

University Assessment Committee
Tuesday, September 19, 2017
3:00-4:30 pm
Halle – Faculty Development Center, 109B
NOTES

In Attendance

Bin Ning (IRIM), Chris Karshin (CHHS), Peggy Liggitt (FDC), Rhonda Fowler (Library), Dorothy McAllen (COT), Zafar Khan (COB), Doris Fields (Provost Office), Beth Kubitskey (COE), Wade Tornquist (Grad), Ellen Gold (SASS), Michael Tew (Assoc Provost), Doug Baker (CAS & GESA)

Overview and Purpose of Committee

- Coordinate assessment, including across boundaries
- Build capacity and share information
- Accreditation

Higher Learning Commission (Bin & Michael)

Note: Assessment is the number one cited area of concern of reviewers at HLC site visits (over 30%). EMU has worked hard for the past few years to prepare.

- EMU is in final stage of submitting assurance argument and it will be posted to HLC on Wednesday, Sept. 20
- The document is 100 pages (in word), includes over 300 evidence files, and are cohesive and supportive of our claims
- Federal Compliance package (40 pages with many documents) will also be locked in on Wednesday.
- A Quality Initiative Report (on advising) has been submitted as part of the process also (in late August).
- Although we have financial challenges, we are doing “good things for the students” and making progress. We are well prepared for the HLC visit. We started early and had support from across campus.
- Casey in the President’s office is working to set meetings with team chairs.
- We will prepare to answer basic questions on assessment.
- Once a week the Provost will send out information on the five HLC criteria each week. The whole assurance argument will be available online—Bin will let us know how to access it. If there is one criterion to read completely, read Criterion 1 on mission.

One-page Message/Talking Points

We need to engage in internal advocacy, so share information about the HLC and assessment of student learning. See “Assessment at a Glance at EMU” and “2017 HLC Accreditation at a Glance”

(<http://www.emich.edu/assessment/>). Note: We need to ensure that both links open easily; right now, the second one is not easily opened.

- So, consider reading all of Criterion 1 (Mission); read the information that the Provost sends on each criterion; and the message/talking points at the above link. HOWEVER, we do not want to script our response.

Response to Annual Reports

- From the reviews we see continued need to *show* how we are closing the loop at all relevant levels of scale
- UAC should consider preparing a presentation to the Board and upper administration so they know how the assessment efforts work

Comments

- Ellen described the distinction between reports from SASS and the colleges; in particular, each of the 24 programs has worked hard to assess and report on it. They benchmark with other universities; they examine barriers of student learning, etc.
- Beth raised questions about how enrollment and other issues inform assessment, so we need to consider how to recognize relevant data, etc. We can learn more from each other. Having faculty involvement is key.
- Wade described how assessment is linked with programmatic changes, which have impact in student learning.
- Michael talked about a “middle ground” of assessment of student learning and program review.

Updates, Questions, and Suggestions

- **IRIM & Assessment Website (Bin):** Website is up to date—all reports have been uploaded. Bin’s office is the official reporting agency for the university. It officially captures data to report (for internal and external purposes). The office knows how to contextualize data for individual needs.
- **CAS (Doug):** Transition, mainly because Doug is in Dean’s office now. Two new committee members.
- **CHHS (Chris):** Assessment Council will meet next week. Accredited programs are in process. Clinical Research will be one of the first to be accredited in the new protocol in its area.
- **Comment:** Wade requested that information about some of the programs to help with Graduate School’s understanding of the programs. Mainly, UAC will continue to talk about what assessment information is worthy of providing and what should stay internal. Further conversations needed. (See below, Peggy’s note on archiving.)
- **COB (Zafar):** Midyear accreditation report, coordinated by Toni Stokes-Jones, was turned in and the response is positive so far.
- **COE (Beth):** March 17 CAEP (accrediting body) report submitted; June, CAEP provided response; August COE responded and have strived to complete final submissions. Preparing for visit this November from CAEP. The college has made changes to programs based on the self-study and accreditation process.
- **COT (Dorothy/Mary):** Last year was successful and was able to upload all documents online. Training sessions helped the process. College meeting last week, so there are new members on the committee. Curriculum mapping has been used across the college now. Consistency among documents.
- **FDC (Peggy):** Working to respond to unit needs (e.g., Gen Ed assessment last year). New focus: having faculty take on role as assessment leader. Previously, through training programs coordinated by college and FDC (e.g., Gen Ed-Quantitative Reasoning) to develop leaders. She described the process and encourages us to suggest similar or other initiatives. E-Learning also often plays a role, as do other partners (e.g., IRIM).
- **Gen Ed (Doug):** Described growth over the past few years, especially noted large-scale assessments (e.g., in CTAC 124; WRTG 121; WI courses; and Quantitative Reasoning).
- **Grad School (Wade):** Striving with programs and colleges to build systems to support students and to plan graduate studies. They have been looking at requests, admissions data, common themes from accrediting bodies, etc. Also, looking contributing factors (e.g., enrollment trends).
- **Library (Rhonda):** Noted that the reviews of the annual report are being considered. Library also considering how to survey similar students over time.
- **SASS (Ellen):** Conducted a summer instituted and assessed session effectiveness, etc. She described example sessions and how the focus of each is linked to assessment efforts (e.g., Key Performance

Indicators, or KPI). Also, showcased closing the loop and general assessment processes—mainly to help people see what constitutes closing the loop.

Archiving Assessment Data with University Library

At the April meeting, Peggy discussed the need for archiving with the library. We need an archive process. We will need to better understand what is available and what is not. So, as we consider what might be archived, Graduate School, among others, can find needed information.

Gen Ed Conference in Fall, November 1, 8:30-4:00 in Student Center

Connection between SASS and LBC: At the April meeting, Ellen suggested that we add a piece for LBC, especially in terms of assessment.

“Building our showcase” – Winter 2017

- Build publications website (i.e., assessment website at university and college levels)
- Publicize college-based workshop forums
- Identify a group of in-house “experts” who can tell stories about assessments from university to unit level, especially to interact with university visitors and to highlight the parts and what has happened in the past seven or so years.
- Link college/unit assessment pages to the University Assessment page

Members of UAC

Bin Ning	IRIM
Michael Tew	Ex-Officio, Associate Provost
Doris Fields	Director of Undergraduate Education
Doug Baker (Co-Chair)	College of Arts and Sciences & General Education
Zafar Khan	College of Business
Beth Kubitskey	College of Education
Chris Karshin (Co-Chair)	College of Health and Human Services
Mary Brake	College of Technology
Dorothy McAllen (dmcallen)	College of Technology
Peggy Liggitt	Faculty Development Center, Training and Support
Wade Tornquist	Graduate School
Ellen Gold	Student Affairs and Student Services
Rhonda Fowler	University Library