

University Assessment Committee
Tuesday, November 14, 2017
3:00-4:30 pm
Halle – Faculty Development Center, 109B
NOTES

In Attendance

Beth Kubitskey (COE), Peggy Liggit (FDC), Michael Tew (Assoc Provost), Wade Tornquist (Grad School), Doug Baker (CAS)

Updates and Thoughts about Next Steps

COE: Beth described the *very successful* visit by COE's accrediting body (CAEP). In a post visit meeting, the reviewers highlighted partnerships, candidates' use of technology and assessment, etc.

- Christine Lancaster has continued to work on advising and has discovered critical information about retention and completion.

CAS: Doug described areas the CASAC is considering and working on (e.g., how archived materials could be used; links between retention and assessment).

FDC: Peggy described how FDC is partnering with G2C, particularly will send a survey about support necessary for instruction. This will be part of a Connect, the annual conference. Faculty will be invited to participate and have a venue to take a lead on presentations.

General Education: Doug described the successful, working conference hosted by the Program and John Koolage on November 1. There were effective presentations on (and models of) assessment; the plenary talk provided a reflection on the Program (Marty Shichtman), the current status (Michael), and the future (John). Two new co-chairs: You Li (CMTA) and Laura McMahon (HIST/PHIL).

Graduate School: Wade raised questions and suggestions about needs for graduate school. How can we create processes to ensure people in leadership roles have the information that derives from decentralized approaches? Also, interested in specialized accreditation, graduate programs, and program review. Also, need programs to develop handbooks.

HLC Visit: Michael said that in two weeks or so EMU will receive the HLC initial report, mainly available for factual corrections. He anticipates that we will receive the review at the beginning of next term. One area EMU needs to improve on: how to distribute and communicate information.

Some thoughts from conversation

- All reflected on the value of the process, particularly of the process of the self-study.
- Examples discussed especially showed how assessment practices have changed the way courses are taught, how instructors approach teaching and students, etc.
- Assessment is a slow process toward change, especially since decisions should be data driven.
- No need to be afraid of data; we interpret data in order to make decisions.
- Assessment provides measures to help us understand student success (e.g., retention is one measure). Gateways to Completion right now examining entry level STEM courses; can we show measures of retention, which informs resource allocation.
- The old adage: "Assessment and program review are things I have to do"; new: "Assessment and program review provide process to measure student and program success."

- Assumptions faculty come to EMU with and how EMU can influence change. Need to orient faculty to who our students are. And are best practices to help struggling students similar to ones that help all students learn?

Considerations

- How can we take what we've learned from assessments, from work on G2C, information about first-generation students, etc. and create teaching models and practices leading to success? How do we use the range of data to improve programs, opportunities provided to students, etc.?
- What if instructors get a course list and aggregated data about students?
- How could we use predictive data analytics to anticipate, prepare instruction, etc.?

Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 12 at 3:00 in FDC 109b