**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Prairie Room

Date: 4.5.23

Time: 1:30 - 2:30 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Interim Univ Assessment Dir), Chair  Dr. Kaley Klaus (Faculty Senate)  Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library)  Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs) | Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator) Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean) |

Absent:

Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) Hannah Dechant (Student)

Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator) Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)

Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator) Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)

Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY Program Assessment of Student Learning Annual Report template (3.13.23 version) discussion

**Discussion:**

*Action items 1-4 from Meeting #6 were discussed to determine if the updated draft would be an improvement on the template moving forward. Grammatical enhancements were highlighted and determined to be necessary and Dr. Will and Dr. Klaus volunteered to provide recommendations in this area.*

*It was highlighted an additional focus on “curriculum” improvements and changes needs to be more apparent in this process as that is the true intention of pursuing student learning assessment. It was recommended to be more deliberate in the “changes needed for improvement” section of the template to be explicit in identifying “curricular” changes.*

**Conclusion:**

*Improvement in the template for reporting on student learning provide additional clarification for faculty/staff who are participating in this process. The template should continue to be a living document and additional clarifying items will be necessary as our assessment of student learning processes evolves.*

**Action Items:**

1. *Update template to reflect Dr. Klaus & Dr. Will’s grammatical enhancements (Dr. Klaus, Dr. Will, Andrew Cutright).*
2. *Update the “changes needed for improvement” section to read “curricular changes needed for improvement” (Andrew Cutright).*

**Non-Agenda Item:**

1. ***Specialized Accredited Program Assessment Processes***

**Discussion:**

*The Chair brought up a question to the committee on their thoughts for requiring programs that maintain outside specialized accreditation having to participate in the Universities annual program assessment of student learning process. Multiple programs that maintain specialized program accreditation have much more stringent reporting on student learning than what the University asks of them in the annual process, the question is should we require those programs to report through the University’s process if they are reporting to their outside accreditor? The overall feeling and thoughts of the committee was “no”, should a program have specialized accreditation that requires them to report on student learning in their program they should not be required to also participate in the University’s prescribed annual process. The next discussion was then on “what should they have to do then, if anything”? As each program that maintains specialized accreditation is different (reporting cycle, what they must report on, standards, etc.) what might be best is determining what efforts on an annual basis would help the individual program stay on top of their cycle reporting requirements? The answer to this question might help define what reporting to the University on an annualized basis might look like for programs that maintain outside specialized accreditation.*

**Conclusion:**

*The University needs to ensure the activities we are asking programs to participate in are not duplicative, are meaningful, manageable, and effective at assessing student learning. It is becoming more evident that some of our programs are duplicating student learning assessment efforts for both their outside accreditors and the University’s annual reporting expectations.*

**Action Items:**

1. *Setup a meeting with the programs on campus that maintain specialized accreditation to determine a process that does not create duplicative work and no meaning for programs (Andrew Cutright).*
2. ***Assessment Cycle Possibilities***

**Discussion:**

*Stemming from the discussion about programs that have outside specialized accreditation, it was highlighted the self-studies that programs report, more-often-than-not are not, are not reported on annually. Instead, programs reporting often times follow a 3, 5, 7 year reporting cycle with potentially some reporting required annually. The question that was brought up was: should our program assessment of student learning require an annual submittal? Often times assessment data is lacking on an annual basis and could provide more meaning if data was allowed to be aggregated over several years prior to reviewing the cumulative results. In addition, establishing trends prior to suggesting or implementing any changes to curriculum would be advisable especially if the assessment is relatively new. The discussion turned to HLC and do they request an annual cycle? From the Chairs perspective, no annual reporting cycle is mentioned in the assurance argument the University will be submitting in September; rather, HLC asks universities to outline their process and how it works for them in driving meaningful improvement in student learning. Although there certainly are benefits to not reporting on an annual basis on student learning there were also some identified downsides as well with the major one being continuity of process (particularly with turnover) and the relatively “new” processes created by many programs.*

**Conclusion:**

*At this time it was pretty well agreed that we should be working towards a process that may not require annual reporting on student learning but currently we are not there. We still have programs defining their assessment processes and the benefits of reducing reporting are probably outweighed by the negative potential of disrupting continuity of process. As our programs mature in their assessment of student learning processes we do believe we can get to a point where we won’t have annualized reporting but possibly just assurance data is being collected annually in-between reporting cycles. At this time we will continue annual reporting.*

**Action Items:**

1. None at this time

**End**