

University Assessment Committee Minutes October 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted by Joan Aitken, Secretary

Mike Droge spoke at the beginning of the meeting.

The charge of the committee is to review and approve course imbedded, program level and institutional level assessment. We're in the cycle of reviewing again what was previously created. Mike will stay in touch with Deborah and Brian. New members should know the Higher Learning Commission has complemented assessment work. They expect a continuation of good work. Assessment is never done.

We should rethink how we're doing Trimodal so we can address course and program level assessment. Sometimes don't get documents from all three modes. Program level assessment is important. Look at how students are picking up program level outcomes via various courses. Focus on the capstone courses where hitting competency statements and compare online and face-to-face to see that students are learning the competencies when they are ready to finish out.

Carol said there are problems that some programs don't have capstones. Mike said it didn't have to be capstone. Could be work products in a portfolio. None of this is simple. This presumes we have program assessment for all programs, but some programs are still working that out. The UAC needs to be the coaches, champions, and cheerleaders. We need to focus on areas of enrollment, multiple formats, and program-course relationships.

Mike said that we need a plan, then a communication plan. Mike said he'd be glad to go to certain areas. This committee is a University Committee. It does have teeth in the approval process, but if some program areas aren't complying, Mike and the Dean can help see what the problem is. The message needs to be a good plan so we aren't wasting time. Then the process should be a compliance approach with reminders.

We didn't want assessment to be a Got Cha approach with the faculty. When we send information to the Dean, can have the Dean take it to the Dept. Chair regarding problems.

Don't want to tell faculty what to do instructionally.

Focus on large enrollment areas and program level would be useful.

Committee Discussion on Trimodal

Trimodal is not doing well. Some people are not participating well: No one showed up to score, some people didn't send materials in, send the wrong stuff, mix up materials, and other problems. The n is so small in some modes, there is no meaningful data. For the amount of money we're pumping in, we're not getting good data out. School for business, psychology, and sociology account for a large portion of students, graduates, and online presence. The President would like to expand the online presence. Assessment isn't showing how people are functioning online. The ultimate goal has always been program assessment. When you think about it, that makes sense. Figure out deficit competencies, then can go back to the courses. Assessment needs to be both. Trimodal has procedural

problems. It's never worked the way it was supposed to work. John says what we're doing right now is not working because there's only about 50% response.

Brian said if we can't do that, we need to change our focus and rethink assessment.

Pete suggested that adjuncts could be required to turn in grades and assessment materials before pay.

Some adjuncts aren't complying, so the question was raised about why they are still teaching. If getting the materials is too hard to do as a university, we need to think of new and creative approaches. Should the Program Coordinators contact the faculty about what faculty are not cooperating? Or the Department Chairs?

There's no way to enforce anything with individual faculty, if a faculty member receives low scores on student data. We can't find out who the faculty are or why it's happening. The UAC doesn't get that information, it's in aggregate form. We need to know more details so we could share with the Department Chair.

We could put a course shell for every course with content, which may help. Could be minimal, but contain core assessment and require students to submit core assessment in the dropbox. May not work with artwork or exam, but should work in most cases. 85% of classes use papers. In some places they can do final exam on a computer. Could have the proctors FAX the materials (the majority scan and send it already).

Previous Minutes Approved

EC315 Quantitative Research Methods Rubric and Exam

Pete discussed changes in test, rubric, and core learning outcomes for source syllabi in process. Pete received approval to submit with discussed changes so could be implemented in spring.

Modern Language Courses 101, 102, 103, 104

Approved as submitted.

New Procedure for the Committee

Brian said an adjunct wanted a minor change to a psychology class. The faculty member went directly to Deborah instead of Department. Then the faculty member contacted Sue directly. We don't have administrative appointed liaisons any more. Previously, the liaisons took responsibility, but going only to Deborah doesn't work. The UAC will decide who will be liaisons. Brian said we'll develop a form so we know who has approved what. Right now, it's hard to know who is doing what. We need a form like the Curriculum Committee that says who looked at it and date it. The Chair can give it to the liaison, but it needs to come through the Chair.

Computer System

All of this might be moot depending on what we can do with the computer system. Wen's system will be similar to the IRB's system. Upload documents, rubric, and core assessment. Then can enter permissions online (UAC members). Somewhere in the system it needs to say it's approved by the department. System could set it up so only a PC or Chair can submit (easiest way to do now). Can set it up so if a faculty member sets it up, it automatically notifies the Chair and PC get emails. The Developer may submit, for example. That way if any random faculty did it, their Chair and PC would get an email. Liaison can approve or put before the full UAC. We could set it up so Sue can't put it up without it going through the system.

