**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Prairie Room

Date: 3.8.23

Time: 3:30 - 4:30 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Interim Univ Assessment Dir), Chair  Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)  Dr. Kaley Klaus (Faculty Senate)  Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library) | Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator) Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean) |

Absent:

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

Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection) Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)

Hannah Dechant (Student) Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Review of Geosciences MS AY2022 Assessment Report

**Discussion:**

*The entirety of the committee meeting was focused on reviewing the committee member review’s of the MS in Geosciences AY2022 Assessment Report. The initial focus was on the 3 areas (Targets and Benchmarks, Results Data, Review and Analysis) where the largest differences in evaluating the assessment report were observed. Most discussion revolved around ‘Targets and Benchmarks’ and stemmed from the question of: were the assessment tools utilized in some instances appropriate as one was a participation metric whereas others possibly did not allow for enough granularity? Good discussion ensued on Graduate vs Undergraduate assessment practices and the appropriateness of holistic assessment methods being more appropriate for Graduate programs. A suggestion was brought up that without a University Assessment Philosophy it may be difficult to appropriately direct programs on “endorsed” assessment ‘policies’ of the University. When reviewing the ‘Results Data’ it was agreed that if students did not complete an assessment they should not be included in the assessment results as “0’s”, rather, they should not be included as we do not know if they could achieve the outcome(s). The ‘Review & Analysis’ review highlighted there needs to be additional expectations outlined on the “Program Assessment Template” asking specifically who collaborated on the review of the assessment results and how were the results shared.*

*Following the review of the 3 initial focus areas of the reviews the committee moved on to discuss 2 additional criteria: ‘Action Plan for Next Year’ and ‘Closing the Loop Part I and II.’ In discussing the Action Plan criteria, it was outlined that more specifics should be outlined on the report for any identified actions. In addition, the committee discussed what if there are valid reasons for no action items identified? In some instances, it may be appropriate to have no action items but the committee agreed there needed to be clear indications on the report as to why (i.e. waiting on additional data as the assessment was just implemented) no actions steps were necessary at this time. The rubric for evaluating the assessment reports ‘Action Plan for next year’ should be interpreted as a report can still be evaluated at a ‘Level 3’ if no actions are required if specified and detailed in the report why no actions are necessary at this time. In the ‘Closing the Loop Part I and II’, the committee tended to agree that it was not clear in item #1 that we are asking the program to detail changes in the curriculum made to drive student learning improvement. Instead, it can be interpreted as improvements in the assessment “process”; it was suggested to re-phrase question #1 to be more intentional about detailing curriculum improvements.*

*The final discussion revolved around the topic of “student learning” and how our focus is on improving student learning in our programs. It was suggested that we be more detailed about our focus on assessment being about student learning as simply outlining “program assessment” can be interpreted many different ways.*

**Conclusion:**

*The suggestions for improvement of our review process and furthermore the assessment of student learning process were very valuable. The committee’s “review-of-the-reviews” was quite helpful and the Chair of the committee believes will help drive more consistent processes and expectations from the process moving forward. Thanks to the committee for your thoughtful discussion.*

**Action Items:**

1. *Update the Assessment Template to reflect the focus on Student Learning: Report will now be called “AY Program Assessment of Student Learning Annual Report Template.” Language in the template also now reflects the focus on “student learning” assessment and is much more deliberate in the wording (Andrew Cutright).*
2. *Update the Assessment Template (Review/Analysis Section): update to reflect expectation of speaking to how faculty were involved in the review process. New language on template is: “As a part of the review and analysis of the results, please describe how program faculty were involved in the review process” (Andrew Cutright).*
3. *Update the Assessment Template (Action Plan for next assessment period Section): update to reflect expectation of providing more detail on the any identified action plan item. In addition, providing guidance if no actions are identified to provide detail as to why. New language on template is: “Please outline the specific action(s) to be carried out, by who(m), and by when should the action be carried out? If no actions are required at this time please detail why?*

*” (Andrew Cutright).*

1. *Update the Assessment Template (Part III: Closing the Loop Question #1 Section): update to reflect expectation of providing detail on the improvements made in student learning as a result of curriculum changes made by the program. New language on template is: “Please describe any improvement(s) in Student Learning observed in the program when comparing results from prior assessment periods. Were these improvements in Student Learning the result of curriculum changes implemented or assessment process changes, please describe any actions taken during the reporting period.” (Andrew Cutright).*

**End**