**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Smoky Hill Room UN215

Date: 10.11.23

Time: 3:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Univ Assessment Dir), Chair  Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean)  Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library)  Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator) | Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)  Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)  Ms. Judy Brummer (COE Asmt/Accred Assist Pgm Dir)  Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) |

Absent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)  Dr. David Tarailo (Faculty Senate)  Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)  Mr. Kyler Semrad (Student Gov’t Association) | Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)  Ms. Magdalene Moy (TILT) |

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) assurance argument overview of sections pertaining to student learning assessment

**Discussion:**

The committee chair walked through each of the sections in the HLC assurance argument that touch on the assessment of student learning. In particular, the focus was the following:

**Criteria 3 – Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support (starting on page 39)**

*The institution provides quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.*

**Core Component 3.A (pages 39-41)**

*The rigor of the institution’s academic offerings is appropriate to higher education.*

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of student performance appropriate to the credential awarded.

2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate and certificate programs.

3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

**Core Component 3.B (pages 42-44)**

*The institution offers programs that engage students in collecting, analyzing and communicating information; in mastering modes of intellectual inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.*

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution. The institution articulates the purposes, content and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements.

2. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

3. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity and provides students with growth opportunities and lifelong skills to live and work in a multicultural world.

**Core Component 3.C (pages 46-47)**

*The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.*

2. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance, assessment of student learning, and establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff.

**Criteria 4 – Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement (starting on page 59)**

*The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.*

**Core Component 4.B (pages 65-72)**

*The institution engages in ongoing assessment of student learning as part of its commitment to the educational outcomes of its students.*

1. The institution has effective processes for assessment of student learning and for achievement of learning goals in academic and cocurricular offerings.

2. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

3. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty, instructional and other relevant staff members.

**Conclusion:**

Although continued improvement in student learning remains the impetus for the assessment of student learning, we must be cognizant that our institutional accreditor does outline these as clear expectations of the institutions in which they oversee.

**Action Items:**

Continue to encourage members to read the highlighted areas of the assurance argument that relate to the assessment of student learning to ensure awareness of expectations are clear to those who are at the forefront of that work on campus.

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY2023 Program Assessment of Student Learning reporting & AY2023 General Education Assessment submission progress

**Discussion:**

Both AY2023 Program Assessment of Student Learning reports and AY2023 General Education Assessment Course and Results Review reports are due November 15th. Thus far, there have been 4 Program Assessment of Student Learning report submissions covering 3 programs *(2 reports cover the same program but separate reports by modality),* thiscompares to our expectations of close to 75 reports being submitted by the November 15th deadline. General Education Course and Results Review reports show 12 course reports and 14 Results Review reports have been submitted compared to roughly 90 course reports expected based on courses tied to FHSU CORE and offered in AY2023. Program Assessment of Student Learning report submissions are averaging just over 5 minutes to complete, whereas Course Reports are averaging slightly over 10 minutes to complete.

**Conclusion:**

NA

**Action Items:**

None

**Agenda Item:**

1. Upcoming AEFIS product enhancements

**Discussion:**

AEFIS *(the University’s assessment management system)* has informed us they are working on some product enhancements in their “Winter cycle.” A major improvement that some programs on campus could benefit from is the ability for AEFIS to now capture Blackboard rubric data. This new capability comes from the increased data sharing via API from Blackboard. In short, what this could allow for is connection to specific rubric elemental results from a Blackboard course to be tied to specific learning outcomes in AEFIS. Currently this functionality does not exist and acts as an obstacle for those programs using Blackboard rubrics for assessment of student learning. A second improvement is not new, but instead, a fixed integration with our second instance of Blackboard for our international partner programs at SIAS and SNU. The integration with AEFIS and the “China” Blackboard instance has been repaired and data connectivity is now possible. Finally, the last product improvement at this point is just being preliminarily discussed, and that is the additional ability to connect to question level results on Blackboard managed assessments *(quizzes, exams, etc.)*. Currently this functionality is available between AEFIS and other LMS’s *(Canvas, D2L)* but Blackboard has not made that data available via API to AEFIS. FHSU has made a customer request with our Blackboard client success manager for that enhanced level of data sharing with AEFIS.

**Conclusion:**

AEFIS continues to improve their product offering which enhances the different ways we can manage the collection of assessment data across our many different programs. We continue to encourage more programs to look for ways to utilize AEFIS to help in their data collection needs for student learning assessment data.

**Action Items:**

None