Assessment Leadership Team Meeting

March 20, 2020

Attendance: Kelley Woods-Johnson, Edie Wittenmeyer, Ellen Malito, Greg Bierly, Joe Harder, Nathan Myers

Kelley convened the meeting at 9:01 AM.

Minutes were reviewed, G. Bierly made a motion to approve, J. Harder seconded. Minutes were approved.

Kelley began by reporting that the administration would completely flexible in regard to the conduct of assessment and program review this year. External reviews can be done virtually and reviewers will be paid. Some assessments/reviews may have to proceed with partial data. For example, Music is questioning how to assess/evaluate recitals. Student teachers have been taken out of the field. Everything will look different.

J. Harder said that the College of Business will do what they need to do. In his phased retirement, Harder will focus on assessment, particularly assessment of the MBA program.

Some programs will work with existing data and exit surveys. Theses and dissertations will not be physically presented, but through teleconference. There will be digital theses with poster slides.

Kelley noted she is on a listserv looking at issues regarding what should be a priority and how much flexibility should be in the system. There is a consensus that the focus needs to be on teaching and learning.

The Higher Learning Commission will be surveying students. The survey will go live on-line April 6 and run through April 15. There will possibly be a low response rate, given the current mood.

The conversation then turned to review of the revised policy library language. There was agreement that revisions reflected the conversation from the last meeting. It makes clear that the council is looking at assessment outside of academics. There was some question as to whether the new language could go to Faculty Exec, the entire Faculty Senate, or directly to the trustees. Regardless, there was agreement that it was in good shape to move up the line.

The Provost Award had been put on hold. As people need to self-nominate, putting it on people’s agenda seemed unfair.

Kelley gave the group 3 options:

1. Review SOAS, select one undergrad and one grad program
2. Postpone to fall
   1. There are questions about whether the budget would allow monetary awards. It could also compete with doing the new SOAS.
3. There is also an option to suspend.

Myers spoke in support of Option 1.

There was a thought that other awards could be negatively affected and we should move forward.

Joe also spoke in favor of Option 1. It could look at innovations in assessment and how assessment holds up.

There was a virtual vote. All members present voted yes.

Bailey reviewed the results of the Foundational Studies Assessment Day. For literary studies there were 90 samples and the assessors were generally pleased with the results. For Learning Outcome 2, most artifacts were at milestone 1 or 2. No artifacts could be assessed on Learning Outcome 4. There was a question of where students should fall in terms of the rubric, given that most literature classes are at the 200 level.

In regard to Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity, 90 artifacts were submitted and 55 were reviewed. Some artifacts did not fit the category. There was discussion of getting faculty support for selecting assignments that could be used as artifacts. Such artifacts are needed to gauge student achievement.

The main issues with the assessment activity were sampling and support. Based on the information collected they can still track over time and retool areas where improvement is needed. The rubric was adapted from AAC&U. There is a question of the degree to which faculty should be asked to make assignments conform to the rubric.

Myers suggested that there would be pushback against asking faculty to conform to a predetermined format given experience with other systems like the Faculty Activities Database.

Due to social distancing brought on my COVID-19, workshops have been cancelled. The question remains as to how to strike the right balance between reforming and conforming.

Bailey will share results with faculty via email.

Myers raised a question mentioned by a student about the university assessing its response to the pandemic. No one had any knowledge of anything underway. The university has many big issues to deal with moving forward. There are questions about how to collect information and when.

Learning Management System

In-person meetings have been cancelled. Virtual presentations are scheduled for the week of May 18. These will be synchronous and recorded. The potential vendors are Canvass, Blackboard, and D2L. The university wants to stay on track to transition by 2021. The other option is to wait until August for presentations and there is a desire to move forward. The provost will be sending an email. The virtual presentations should be a good test of the system. The workshops could conflict with FCTE activities.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 AM.