**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Pioneer Room

Date: 2.1.23

Time: 1:30 - 2:30 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Interim Univ Assessment Dir), Chair  Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)  Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)  Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library) | Hannah Dechant (Student)  Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator) Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection) |

Absent:

Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)

Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean) Dr. Kaley Klaus (Faculty Senate)

Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY2022 Assessment Report Reviews Debrief *(University Assessment Committee Review Report.xlsx)*

**Discussion:**

*For AY2022 program assessment reports 64 total reports were submitted by the deadline representing 57 unique programs across the campus (some programs submitted multiple reports; by modality, or concentration). These 64 reports were reviewed by 2 committee members meaning 128 total reviews were conducted. Reviews were provided back to Deans & Chairs with the messaging to push the reports reviews down to faculty in each of the programs. Overall, when looking at the University as a whole (see graphic at end), we see the reviews are indicating, of those submitting reports for review, that the most opportunity lies in the improvement of the last for review criteria (Review and Analysis; Ara of Improvement; Action Plan for Next Year; & Closing the Loop Part I and II). The way the reviews were conducted will allow the University to see longitudinally if we see improvement in each of these areas as a whole moving forward. The committee chair mentioned, overall, the Reviews were done quite well but we have some improvement we can do as a committee to ensure we “on-the-same-page” on what we are/are-not looking for on each of these criteria. When looking at how individual report reviews differed, 13 of the 64 review scores (~20%) differed by more than 25% of the total available points. This is indicative that we as a committee can improve our consistency in reviewing these reports. The committee chair mentioned he told Academic Counsel this exact thing, we are going to improve our review process just like programs will continue to improve their reports and those comments were well received. As we continue to improve our reviews we will be in a much better position to provide more consistent feedback that is valuable to programs and subsequently that feedback should in return lead to more actionable improvement items programs can use to improve their assessment processes. Overall, Academic Counsel was supportive of the review process that was conducted and was very happy to hear the results would be shared with programs. Both program chairs of the assessment award winners did approve to have their winning assessment reports added to the Department of Assessment’s website and the plan will be to have an “assessment showcase” of the winning reports for each following year. Providing other programs access to what the winning reports submitted should provide not only greater transparency to our review process but also great examples of what a quality assessment report can look like.*

**Conclusion:**

*To improve the consistency in our review process the committee chair would like to dedicate the March committee meeting to go over the review of a single program by ALL committee members. This action will be a step to improve our of inter-rater reliability of our reviews and hopefully drive more consistent feedback.*

**Action Items:**

1. *ALL committee members will be provided the Geosciences-MS program assessment report and be asked to complete the Qualtrics rubric to evaluate the report prior to the March committee meeting (ALL committee members)*
2. *Compile all reviews of the report conducted prior to the March committee meeting (Andrew Cutright)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. Lessons Learned/Recommended Changes

**Discussion:**

*Some feedback was provided that maybe we should rethink making all reviews available (i.e. only share the reviews with the program submitting the review). The committee chair outlined the biggest area he observed in the reports he reviewed was the lack of action item details, such as: who will carry this out, what will they do, and by when will they complete it. It was suggested that possibly providing more expectations or instructions on the “Assessment Template” could tease more of these details out in subsequent reports. One suggestion for improvement was to provide a resource folder where helpful tools such as graphics, charts, templates could be accessible for report creators. One thought that came up is how do we transfer the knowledge of our assessment review process to potential new Assessment Committee Members to ensure consistency gains are maintained? Another question that was brought up was what are we doing or are we communicating with the programs that did not submit a report? The committee chair mentioned he has spoken with a few of the programs but not all. The dissemination of the ‘Program Assessment Expectations vs Reporting’ file to Deans/Chairs was a first step in at least making them aware of any non-submitters.*

**Conclusion:**

*N/A*

**Action Items:**

1. *Work to add resources to the Department of Assessment’s website (Andrew Cutright/Shelly Gasper)*

