**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

Location: Center for Student Success: CSS 304 – Training Kitchen

Date: 1.17.24

Time: 3:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Univ Assessment Dir), ChairDr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean)Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)Mr. Kyler Semrad (Student Gov’t Association)Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library)Dr. Magdalene Moy (TILT) | 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)Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator) |

Absent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)Mr. Issac Wilson (Assist Dir of Student Engagement) | Dr. David Tarailo (Faculty Senate) |

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Re-Do: Program Assessment of Student Learning Reporting: Walk-Thru of submissions summary and Microsoft Form question responses \*\*Andy’s data analysis snafu\*\*

**Discussion:**

The chair informed the committee that the initial analysis of the survey questions programs answered prior to uploading their annual report(s) was incorrect for the 3 questions that had multiple selection options. Thanks to Dr. Tarailo this inaccuracy was brought to the attention of the chair and fixed prior to further sharing of results. The committee walked through the 3 multiple selection option questions to review the updated results. For each of the questions the results were greatly improved based on the updated analysis. Full results will be attached to an email to LAC members.

**Conclusion:**

As 2 of the 3 questions that elicited the greatest concerns/discussion amongst committee members when first reviewed in the December meeting were updated with the new analysis, reduced concerns of question wording/clarification were present.

**Action Items:**

-Make full analysis of survey responses available to LAC. *(Committee Chair; will be made available in dissemination of January minutes)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. AY2023 Program Assessment of Student Learning walk-through; what was shared with Academic Counsel 1/16/24 & feedback received.

**Discussion:**

The committee walked through the complete report that was provided to Academic Counsel which outlined the AY2023 program assessment of student learning process, progress, and status. The walk through entailed the following aspects: ‘By College Reporting’, ‘Reporting Walk-Thru’, ‘Reports Review Criteria’, ‘LAC Reviews Results’, ‘Closing the Loop Award’, ‘Advancing Assessment Award’, ‘Survey Submissions’, and ‘Andy’s Takeaways.’ A subsequent email that was sent to Academic Counsel will be made available to the LAC. Based on the reviews, it was observed that YoY, as-a-whole, the university observed lower performance reviews of program’s assessment reports across 7 of the 8 review criteria. The committee chair outlined several items could be leading to these reduced results:

1. Reviews were only conducted on programs submitting the standard reporting form. In AY2023 programs with outside specialized accreditation which have assessment of student learning reporting expectations were given the opportunity to submit an alternative report and these reports were not reviewed by the committee.
2. Specifically, on the ‘Closing of the Loop’ review criteria, the language on the review rubric was amended to better align with language inherent in closing of the loop. This language reflected more on “process” in the past and more on “results” beginning in AY2023 reviews.
3. As AY2023 was the 2nd year where the LAC reviewed reports in a consistent manner, there was potentially increased clarity of what reviewers were looking for based on work we performed in AY2023 as a committee.

Selection process for both ‘Closing of the Loop’ and ‘Advancing Assessment’ award winners was provided; more specifically, there were 3 programs meeting eligibility for the ‘Closing of the Loop’ award as they were reviewed at the highest level on the ‘closing of the loop’ criteria by both reviewers. The ‘Advancing Assessment’ award was selected by reviewing AY2022 review scores to that of AY2023, there were several programs who observed significant improvement but following review from the committee chair the selection of the winner was quite apparent and appropriate.

The committee chair shared that Academic Counsel was very appreciative of the work the LAC has done over the last several years and believes the work is leading to intentional advancement of student learning across programs at the University. Based on the review of the survey answers, Academic Counsel did suggest some minor clarification language be added to questions asking about “contribution/review” to the assessment process.

**Conclusion:**

Award winner suggestions were approved by Academic Counsel and will be announced at Winter Convocation.

**Action Items:**

-Make email provided to Academic Counsel available to LAC. *(Committee Chair; will be made available in dissemination of January minutes)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. Debrief from Reviews of Assessment of Student Learning reports: *what’s working, what’s not working, and suggestions for improvements*

**Discussion:**

The committee chair outlined his appreciation of the efforts of the LAC to conduct the reviews of assessment reports in full and on-time. These efforts truly allow the University to be better aware of the progress programs are making on their assessment of student learning processes. In addition, the feedback provided to programs on the reviews has the potential to drive both process improvement as well as future advancements in student learning. The winner of the ‘Advancing Assessment Award’ report outlined specifically changes they have made to their process because of feedback provided on the AY2022 report. One item that the committee chair discussed was the extent to which deviations in reviewer scores increased in AY2023 when compared to AY2022. In total, the average reviewer difference as a % of available points increased from ~15% in AY2022 to ~19% in AY2023. Many factors are influencing this result, but it was shared that the chair will be doing some additional work on interrater reliability, specifically at a review criteria level. Academic Counsel shared some research and work on interrater reliability has come out of the Leadership Studies faculty and should be explored to determine if it can be leveraged by the committee.

Other thoughts from the committee on the AY2023 review process were:

-It was useful when reviewing reports when programs specifically outlined previous year’s results in a clear way. Providing the previous year’s results in a table to observe trend data was helpful for reviewers.

\*Providing trend data in alignment with following up on previously identified action items could make identification of closing of the loop activities more apparent

-Some programs continue to struggle with the basics of writing measurable program learning outcomes (PLOs)

\*Should we be more intentional in reaching out to programs that continue to struggle with meeting the very basics of a quality assessment of student learning process

-It was questioned what “training” or “development” opportunities we provide to programs to advance the assessment of student learning processes and should we focus on developing those opportunities

\*Could we align these opportunities with the new strategic planning process the university is undertaking shortly

**Conclusion:**

Additional work to ensure more consistency in reviews will be necessary. The chair will provide some additional data on interrater reliability to the committee prior to the next LAC meeting.

**Action Items:**

Interrater reliability results *(% agreement; % adjacent)* need to be conducted at the review criteria level to determine if reviews are deviating more at certain criteria vs others. *(LAC Chair- prior to February meeting)*