**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**

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

Date: 3.13.24

Time: 3:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Univ Assessment Dir), Chair  Ms. MaryAlice Wade (Library)  Dr. Magdalene Moy (TILT)  Dr. David Tarailo (Faculty Senate) | Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)  Ms. Judy Brummer (COE Asmt/Accred Assist Pgm Dir)  Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator) |

Absent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs)  Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)  Mr. Kyler Semrad (Student Gov’t Association)  Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator) | Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean)  Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)  Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)  Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator) |

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Program Assessment of Student Learning Reviews Analysis: Tool *(rubric)* Scale Reliability statistic *(Cronbach’s Alpha)*; Inter-rater Reliability statistics *(% Agreement/% Adjacent)*. Next step recommendations.

**Discussion:**

The committee walked through a brief compilation of reliability metrics on the reviews conducted on the AY2023 program assessment reports. Cronbach’s alpha was run on the reviews to determine if the instrument itself *(review rubric)* is reliable. The results just shy of .9 *(.896)*, indicate there was a great deal of covariance among the elements of the rubric relative to the overall variance. Results indicate ‘Good’ internal consistency. Further, it was determined Cronbach’s alpha is not improved if certain elements of the rubric are removed, indicating each element belongs.

Next, inter-rater reliability measures of ‘% agreement’ and ‘% adjacent’ were reviewed. Overall, and by element, analysis of % agreement yielded no measures meeting the >70% threshold indicating we as a committee may need to focus on improving the consistency in our reviews. When looking at % adjacent, overall, we were at 83% of reviews had adjacent scores between reviewer 1 and reviewer 2, indicating below >90% threshold results. By element analysis of % adjacent scores indicated 2 areas *(Targets and Benchmarks; Results Data)* met the >90% threshold, with all other elements falling below the threshold. These results further the need for improving the consistency in our reviews.

Finally, how to improve was shared based on research conducted on a norming process established by Maki (2004). It entails:

*(1) raters independently score a set of student samples;*

*(2) raters are brought together to review responses and discuss patterns of consistent and inconsistent responses;*

*(3) raters deliberate and resolve inconsistent responses;*

*(4) raters repeat the process of independent scoring for a new set of student work; and*

*(5) again, raters are brought together to discuss consistent and inconsistent patterns in their responses, and raters deliberate and resolve responses.*

The committee discussed the results and the recommendations and offered a couple additional recommendations:

1. Conduct the norming process prior to the reviews being conducted *(i.e. in the Fall before we conduct reviews)*
2. Conduct a walk-through together *(as a committee)* prior to the independent scoring of a sample report. This should increase expectations of “what we are looking for” in each element of the review rubric and allow new committee members an onboarding opportunity.
3. Select intentional artifacts *(assessment reports)* where previous reviewers showed wide disparity in their reviews.

**Conclusion:**

Rather than perform a ‘postmortem’ inter-rater exercise in the Spring term we will do a pre-review norming process *(mimicking the recommendations above)* at the beginning of the Fall term.

**Action Items:**

-Make selections of reports that will be reviewed by the committee to carry out the norming process in the Fall 2024 term. *(Committee Chair)*

**Agenda Item:**

1. New Program Review process discussions and aligning program assessment of student learning expectations. Where is the balancing point?

**Discussion:**

As program review is updated to align with the new expectations of KBOR there is an opportunity to potentially align the assessment of student learning portion of that process with the current process for program assessment of student learning being facilitated by the LAC. The question to determine is if the existing LAC annual program assessment process should be modified to allow for both additional space *(time)* and reporting alignment *(every 4 year review)* between the current distinct processes. An idea floated by the Chair was: should we modify the annual reporting expectation for program assessment of student learning to a ‘data collection’ expectation with full review/reporting taking place in alignment with program review *(every 4 years)*? The pros and cons of this idea were discussed:

**Pros:**

-Would lighten the load for programs annually *(reduce analysis/review of student learning results)*

-Would place assessment of student learning in the place where it belongs: as a piece of the program’s overall review *(i.e. program review)*

-Increased data for student learning review; 1-4 years of data vs 1 year of data for reviewing assessment of student learning results

**Cons:**

-Could place the university/programs in a precarious situation in year 4 *(program review year)* if they decide not to collect data annually

-We have momentum *(participation)* with >85% of programs participating in the annual submission of program assessment reports, would this stifle that progress

-Elongating assessment cycle: plan, do, study, act; with particular reduction in acting on results to drive *(and document)* improvement, i.e. closing-the-loop. Which was a highlighted concern area from HLC review team.

-Could make it more difficult for programs to track what they “changed” or modified in previous years if there was great time between reviews

Other thoughts from the committee were:

-Instead of a review of assessment of student learning taking place annually or in alignment with program review (every 4 years) could we do a mid-cycle review (every 2 years) as a compromise

-TILT is creating a program refresh process, could we align a mid-cycle review with that process

-We need to be more explicit in data reporting expectations if we go that route *(reporting results by modality should be explicit)*

-To what extent would the LAC role change if there were not annual reviews

-In addition to annual data collection, could there be a place to track changes made

**Conclusion:**

Additional discussions with the Program Review Committee & LAC will be necessary to derive the approach that works best for the institution and it’s programs.

**Action Items:**

None at this time.