The Graduate Program as a whole is not in the system. Nothing goes through the UAC. Graduate School doesn't have department chairs or program coordinators. To include the Graduate School in this system, we would need to build in the Graduate Directors in this system. The Graduate School doesn't really have any power, but are there to support the graduate programs. The decision will be on a school by school basis. Hauptmann School doesn't have undergraduate programs other than portfolio, so they don't have systems in place. We're having enough trouble with implementation with undergraduate programs, so there may be challenges for the Graduate Program.

Somehow Criminal Justice materials were never approved in the system, for example. We need to do the review process, go at it systematically, and send back any we think need work.

UAC Approval System

The system will set up filters to flag problems. The earliest is end of this Fall 2. Probably can start in January. The system small changes from the IRB system. We'll be able to see everything in one table.

The UAC is supposed to approve course materials before the Curriculum Committee, but that's not happening. Pete suggested the Curriculum Committee review at the same time as UAC. We need a system so we don't slow the process down. Department and Chairs Council has to approve too, so it's a problem adding us as another layer that might tie things up. Suggestion was made that we need to be fluid, but less fluid than in the past. We need some teeth—perhaps Droge will help--so we bounce courses that don't come to us. When it comes out of Department/College/Chairs Council, we want the course materials to come from the Dean to Curriculum Committee and UAC. The Dean can assign the Department chair to do it.

The Program Coordinator or Department Chair could fill out a form in the system, then that would become part of the path and show a history of the pathway similar to the Curriculum Committee.

1. Department decides according to their approval process. CA, CLO, CAR.
2. Login to PirateNet (Chair, PC) submits to UAC Approval System. The action that sends the proposal forward it the Chair.
3. The system sends automatically to Dean. They will use whatever procedure they've decided. Will send form/document to Dean for College approval. Optional for the Dean.

If she or he ignores, the Chair takes over. Chair comes back and says the Dean approves or can ignore. The Chair is in control of the form.

4. Department Chair says approved and it goes to two people on UAC, one in area and one random draw.
5. UAC member can approve, disapprove, or send to full committee.
 - a. If both disapproved, goes back to department chair with reasons and suggestions.
 - b. If one-one vote goes to UAC Chairs, give suggestions back for changes. Or can go to UAC Chairs or full committee to decide.
 - c. If both disapprove, goes back to Department Chair. Brian thinks it should go to the full committee at that point.
 - c. If approved, it goes to the Department Chair. The chair hits the button to send it on to Sue. If sent to UAC, email goes out a fixed number—two--of people. If two UAC members can't agree, it goes to the monthly meeting.

Larry suggested we ask Dr. Droge if the Graduate Program should participate in this system. It will be a school by school decision.

Revised Proposal, there should be an ID, so then automatically goes to #4. Needs a check box for new or revised proposal. The chair will still put it in there, then depending on the school's procedure, the chair will send through system or send to Sue.

Fall 2 System

We need to do something for Fall 2 because of the extensive courses.
We assign designated members to approve or not. Deborah will refer out.

Curriculum Committee

We might suggest the Curriculum Committee use the same system so the committee work is in the system together.

Between Now and Next Meeting

Think about course-embedded assessment. Trimodal system is not working, but they don't want to scrap it or fix it. We talked about problems with the trimodal and what strategies we might use. We are confused about what the problem is and what to do next. The Chairs will seek more information. If the core assessment didn't have to be proctored, then it would be much easier, but then it's an academic decision. The final exam has to be proctored if that's the core assessment.

Courses

We planned an email vote on the EC315 items. The email vote was on the EC 141 items instead, and the EC315 items are on this month's agenda.

The art department submitted a revised core assessment and car for AR215 and AR216.

We tabled the Modern Language materials.

Higher Learning Commission

The committee met with a member of the Higher Learning Commission on November 12, 2008.

Attendance

Welcome Becky Stuteville, a new member.

In attendance were Larry, Kevin, Becky, John, Evelyn, Brian, Deb, Amy, Carol, Betty, Pete, Wen, Joan.

Larry Ewing (visitor)

John Tew (visitor)

Mike Droge (visitor)

Membership

Aitken, Joan

Bennet, Betty

Cowley, Brian

Hight, Ed

Hsin, Wen

Knowles, Evelyn

Mason, Theresa

O'Rourke, Vince

Sanders, Carol

Sheffer, Deborah

Soule, Pete

Stuteville, Becky

Wolf, Amy

Next Meeting

UAC Meeting 11/19/2008 11:00 AM 01:00 PM Mabee CDL CR