

University Assessment Committee (UAC) Annual Report
2019-2020
June 2, 2020

Committee Members

Nancy Stone (Chair) - Psychological Science	Committee Support – ex-officio
Dave Duvernell – Biological Sciences	Sarah Johnson – Provost Office
Cassie Elrod – Business & Information Technology	Daniel Forciniti – Provost Office
Dan Reardon – English & Technical Communication	Caprice Moore - Global Learning
Tyrone Davidson – Academic Advising	Irina Ivliyeva – Arts, Language, and Philosophy (CAFÉ Chair)
Rachel Morris - Academic Support	
Audrey Deterding – Arts, Language, and Philosophy	
Christi Luks – Chemical & Biochemical, Freshman Engineering	
Steve Raper – Engineering Management & Systems Engineering	
Barb Prewett – Student Affairs	
Eddie Grover-Bisker – Student Affairs	

Committee Purpose

- To initiate a university-wide, faculty-led process for assessment and continuous improvement of student learning outcomes
- To foster an ongoing institutional culture of continuous improvement
- To be a resource and support for university assessment and revision of student learning outcomes

Committee Goals

- Identify and review current program assessment tools and techniques for all academic programs and provide recommendations for improvements to deans, department chairs and program directors
- Develop a campus-wide assessment process, which incorporates policies, procedures and assessment tools
- Prompt departments to define, inventory and assess student learning at the department level. Develop shared language for assessment and oversee conduct of department activities related to assessment of learning experiences for undergraduate, graduate, and general education learning outcomes

The UAC met on the following dates:

9/15/2019	12/2/2019	3/30/2020
10/1/2019	1/27/2020	4/13/2020
10/14/2019	2/10/2020	4/27/2020
11/5/2019	2/24/2020	5/11/2020
11/18/2019	3/9/2020	

Goals for 2019-2020

- Receive campus input on revised SLOs
- Review GLOs
- Develop a common language for campus-wide assessment
- Develop a process for reviewing assessment plans
 - Need to work with other assessment people to create sessions for developing basic components of an assessment plan. Examples from comments at summer 2018 workshops – listed from highest to lower priority):
 - Creating and using rubrics
 - Creating an assessment plan
 - Using results to make improvements
 - Methodology
 - Writing learning objectives
 - Revising an assessment plan
 - Learning about learning mastery

The goals for 2019-2020 were met, as described below.

Activities of the UAC over the year:

- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
 - The UAC reviewed and revised the SLOs once more before distributing the SLOs to the campus for comment.
 - The six revised SLOs were distributed to the campus via Qualtrics for comments. Campus faculty and key staff associated with co-curricular activities were invited to provide feedback between October 8 and October 16, 2019.
 - We received comments from 39 individuals, which the committee deliberated about and used to make additional modifications to the SLOs. The SLOs were finalized on November 18, 2019 (Appendix A).
- Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs)
 - The members of the UAC collected information on how other universities across the nation articulated their learning outcomes for various levels of graduate education (e.g., master's non-thesis, doctoral).
 - Need clear articulation between GLOs and SLO.
 - Need clear articulation between levels of GLOs (certificates, non-thesis master's, thesis master's, doctoral)
 - The review of other universities' information had too many categories.
 - Identified six (6) graduate outcomes.
 - Decided to determine the outcomes for doctoral education first and then to work down to certificate outcomes, which should be just above the SLOs.
 - The UAC worked from December 2019 to May 2020 to refine the six outcomes and how they were defined for the different educational levels.

- The labels for the six outcomes are agreed upon by the UAC at this point: Knowledge, Communication, Integrity/Ethics, Leadership, Research, and Critical Thinking
- Only one GLO (Communication) was clearly defined for each level of education. Will need to define the other outcomes for each level of education.
- Processes and Procedures Document
 - Developed a draft processes and procedures document.
 - Received input from the new Sr. Director of Institutional Research and Data Management.(IR&DM)
 - Approved “Assessment Processes and Procedures” document on May 12, 2020 (Appendix B).
 - Need to distribute to campus community.
- Development of a common language for campus-wide assessment
 - With the approval of the SLOs and revision process of the GLOs, a common language for campus-wide assessment is emerging.
- Dr. Joseph Smith is replacing Dr. Christi Luks on the UAC.

Activities and Goals for 2020-2021

- Receive campus input on revised GLOs and finalize
 - Complete discussion on definitions of the GLOs at the different levels of education.
 - Request campus input on revised GLOs.
- Assist departments with implementation of new SLOs
- Begin review of departmental assessment plans
- Develop working relationship with Senior Director of IR&DM

Appendix A:
S&T SLOs
November 18, 2019

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) drafted new undergraduate SLOs during the 2018-2019 academic year. At the beginning of the 2019-2020 academic year, the UAC reviewed and revised the draft SLOs. These proposed SLOs were distributed to all faculty and key staff involved in co-curricular activities. Comments from 39 individuals led to in-depth deliberations and revisions of each SLO during two UAC meetings. The finalized list of SLOs is:

Career Readiness

Students will apply their academic knowledge to achieve personal and professional goals.

