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

Present: Emily Berg, Jeffrey Boyer, Melissa Vosen Callens, Mila Kryjevskaja, Jeremy Penn, Larry Peterson, and Shafiqur Rahman.

Recorder: Kathy Hoovestol

Unable to Attend: Ann Clapper, Rosalinda Connelley (graduate student representative), Julie Garden-Robinson, Brenda Hall, Beth Ingram, Joseph Jones, Scott Pryor, and Elizabeth Skoy.

1. The minutes from the 04/12/16 meeting were approved.

2. Regular Updates:
   - Overdue Assessment Reports Log
     o Larry contacted John Miller in the Music Department again this week, and John stated that as soon as the end of the semester work is done, he will get to it.
   - Mini-Progress Report
     o The report that Larry sent out to everyone on the 26th is outdated. The correct number of completed reviews is now 55 (or 56 if we count Horticulture). Larry has four reviews that he has not done a cover letter on yet and there are eight academic affairs reports that are still needing to be reviewed. Larry will do the remaining one from Student Affairs. If there is time after the meeting or sometime this summer, Larry would like to talk about how we can do this differently next year. Jeremy earlier suggested that we would set aside a block of time and work on the reports a couple of times during the semester.
   - Qualtrics Reports for Academic Affairs
     o The Qualtrics Reports have been updated as of last week. Over the summer, Larry will update it and he will see if he can find trends. We have been doing this now for two or three years with some similar questions. We should be able to see if there are any trends. Some departments are taking assessment very seriously. It is very encouraging.

3. Draft of Yearly Report for Faculty Senate
   - Larry distributed a draft of the annual report to the Faculty Senate. A couple of changes are that the numbers are wrong on number 2. We have now completed 76 reports since last May 7th and there are nine reports under review by primary reviewers and that includes eight Academic Affairs reports and the one Student Affairs report. Number 3, the titles should say Selective Characteristics and Academic Affairs Reports Review. Larry is following the model we used last year where we pulled out some Qualtrics data that might give us a big picture of things about Academic Affairs Reports. He has noted some of our more significant committee actions, such as the drop-in workshop, the survey of the chairs, the contact with the interdisciplinary programs, and the two workshops in March.
     o Jeremy stated that if there is an improvement in sections 2 and 3, if the numbers are favorable over last year, maybe there could be a way to highlight some of the
successes that we had over the year. The UAC has worked hard to move the ship in the right direction. This would be a way to show the progress with some departments now much more engaged in assessment.

4. Assessment Workshops for 2015-2016
   - Connie Jadry, of the Office of Teaching and Learning, asked Larry for material about the workshops to highlight such that the Office of Teaching and Learning is doing and possibly put that on their website. She is preparing a handout for the workshop on how to use the Qualtrics updated version. Larry changed “outcomes” to “objectives” as Jeff had suggested.

5. Update on Accreditation and Assessment
   - Charlene Wolf-Hall, the Provost, and Larry met last week planning for the framework for the next accreditation. We have a Year Four Review in 2019. It is a written review only with no visit. One disadvantage is that when the team visits a campus, we can clarify things when they ask questions. We do not have a chance in a written review to meet with people and go into extended explanations of how things really work. Everything has to be very clear in terms of these are the results of assessments, this is how departments use it, and this is what we do in terms of complicated feedback with issues in the assessment program. We will have to document our steps and processes much more clearly. They talked about how to avoid overkill in terms of what we might ask of faculty and the university to do and yet have enough material there to be clear with what we are doing.

   o The Provost does not think assessment reports and reviews should be on the website. We want departments and reviewers to be honest.

   o The Provost suggested that we provide some sort of tracking information for the deans. Larry is thinking about a simple spreadsheet for each college showing: the date we received the report from the department, the date we received their learning outcomes, the date it was revised, the date we got their curriculum map, the date we got their assessment plan, and are departments turning in their assessment work, etc. That would be something we could provide to the deans. The Provost would like to see the deans have some kind of connection to assessment in terms of getting the big picture of what departments are doing, but we want to protect departments from deans using assessment results to reward or punish faculty and or departments. We don’t want departments to have an incentive to fudge their results.

   o Jeremy asked if those reports to the deans would be found in the accreditation file or would they be posted on the website or should they be posted? Larry said he would ask the department chairs and heads what they would feel comfortable with. The group agreed that a spreadsheet would be a good idea.

   o Shafiqur asked if it was possible to have different levels and be able to see what kind of feedback they are getting from the committee. It goes to Larry, the dean gets a copy (one page letter) and the Provost gets a copy. Emily stated they would need the appropriate type of functionality, like Workflow. Shafiqur asked
If there could be different levels that people could see. Emily said that Strategic Planning Online is the only tool right now that has that functionality. Jeremy said maybe SharePoint could handle that.

