**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Pioneer Room

Date: 12.7.22

Time: 1:30 - 2:30 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Interim Univ Assessment Dir), ChairDr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean) Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library) | Hannah Dechant (Student)Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Kaley Klaus (Faculty Senate) |

Absent:

Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)

Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean) Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)

Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY2022 Assessment Report Submissions vs Expectations

**Discussion:**

*It was outlined to the committee that a meeting with Provost Arensdorf and VP Pool-Funai took place to outline the expectations for programmatic assessment of student learning at FHSU. In order to establish expectations, we first need to be clear what constitutes a “program” at FHSU and therefore would be outlined as needing to carryout the annual assessment of student learning. Knowing there already exists a process of program review for our board of regents (KBOR) on this campus we discussed and agreed that the annual reporting on student learning should align with those programs. We therefore agreed the 81 programs outlined on KBOR’s website (*[*https://www.kansasregents.org/academic\_affairs/program\_search*](https://www.kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/program_search)*) would constitute the minimum of programs we would expect to see annual reporting on student learning. The committee was then informed that Deans and Chairs were emailed the file outlining the AY2022 Program Assessment Expectations vs Reporting as well as a narrative on the reporting expectation.*

*When reviewing the document it was noted by Dr. Sumrall that the ‘Environmental Geosciences-BA’ is still in it’s infancy and currently has not had students make their way through the entirety of the curriculum. The report will be amended to reflect 1 less reporting expectation for AY2022. Taking the change into account, for AY2022, 57 of 74 programs submitted annual reports of student learning. This equates to ~77% of programs.*

**Conclusion:**

*74 programs were expected to report on student learning taking place for AY2022*

**Action Items:**

1. *Lower the AY2022 Submission Expectation number by 1 program: Environmental Geosciences-BA (Andrew Cutright)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY2023 Assessment Expectations for MPS Programs

**Discussion:**

*The committee was also informed during the meeting with Provost Arensdorf and VP Pool-Funai that although KBOR outlines the MPS as a singular (1) program, there are actually 20 unique curriculums depending on the concentration pursued by the student. As a result, the expectation for AY2023 will be for the owning academic unit of the MPS concentration to complete an annual assessment of student learning. The MLS program, in contrast to the MPS, does share a common core of 10 hours that students pursuing any of the concentrations must complete; as a result, it is a minimum expectation that the MLS will complete 1 assessment report of student learning of the core 10 hours. Ideally, the expectation of owning academic units of MLS concentrations would be to complete an individual assessment of their concentrations as 20+ hours of the program resides in the concentration coursework. These expectations were also shared with Deans and Chairs.*

**Conclusion:**

*Owning academic units of MPS concentrations should be reporting on student learning starting in AY2023*

**Action Items:**

1. *Committee members please bring this message back to your Colleges, Departments, Programs*

**Agenda Item:**

1. Assessment Reporting Consistent Naming Conventions

**Discussion:**

*To facilitate an easier way to communicate expectations and recognize which assessment reports are being submitted the Committee Chair recommended a formal nomenclature for naming a submitted program assessment report. This consistent naming convention would be:*

**College.Department.KBOR Program Title.FHSU Program-(concentration, if narrowly defined).Award(s)**

*The naming convention would allow for easier identification of programs submitting reports and any subsequent reviewing of program reports. Several suggestions and recommendations were provided to shorten the naming conventions as they are simply too long and in some instances repetitive. There was also a suggestion to possibly allow for a consistent process of submission of reports that could allow for easier identification of the program submission*

**Conclusion:**

*There will be an amendment made to either the naming or submission process to allow for easier identification of assessment reports being submitted.*

**Action Items:**

1. *Revisit the naming conventions and determine a more amenable solution (Andrew Cutright)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. Progress on AY2022 Assessment Report Reviews

**Discussion:**

*Through December 6th there have been 41 reviews of assessment reports submitted by Committee Members. The deadline for review submission is Monday December 12th (timeline is below) but should a committee member need additional time that shouldn’t be a problem if they are able to have the reviews completed by the week of December 18th. There was some good discussion of committee members abilities to appropriately evaluate a program’s assessment report outside their area of expertise as well as the rubric seemed, to some, to be too narrowly defined. The committee chair outlined the review is a review of “the process” and does that process address the elements outlined in the rubric. Does the report touch on the elements outlined in the rubric, should the report not, then please provide the appropriate score and feedback to the reader for the subsequent selection. Another suggestion was made that possibly we should not provide the “score” on the report given back to the program, instead, we should just provide the feedback. Not providing the score could reduce the potential emphasis being placed on it and instead leave the focus on the feedback. Committee members also suggested reviewers compile a list of common errors, missing elements, or other items they find while reviewing reports. These common items could then be shared with the entire University to drive awareness and possibly improvement in assessment processes moving forward. Finally, it was suggested that the communication that goes back with each review to programs include: a precautionary narrative around what the reviewers were looking for in each of the elements of the reports. This narrative would include a message that reviewers are not “experts” in the discipline of the reports they reviewed and instead are looking to evaluate a process, reviewers do not have the insight of program faculty and should something simply be missing/left out reviewers don’t have the luxury of that context.*

**Conclusion:**

*Reviews will continue to be conducted throughout December and Award contenders will be passed to Academic Counsel in early January*

**Action Items:**

1. *Work up narrative about the review process and “what it is” and “what it isn’t” (Andrew Cutright)*

**Non-Agenda Items:**

1. None

**Discussion:**

None

**Conclusion:**

**Action Items:** None

