

**University Assessment Committee**  
**Tuesday, October 18, 2016**  
**3:00-4:30 pm**  
**Halle – Faculty Development Center, 109B**  
**NOTES**

**In Attendance**

Bin Ning (IRIM), Anne Balazs (Graduate School), Susann DeVries (University Library), Chris Karshin (CHHS), Peggy Liggitt (Faculty Development Center), Dorothy McAllen (COT), Kate Mehuron (CAS), Natalie Taliaferro (COB), Doug Baker (CAS)

**Discussed “Building our showcase”:** How do we showcase and link to HLC expectations? And how can we better link assessment of student learning to retention and completion rates?

***Showcase Items***

- Bin: (1) publications website (i.e., assessment website at university and college levels); build one-page “elevator” talk and other useful handouts; flow charts; (2) college-based workshop forums; (3) 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. We need to prepare stories that address the different aspects of assessment of student learning, especially how assessment efforts are helping to close the loop, etc. The UAC is the core, but site visitors may want to talk with others across campus. Main message and talking points.
- If you college/unit has an assessment page link it to the University Assessment page.
- Peggy: example from Barbara Woolvard – have a flow chart and how things happen, etc. Doug: COB also has a visual that we could use.
- Doug: will begin to build the “publications” part for Criterion 4 evidence.
- Workshop on representing types of assessments (i.e., indirect vs. direct) – SASS is organizing an assessment showcase in November.

***Retention/Completion Rates and Assessment Links***

- Discussed how completion and retention rates link with assessment of student learning, among other considerations? Bin: At the university level, we are paying close attention to retention and completion rates, especially since both are linked to funding and reputation. However, in support of Criteria 3 & 4, may help for people to prepare stories that show how quality of programs and assessment are linked to retention/completion rates. Anne provided examples of how Graduate School is working on that links these: multiple initiatives on “on-time” completion and ways to motivate students who have exceeded statue of limitations, reaching out to students, etc.
- Anne will send Doug a paragraph or two about Graduate School efforts on retention and completion, and he will send it along to Criterion 4 team working on this.
- Bin: In general, retention and completion are still university efforts; from the data perspective, Bin is comfortable. However, how we use the data raises other questions.

### **Criterion 3 – ePortal (Peggy) – see handout**

Description of link to the portal; and Peggy will answer any questions people have about the ePortal link that Bin sent out to all administrators in Academic and Student Affairs. Peggy raised items on the handout as a way to initiate a conversation about soliciting and retrieving evidence for the ePortal for Criterion 3, which is focused on processes. The handout includes questions that will need answers and evidence, which could be uploaded by units across campus. Peggy discussed each item and asked for suggestions for additions.

- *So, Peggy will amend the handout and ask colleges to upload appropriate documents to the ePortal (Peggy briefly described how the information can be uploaded, so contact Peggy if you have questions).*
- Criterion 4 team, which focuses on outcomes, will be working on assessment organization and numbers of faculty, etc., and team 3 will have access to the document.
- For now, there is NO specific deadline, but each unit will create internal deadline. The information is critical as evidence that will support the narrative that will accompany Criterion 3.

### **Organizational Chart of Assessment of Student Learning**

If you have not already done so, please send Doug a list of the members of your assessment committee. Criterion 4 will also want examples from each college that exemplify the assessment of student learning process, including how programs closed the loop.

### **Updates, Questions, and Suggestions**

- IRIM – Bin: Mock visit (November 10) confirmed (see handout for schedule). The two reviewers will prepare well for the visit. For the day, Bin said that we “will capture about 60% [of the events and items] of a regular visit.”
- CAS – Kate: work ongoing
- CHHS – Chris: Assessment group met to discuss new approach to soliciting and reviewing assessment plans/reports. So, they will focus on the process (November 18, first three components due; all components due by end of March, which will provide time to give feedback. Will also create workshops before due dates to prepare programs before due dates.
- COB – Natalie: work ongoing. COB dean is leaving in January.
- COE – Beth: work ongoing
- COT – Dorothy: assessment com meeting next week; making changes on directors.
- FDC – Peggy: working with Gen Ed and eLearning coordinating training for second round of QR; hoping to use that model for other areas of Gen Ed. So, if you are considering an assessment project in your college, consider looking at this model.
- Gen Ed – Doug: Will submit a proposal to support the training Peggy mentioned. Also working with Gen Ed Subcommittee on Assessment to work with Gen Ed categories and faculty to revise SLOs as needed—there is a process, which Michael Tew has made visible.
- Grad – Anne: working with retention and completion; continuous enrollment also being explored—research that would help possible changes here.
- Library – Susann: Libqual, similar to NSSE, survey going to be used by March
- SASS – Ellen: work ongoing

**Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 2016, 3:00 – 4:30 pm, Halle-FDC 109B**