

University Assessment Steering Committee (UASC)

<http://www.wmich.edu/assessment/uasc.html>

Summary Notes #98

Monday, September 16, 2013

2:00-3:30 p.m.

Room 3150, Schneider Hall

Learner –Centered, Discovery- Driven, Globally engaged

Attending: Cari Robertson (SHC), Thomas Kent (CAS for Scott Slawinski), Dave Reinhold (ASUGS), Karen Stokes Chapo (AIA), Marilyn Kritzman (AAUP), Betty Dennis (EUP), Ewa Urban (CASES), Renee Schwartz (CAS), Andrew Kline (CEAS), Julie Evans-Little (CFA), Sue Brodasky (OIT), Jason Glatz (UL), Anthony Helms (LHC), Laura Ciccantell (ADV), and Chris Stamper (HCoB),

Absent: James Cousins (CAS), Anne Lundquist (DSA), Dae Kim (CHHS), Marcia Fetters (CoEHD), Lori Brown (CoA), Robert Dlouhy (IEC), and Kelly Ackerson (USC)

1. **Chair remarks:**

- a. Welcome to all and especially to new members. There will be a new member orientation held prior to the October meeting in room 3150 Schneider Hall from 1:30 to 2 p.m. All are welcome to attend. Stokes Chapo will send out upcoming meeting schedule to the group again.

2. **Acceptance of agenda:** Motion to accept the agenda was accepted and seconded, motion carried.

3. **Acceptance of UASC summary notes #97:** (May) Stokes Chapo will add the 2013-14 Assessment Fellows Grant winners to the summary and make a change to the Absent category. Stamper motioned to accept the minutes as amended, Glatz seconded, motion carried.

4. **Acceptance of the 2011-12 Year-end Report:** It was suggested that Stokes Chapo change the report to reflect the 2011-12 Assessment Fellows Grant winners. During the academic year 2011-12, (in May 2012), we awarded the 2012-13 Assessment Fellows Grants so the way the report read to include the 2012-13 winners was correct. Kline moved to accept the report, Robertson seconded, motion carried.

5. **HLC Accreditation Standards:**

- a. Reinhold pointed out the new wording in the HLC accreditation standards which emphasizes more on not just having an assessment plan in place but how we are using the data to make improvements. Page 3a #2 and #3 focuses on learning goals. Need to have learning goals and criteria for all programs. In our last visit we were told we needed more focus on assessing graduate students and our general education program. The new criteria talks a lot more about both of these areas and not just assessment of undergraduate students. It might be a good idea to ask the Graduate Dean to attend our meetings. (Sections 3b #2 talk about general education assessment.)
- b. Reinhold also noted page 4, 3c #1, which states that the HLC expect faculty and staff involvement at root level not just administrators and student support unit heads to be working on student learning assessment.
- c. In the past, we've been lenient about our definition of assessment on our campus; we need to focus on how the HLC defines it.
- d. Page 5, Criterion #4, the whole criterion is important as student learning is defined here. Reinhold is working with the Faculty Senate on general education structure, outcomes and eventually how to measure the outcomes.
- e. Page 6, 4b #1, 2, 3, 4, describes that we are supposed to know what students are learning, how that learning is taking place and how to make it better for them.

- f. Criterion #5c correlates assessment with budgeting and planning. This relationship is something that we need to focus on and become more intentional about, (using the assessment data to make budgeting and planning decisions.)

Reinhold: All of this should be happening already including good pedagogy, student support units measuring what students receive from programming etc. All this should be part of what we are already doing on a day to day basis. Our charge is to help the university move forward with the HLC criteria which were approved by the HLC in June 2013.

6. **Assessment website overview:**

- a. Stokes Chapo briefly walked the group through the Office of Assessment and Undergraduate Studies (assessment) website and showed them the resources page, the UASC page and briefly discussed TracDat, iWebfolio and the Assessment Fellows Grant. Consultation and Review Teams were mentioned briefly as well.

7. **Assessment Survey:**

- a. Stokes Chapo mentioned the proposed assessment survey and provided a little background on what was done in the past when the first survey was administered to the WMU community back in 2008. (The survey questions were provided to the UASC members via email prior to this meeting for their reference.)
- b. Suggestions for incentives for the assessment survey were Miller Auditorium tickets, massage gift certificate from Sindecuse, and WMU Bookstores gift items.
- c. A question came up as to if the data received from the survey can be broken out in to department level or college level results. Stokes Chapo will check into this and get back with the group.
- d. The purpose of the survey is to see how far we've come since 2008 in regard to awareness, participation and involvement with assessment and where we still need to make improvements. One question came up as to whether or not there is a difference between units that are accredited and those that are not. Do units that are not accredited need more assistance?
- e. It was suggested that we might want to add a question about the unit someone is in and then whether or not the unit is accredited.
- f. Kritzman asked that the group take home the survey and provide feedback to Stokes Chapo if have any other suggestions by September 23.
- g. One last suggestion was for question #19 to add an N/A

