**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Memorial Union: Prairie Room UN219

Date: 12.8.23

Time: 3:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Univ Assessment Dir), ChairDr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean)Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)Dr. David Tarailo (Faculty Senate)Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean) | Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)Ms. Judy Brummer (COE Asmt/Accred Assist Pgm Dir)Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Mr. Issac Wilson (Assist Dir of Student Engagement) |

Absent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Kyler Semrad (Student Gov’t Association)Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) | Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library)Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)Ms. Magdalene Moy (TILT) |

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Program Assessment of Student Learning Reporting: Walk-Thru of submissions summary and Microsoft Form question responses

**Discussion:**

The committee walked through the results of the summative results indicated by the 72 reports submitted through the Microsoft Form when uploading there AY2023 program assessment of student learning reports. The committee reviewed the eight questions asking programs about participation/contribution in the process, status of outcomes/curriculum map/assessment plan, actions taken as a result of assessment, and assessment activities undertaken by multiple faculty members. The questions responses that elicited the greatest discussion were:

\*Who contributed to/reviewed this report prior to submission? (select all that apply)

-32% of submissions indicated ‘Department Chair/Program Coordinator’

-26% of submissions indicated ‘One or more Program Faculty’

-15% of submissions indicated 'One or more Program Faculty that teaches Online’

-6% of submissions indicated 'One or more Adjunct Program Faculty’

Some committee members felt potentially the question was not well understood or well-studied prior to submitting the response and perhaps that is what led to the low % indicating contribution/review by these parties.

\*Please select the type(s) of program assessment activities that two or more faculty members engaged in during the past academic? (select all that apply)

-10% of submissions indicated ‘updating or developing program SLOs’

-10% of submissions indicated ‘curriculum mapping’

-15% of submissions indicated ‘updating or developing an assessment measure’

-5% of submissions indicated ‘norming on a program rubric’

-17% of submissions indicated ‘evaluating student work for program assessment’

-21% of submissions indicated ‘reviewing/discussing assessment data/findings’

-15% of submissions indicated ‘making decisions informed by assessment data’

-4% of submissions indicated ‘faculty/TA professional development’

-1% of submissions indicated ‘none of the above’

Again, some committee members outlined there may need to be additional clarification of what is being desired from the responses and what constitutes participation.

**Conclusion:**

As the committee just reviewed the summative results the chair was asked if he could make the individual responses available to the committee. Several committee members mentioned making this available for each program could help potentially provide additional context to the review of the submitted assessment reports. The summative results will be shared with Academic Counsel to gauge their perceptions as well.

**Action Items:**

Committee chair-make Microsoft Form submitted responses available to LAC *(Done, Microsoft Form questions and responses were uploaded to the ‘Assessment Committee’ Blackboard Organization on Friday December 15th)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. Comments/Concerns about ongoing Program Assessment of Student Learning Report Review Process (timeline below)

**Discussion:**

A brief discussion of the review of program assessment of student learning reports took place ensuring all were still aware of the Friday December 29th deadline for submitting reviews. It was outlined by the chair that only 1 clarification request has been received and resolved. No committee members brought any additional questions at this time. It was asked if the reviews will continue to be the how assessment awards will be determined. The committee chair outlined the ‘Closing of the Loop’ award is quite quantitative as only programs rated at the highest level (level 3) will be eligible for the award. The ‘Advancing Assessment Award’ this year will be looked at in comparison to last year’s results and gauge the programs with the greatest point improvement or a program that used AY2023 as a first-time submission. There remains a level of subjectivity to the awards selection process but the reviews are imperative in that process. In addition, the reviews allow the university to better understand the ’10,000 foot view’ of how program assessment of student learning processes are going.

**Conclusion:**

Reviews of program assessment of student learning reports are **due Friday December 29th** please have each of your assigned reviews submitted through the Qualtrics form by that time. Each committee member received a “Reviewer #” via email by the committee chair and should review the programs assigned to that reviewer #. All the details are available on the ‘Assessment Committee’ Blackboard Organization page.

**Action Items:**

-Assessment of Student Learning Report Reviews *(All LAC Committee Members)*

**Agenda Item:**

3. Program Review Updates

**Discussion:**

The LAC chair outlined the University has reconvened the Program Review committee to review the University’s program review process in light of the changes implemented by KBOR. The LAC chair outlined it is his perspective that any process undertaken by the Program Review process that involves assessment of student learning, should align with the processes already in place via the LAC. KBOR’s current expectation is that each University will review ALL of their programs every 4 years; with reporting from all programs happening in a single year from the University. FHSU is currently scheduled to submit their Program Review in AY2027. The chair outlined he will keep the committee up-to-date with any work that comes out of the Program Review committee that impacts assessment of student learning.

**Conclusion:**

More to come as the Program Review committee begins there work in January.

**Action Items:**

None