Critical Thinking

Students will apply creative approaches to explore and evaluate complex challenges.

Communication

Students will use effective and targeted communication strategies.

Teamwork and Collaboration

Students will organize partnerships and demonstrate effective teamwork.

Global and Inclusive Fluency

Students will demonstrate value and respect for individual and cultural perspectives and experiences.

Professional and Ethical Conduct

Students will demonstrate the highest standards of professional behavior, integrity, and ethical conduct.

Appendix B: Assessment Processes and Procedures

The purpose of the **University Assessment Committee (UAC)** is to

- Initiate a university-wide, faculty led process for assessment and continuous improvement of student learning outcomes
- Foster an ongoing institutional culture of continuous improvement
- Be a resource and support for university assessment and revision of student learning outcomes

The purpose of this document is to provide campus-wide assessment processes that cover policies, procedures, and assessment tools.

Review of Assessment Plans

- 1) Due to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation processes, all departments should have current assessment plans. If not, the UAC should request a new plan from any department that does not have an assessment plan.
 - a) New or revised plans
 - i) New plans could be due to new programs, departments, or plans developed for units other than academic departments.
 - ii) Revised plans could be due to changes within the department or campus-wide expectations related to assessment (e.g., changes in undergraduate SLOs or GLOs).
 - b) All departmental plans needs to be reviewed to ensure
 - i) Appropriate mapping of course learning outcomes to departmental learning outcomes.
 - ii) Appropriate mapping of departmental learning outcomes to campus learning outcomes (SLOs and GLOs).
 - iii) Reasonable assessment tools selected to collect assessment data (based on departmental justification) and appropriately linked to specific activities (e.g., thesis defense) or courses.
 - iv) Appropriate specification of when and how frequently the measurement occurs for each assessment tool.
 - v) Reasonable plan for the review and use of assessment data (based on departmental justification). This includes the specification of the specification of meeting the learning outcomes (e.g., on a 1-5 scale, must have 70% at the score of 4 or higher, or must be at the “good” level or higher).
 - c) The UAC will provide feedback to enhance assessment plans, such as, but not limited to
 - i) Potential assessment tools.
 - ii) Plan for use of assessment data

Review of Assessment Reports

- 1) Assessment reports should be submitted to the Institutional Research and Data Management (IR & DM) Senior Director.
 - a) The IR & DM Senior Director will be responsible for maintaining assessment documents.
 - b) The IR & DM Senior Director will aggregate the data from each departmental report for analysis at the campus level.

- c) In order to aggregate these data, the UAC will work with the IR & DM Senior Director and departments to ensure the proper data are submitted for analysis. That is, reports can include summarized data; however, aggregation of data will require the raw data to avoid averaging averages.
- 2) The standard reporting cycle will include a two-year report followed by a one-year follow up report documenting the impact of the proposed changes in the two-year report. As appropriate, an additional report on assessment changes requiring a two-year period to identify impact would be required as a second-year follow up report. For example:
 - a) Year 1: Two-year report
 - b) Year 2: One-year follow up report
 - c) Year 3: (Only as needed) Follow up report only on parts of assessment plan requiring an additional year of data to determine impact of changes
 - d) Year 4: Two-year report
 - e) Year 5: One-year follow up report
 - f) Year 6: (Only as needed) Follow up report only on parts of assessment plan requiring an additional year of data to determine impact of changes
 - g) Year 7: Two-year report
 - h) Etc.
- 3) Department reporting cycles will be staggered with six or seven departments reporting each year.
- 4) Report descriptions:
 - a) The two-year report should include the assessment plan, the results, and proposed changes to address areas needing improvement.
 - b) The year following will include a report on the impact of the changes proposed in the two-year report.
 - c) If needed, the additional follow up report will provide the data on the impact of the changes proposed in the two-year report.
- 5) The UAC will review the two-year and one-year follow up departmental assessment reports to ensure:
 - a) Use of assessment data for making (or not making) program changes (based on departmental justification).
 - b) Appropriate data are available for proper assessment.

Assistance with Assessment

- 1) The UAC will provide assessment assistance as needed, including:
 - a) Requested reviews of assessment plans.
 - b) Assistance with mapping (e.g., courses to departmental outcomes, departmental outcomes to campus outcomes).
 - c) Informational sessions (e.g., open forum, meeting with departments).

These Assessment Processes and Procedures will be updated as the assessment process at S&T matures.