**University Learning Assessment Committee Meeting #7 Minutes**

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

Date: 4.10.24

Time: 3:00 - 4:00 PM

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Andrew Cutright (Univ Assessment Dir), ChairMs. MaryAlice Wade (Library)Dr. Brad Will (General Ed & AHSS Assist Dean)Ms. Amie Wright (BE Assessment Coordinator)Dr. Karmen Porter (HBS Assessment Coordinator) | Ms. Shelly Gasper (Assessment Data Collection)Dr. Jeanne Sumrall (STM Assessment Coordinator)Dr. April Park (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Ms. Karen McCullough (Student Affairs) |

Absent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mr. Kyler Semrad (Student Gov’t Association)Dr. Masa Watanabe (STM Asmnt Coordinator)Dr. David Tarailo (Faculty Senate)Dr. Magdalene Moy (TILT) | Dr. Kenny Rigler (Ed Assist Dean)Dr. Jennifer Bechard (HBS Assessment Coordinator)Ms. Judy Brummer (COE Asmt/Accred Assist Pgm Dir) |

**Minutes**

**Agenda Item:**

1. Continued New Program Review discussions and aligning program assessment of student learning expectations. Where is the balancing point? Annual Progress Report example walk-through.

**Discussion:**

The committee continued the conversation on potentially amending the reporting process and cycle for program’s student learning assessment. The committee Chair outlined the potential of an annual reporting/review process requirement for programs in the new program review and how the Program Review Committee continues to determine what that process will look like and entail. The initial feeling the LAC Chair is getting is there is likely to be an annual ask of programs for the new program review process beyond just a report conducted every 4-year *(as has been the modus operandi as of lately)*.

As program assessment of student learning is a piece of overall program review, how can we help programs and the program review process best accomplish both objectives in these meaningful processes. As discussed in the March LAC, there remains hesitation to eliminate an annual reporting on student learning assessment. Based on this hesitation, the LAC Chair walked through an outline of what an every-other-year data submission process may look like if programs were asked to submit a full review/analysis/report *(i.e. the existing template)* only every-other-year. In short, the reporting requirements for a “data-collection” year could entail the submission of five major elements:

1. The prior academic year’s Program Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map
2. The prior academic year’s outline of what tools will be used, when *(the timing)*, and their established success thresholds of performance *(performance on the tool to be proficient & % of students successful on the tool to indicate achievement of the learning outcome)*
3. *Results (data)* from the prior academic year’s assessments they outlined would be conducted in items #1 & #2 disaggregated by modality *(On-Campus, Online, IP)*.
4. Any action items that are glaringly apparent. This is not an analysis of the results, instead, if assessments were not conducted, changes were made in curriculum that will impact the assessment of student learning process moving forward, or other items that are deemed important enough to require action now and not wait until the full review should be documented. These “changes” should be captured to provide context to the full review period and create an avenue to follow-up on the impact of these changes moving forward.
5. Next academic year’s assessment plan *(PLOs, curriculum map, assessments & schedule)*. This plan should be a repeat of item #1 & #2 above considering any changes captured in item #4.

The LAC Chair walked through the draft document of this process that was provided very shortly before the meeting. There was initial confusion about what the ask would entail and how did it really differ from a full cycle review. The committee walked through different cycle reporting options, but it became apparent an outlined calendar would be necessary to ensure everyone was on the same page. Some of the feedback on the data collection process was as follows *(with the LAC Chairs answers provided post the meeting and some additional thought)*:

-how is this different from a full cycle review *(The data submission process does not require the communal review of results and discussion of changes in the curriculum to improve student learning. Instead, it is an outline of the assessment of student learning process and the subsequent results of the previous year’s assessments conducted and what the assessment plan for the next academic year will be.)*

-the data collection is often the most time-consuming aspect of the current process, are we really saving any time *(This outlines where many programs find themselves, in that, they are just collecting data and finding it difficult to even accomplish that. By allowing an avenue to outline their process more formally, it could allow for additional clarity into how each person in the program plays a role in the program’s assessment of student learning process. If we can streamline the data collection process, we can then shift our focus to how to improve student learning based on the results.)*

-The person serving in the “coordinator” role in the assessment of student learning process often changes, how does this data-collection one-year, full review the next year process account for those potential fluctuations? *(Change is inevitable and as a result our ability to create transparency around processes to allow all involved in the process to understand what is happening is key. Formalizing an assessment plan that outlines the process should allow any individual the ability to pick-up the document and better understand what is happening and when/where activities are occurring to facilitate the process. Although outside of the LAC control, it would be recommended that programs align roles, responsibilities, and expectations for assessment of student learning with the processes and activities aligned with the program’s assessment plans and reporting.)*

-How will programs with outside specialized accreditation be affected by this model? The shift last year to allowing the outside accreditor review *(plus additional short form)* to serve as an annual report meeting the university’s annual reporting requirements was a step in the right direction, this proposed data-collection method appears to “walk-back” that more streamlined process. *(Programs with outside specialized accreditation often already have and conduct what the draft data-collection year report entails. Collecting this data annually allows for programs to remain on-track with existing outside accreditors annual supplemental reporting requirements as well as creating annual accountability to ensure data is collected for the next cycle’s review. At current, I am envisioning the data-collection report to be the annual submission programs with outside specialized accreditation would submit each year.)*

-Is this something we would be looking to implement starting in AY2025? *(No, just looking at the calendar we are likely past the point of making a change for AY2025. In addition, with AY 2027 being the year programs will need to complete their 4-year program review for KBOR, we will want to continue the Full year report for program’s student learning assessment through reporting year AY 2026. Why? If we shift to full reporting every other year, we could have a full review the year before the program review is conducted. This would allow the program to have a full review conducted, any feedback, an identification of any necessary actions identified prior to outlining those items in their program’s review report. Additionally, this would allow the program an opportunity to then discuss how in the latest year how any of those changes implemented are performing. This prior year review of assessment of student learning in the program would also allow for seamless handoff of review information coming from the LAC to the Program Review Committee.)*

**Conclusion:**

Continued discussion of the draft data-reporting report along with the reporting timeline will be necessary and will conclude our final LAC meeting in May.

**Action Items:**

-Create calendar of reporting expectations and what it might look like under a revised assessment reporting cycle *(Committee Chair)*

-Review Assessment of Student Learning Data Reporting Process draft document and provide any feedback to the LAC Chair *(LAC members)*

-Review Connecting Reporting Cycle Process *(Calendar)* draft document and provide any feedback to the LAC Chair *(LAC members)*

*End of Minutes*