreditation portal to generate the documents that would fulfill some of the accreditation requirements. There will be a lot of setup to be done first, but there are more details that you will be able to use. Atlas (used by Education and Pharmacy) is more robust. Atlas tracks individual students where SPOL is more of a template and will operate at a higher level – it will be more aggregate. As a repository of programs and their outcomes, Jeff thought this would be a better understanding of the logistic information that is needed – he sees the potential in reducing a lot of the logistics that Larry has to do in getting reports to the reviewers and all of the work that has to be done. It would also have the possibility of workflow, which would be important. Larry said it would be nice to know if you can find institutional level wide information like with curriculum maps – if each department has one, can you look at all of them and look across them for common features in terms of learning outcomes, etc. A lot of the information required in set up is already in our college catalog. A question worth asking is if there a way to pre-populate the information from another program. Some were not comfortable with assigning a single percentage in program effectiveness – it could be problematic. It could also be harmful for budget purposes. Cynthia, Jeremy, and Emily have access to this program. Emily can give Larry access to this program also. So far, the system office entered each of our president’s goals that are based on the chancellor’s strategic plan. Institutionally we have not done anything with it yet. They are exploring and doing mock ups at this time. Larry is skeptical as to how this
is going to work at the state level, because thinking of the GenEd work and how there are only two campuses in the State that actually have the resources to dedicate themselves to GenEd. How are the smaller higher education institutions going to have the time to supply all the information needed? This is a lot of information. It is also an interesting opportunity for us. We need to know more.

5. Drop-In-Session for Reports
   - Larry feels that we should offer another drop-in-session for reviewing reports? We did it last September 1st. Reports are due September 15th. We would like them to send in their reports in advance. We were helpful and it was productive use of our time. Looking at the calendar, the first full day of classes are the 23rd. The first full week of classes is busy and it is not a good time for anyone. We could do it September 1st or 2nd. That would give the departments a couple of weeks to make any changes based on what they heard from us. We had people come throughout the day and good things were heard and that it was valuable. Kathy will schedule a room and Larry will ask for people to volunteer for maybe an hour.

6. Draft Revised Report Guidelines for 2016-17 and Response Forms for 2015-16:
   - Larry drafted some possible guidelines for 2016-2017 and also possible review or response forms for next year. What Larry tried to do on the first part was bring in Shafiqur’s concerns about if we could have more than just yes or no alternatives. Under view response form, Larry added yes, partially, or no, and then a comment section. Does it look like something we would want to try for next year? It would make our information somewhat different from the current year, but he feels we may be more accurate in terms of providing that in-between level. Jeremy feels that this is a way of getting to the next set of questions without it being an issue. Before it was showing the graduate questions and it didn’t have a graduate aspect to report. Jeff said there is in qualtrics to use the display only logic based on the first learning outcomes reports. It should take us to that section and we should check that. We do have to go through the other two sections currently and put in whatever. Ann said that Linda set it up, so she should be able to fix it. Larry said it will affect his summary data with Plant Pathology, because they are a graduate only program. Larry end up doing a manual spreadsheet for them. Polymers CPM would throw the qualtrics numbers off a bit also. However, next year the changes will make it smoother. Right now, it is set that you have to answer the questions with a yes or no. If we just have the first set of questions fixed – display logic- only - display is based on how you answer those questions. You choose the alternatives from the landing page and continue on.

7. As time had run out, we will discuss the Updates on the Strategic Plan for Assessment Group and the Updates on Possible Assessment Workshops for 2015-2016. Guidelines were given out.

8. New Business
   - None

The meeting was adjourned.

***** Next Meeting is Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at 2 pm in Peace Garden*****