- The Provost really did like the idea that we should use the assessment website to share best practices like portfolios, etc. The Strategic Planning group has discussed this and it would be a chance to see what other departments are doing and who does a good job of certain particular areas. Departments could see what is out there in an organized way.

6. Jeremy gave an update from Student Affairs. This spring they updated the curriculum mapping in the Division. They used the Undergraduate Learning Outcomes, but didn’t include Natural and Physical Sciences and they added one of their own.

- They had a small committee that met with the Student Affairs departments and programs to ask what programs they offered and which outcomes they related to and which level they were, like freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, or graduate.

- They compiled those responses into a huge spreadsheet and looked at what that meant for the Division: what was their coverage like for our outcomes, and what were their gaps to address in planning for future programs. The lowest in terms of number programs were technologies and human societies. In human societies during the mapping, some departments found it very confusing or unclear as to what was meant by the human societies outcomes.

- The other thing they looked at was the developmental level of the programs, how many were beginner level, how many were advanced – 40 percent of the programs were sort of generic level so anyone can come. So they are looking for more programs that are developmentally scheduled for beginners, intermediates, and especially for graduate students.

- They are trying to bring together people in the division that are writing programs with similar outcomes so that they can get better alignments between programs and then they can get better outcomes.

- Jeremy is doing a communication program on how to write email messages or how to communicate with professionals, and to have conversations with students to steer them in the right direction. They are trying to figure out how to do a better job of sharing these opportunities with faculty – something outside of their class as class requirements.
  - Larry said that if something is in the Union, the faculty may know about it, but if it is in the residence hall, Student Affairs needs to get the word out.

- Jeremy said they may get a software tool called Collegiate Link. It is a way to communicate with clubs, students, pin board. Students can filter events to look for activities, find free food events, etc. Hopefully it will be up by spring 2017. It is a very positive thing for students. They can search and scroll through
activities and events that they are interested in. It makes it a lot easier for
students to get involved. What Jeremy is interested in is the back end that can
link to learning outcomes, group things together, etc. It is open to the
departments too, so the Wellness Center can have a page and place events on
there. The whole campus can use it.

- Larry said some of the connections for this might include out of class options
  that are part of the Grand Challenges in Engineering. There might also be
  options in the new interdisciplinary minors for GE where students should get
  credit that is not class based. Maybe there could be some sort of reinforcement
  for those students.
  - Jeremy said the badging system is the most popular at this time. It does
    not appear on the transcript, but there is some way of recognizing what
    the student has done. Some institutions have something on the
    transcript. It is certified, sort of like graduating with honors.

- Shafiqur asked about the technology outcomes for Student Affairs. Jeremy said
  the technology outcomes is one of the GE undergraduate outcomes, but
  Student Affairs does not have very many programs that teach about technology.
  Jeremy said one possibility might be for Student Affairs to partner with ITS.

7. Emily is looking at curriculum mapping on a big scale. She has found a way to use what we have
   stored in Course Leaf and combine it with People Soft so that we can create a curriculum map or a
   program alignment map. We can look at the program to see what they cover, at this point just Gen
   Ed learning outcomes, or Gen Ed categories. If we can pull in more data even in a shadow system,
   she can merge it. On top of that if we can get program learning outcomes into the data set and
   align them with the courses, then we can create something pretty similar to what Jeremy is talking
   about for academic affairs on a broad scale.
   - Larry asked if this could be linked to an actual student’s history. Emily said yes.
   - Emily noted that there are quite a few programs that put off Gen Ed until the junior or
     senior year. Are their implications for student outcomes for their ability to have a good
     understanding of the rest of the curriculum?
   - Larry said it would be able to help us understand if there certain types of courses that
     work really well together and those that don’t work well together. Is there a sequence
     that works better?
   - Shafiqur said with Student Success software you can see if a student is in Math 102 you
     can see if they get a certain grade how likely they are to succeed in a particular major.

8. New Business
   - None

Larry thanked everyone for a good year. The meeting was adjourned.