8. **Advising Directors Assessment Plan Update:**

- a. Background: In 2004 departments were asked to write assessment plans. A few years ago, several student support units were also asked to write plans, including the advising offices. Each college advising office was charged with writing their own plan. Charlie Nutt, the executive director of NACADA (National Academic Advising Association), recommended that centralizing some things, making things more consistent including making an advising syllabus is helpful for students. This could also include an overall advising assessment plan to be used by all advising offices. The UASC wanted to consult with the advising directors on the direction that they would like to take with this. Dave Reinhold spoke with them on behalf of the UASC over the summer. Their decision was that they would like to create one overall assessment plan for all advising offices to utilize and then have the ability within in each office to add to the plan and do more than just the basic overall plan.
- b. The question for this group is what do we think of this and how do we want to proceed as far as providing feedback to the advising directors on their plans? Do we want to see all of their outcomes for approval or just the approve the overall plan?
- c. The group decided that we'd like to see all additional outcomes added by the advising offices and not just the overall group plan.
- d. Stokes Chapo will be sure that all current assessment plans are up to date on the assessment website.

9. **Rubric Review Document:** Will be added to the October meeting agenda.

10. **General Education Assessment Data Review:** All members were provided with the 2005, 2011, and 2012 general education assessment results.

- a. Good work was done in 2005. The general education faculty were given forms to fill in learning outcomes for their courses. This allowed for faculty to enter their own outcomes and not just the general education outcomes. Reinhold met with a group to revise the rubrics used in the 2005 assessment. The rubrics were updated to include the actual general education outcomes for each of the distribution areas and then changed from a 3 point scale to a 5 point scale to fit along with grading better (A-E). The assessment was done again this time in 2011 and 2012, and no training was provided to volunteer instructors who participated. They utilized the new rubrics to evaluate their students, based on the actual, agreed upon by WMU faculty general education outcomes.
- b. There was pretty good participation but no structure was put in place to analyze the data from 2005, 2011, or 2012. There is no infrastructure in place to evaluate the data and make recommendations.
- c. Reinhold has been meeting with an ad hoc committee from the Faculty Senate Committee to look at the gen. ed. outcomes and to see if they need to be revamped. They are also being charged with how to assess the outcomes that they propose, whether the old ones are changed or new ones will be created.
- d. Reinhold would like this group to be involved with the data analysis once we have collected it down the road.
- e. One idea to help with this whole process is to model what has been done in Kansas to train the faculty on how to use the rubrics to get better more consistent data to begin with.
- f. Reinhold wanted this group to know that we have some data to evaluate. We will need to give the small group charged with revamping the outcomes feedback on how to assess them once the new outcomes are in place.
- g. Mostly bringing this data today was to start the conversation for the year. Barbara Walvoord's visit last March was mentioned and her model for assessing general education is a good one that we can look at. Reinhold will share this with the group.
- h. Reinhold shared that he has been looking at how other institutions do this (Grand Valley and Michigan State, for example) and other models as well (such as AAC&U, Association of American Colleges and Universities). He will plan to bring along this information to the group so that we have a starting point for discussing this at our October meeting.
- i. It was mentioned whether this discussion has taken place in the Faculty Senate yet and yes they are dedicating their November meeting to the topic of general education. Questions posed to this group are: 1) What should the general education program look like in 5 years. 2) How do we assess it?
- j. There is a blog available to the University community on Faculty Senate discussions so the community can provide feedback to them. Students are also being involved with this process, (Reinhold is meeting with a student today for this purpose.)
- k. It was mentioned by Reinhold that critical thinking, writing ability and the College of Arts and Sciences will be heavily involved in this discussion as facts show that humanities students are better at critical thinking.
- l. Reinhold will make a list of challenges he sees with general education at WMU for this group and we can talk about it and add to the list.
 - i. One item in particular for this list is how do we fit transfer students into this?

11. **Call for Associate Chair of the UASC:** It was discussed last year that we would like to have an associate chair for this committee to start in January 2014 for transition in leadership. We would like to continue this new tradition that during the second year of the chair's term, an associate chair would start half way through the year to help with the learning curve and transition. Historically in the past the chair has been a faculty member but this is not set in stone. Anyone who is currently on the committee would be acceptable as a nomination and nominees do not have to have faculty ranking. If you have any suggestions for nominations, please submit them to Marilyn Kritzman or Dave Reinhold.

12. Motion to adjourn meeting by Dennis, seconded by Ciccantell and Glatz. Meeting adjourned.

Next Actions:

1. Stokes Chapo will contact different departments on campus in regards to incentives for participating in the assessment survey.
2. Stokes Chapo will find out about how the results of the assessment survey can be broken down (by college or department?)
3. Stokes Chapo will make sure all current assessment plans are up to date on the assessment website.
4. Reinhold will share Dr. Walvoord's plan on assessing general education with the group.
5. Reinhold will bring information on what other institutions are doing and other models for general education assessment to this group so we can start discussions on this in the October meeting.
6. Reinhold will create a list of challenges regarding general education assessment that he has noticed at WMU and bring to the next meeting for discussion.
7. All, submit suggested nominations for associate chair to Marilyn Kritzman or Dave Reinhold.
8. CART chairs, pending assessment plans need to be received no later than the October 21, UASC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Stokes Chapo