

Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda

February 7, 2023

Present: Beth O’Neill (Chair), Gloria Dye, Bobby Tso, Rhonda Boeckman, Emily Grant, Haley Glover, Benjamin Reed, Tom Hickman, Bassima Schbley, Steve Hageman, Teresa Clouch, Jennifer Ball, Kara Kendall-Morwick.

I. Program Assessment Update

a. Taskstream Issues

- i. IT barriers on Watermark’s side prevented users at WU from being able to access Taskstream between early December 2022 and today, 2/7/2023. WU IT and Watermark worked together to resolve the issue, and liaisons should now be able to access Taskstream AMS to retrieve any needed program assessment materials, and rubric ratings and comments. O’Neill thanked Glover for retrieving the assessment materials needed for the HLC Desk Review during this time.

b. Discuss Program Assessment Report

- i. O’Neill provided a brief summary of findings/trends from the report. As discussed previously in the committee, there was a large increase in the number of programs that submitted materials, which is a success. There was also a decrease in average rubric scores that were evident overall. This may be due in part to there being so many programs that submitted materials for the first time, as well as a change in committee composition and implementation of the rubric. The committee discussed an interest in having a calibration/norming session prior to starting program assessment review next year, and discussed that the committee “retreat” in September would be a good time to complete this.
- ii. O’Neill also reported that several programs re-submitted mission statements, PSLOs, and curriculum maps for re-review, which likely is associated with the increased overall score observed for those rubric areas. This is a good demonstration that committee feedback and continuous evaluation can be effective.

II. Planning for Program Assessment 2023

a. Discuss potential for rubric revisions

- i. The committee had discussion regarding confusion about the item related to university stakeholder involvement in assessment. Several committee members shared struggles with rating this rubric item, and had confusion about its purpose. Ball shared that this item was likely included to increase communication about assessment, and improve the assessment culture, when program assessment efforts were new. She discussed that it is likely that this item is no longer relevant, and if there is confusion on the part of the liaisons and on the assessment committee raters, it may be good to eliminate it.

1. Dye moved to eliminate the assessment findings rubric item regarding collaboration with other university stakeholders. Grant seconded. There was no further discussion and motion carried.
 - ii. Hickman expressed concern regarding the inclusion of the term “collaboration” on the assessment findings rubric item about communication and collaboration with students. Hickman discussed that it isn’t appropriate for students to collaborate/contribute to designing assessment processes/measures, because they don’t have the necessary expertise to do so. Ball agreed that student collaboration isn’t always appropriate. O’Neill shared that some program accrediting bodies require student collaboration/participation (e.g., social work), but that it likely isn’t something appropriate for most programs. Discussion was held regarding revising the item to state communication and/or collaboration with students to clarify that collaboration wasn’t a required activity.
 1. Hickman moved to revise wording to communication and/or collaboration with students. Tso seconded. There was no further discussion and motion carried.
 - iii. O’Neill shared that the assessment findings rubric item regarding alignment to mission was problematic for her because programs aren’t asked to discuss alignment to mission. Thus, committee members are rating programs on something that programs aren’t being asked to discuss. Discussion was held regarding adding language to the findings report form that asks faculty to discuss mission alignment for program/curriculum changes made as a result of assessment data.
 1. O’Neill moved to add language that directs programs to discuss mission alignment to the findings reports. Grant second. There was no further discussion and motion carried.
 - iv. O’Neill will make the approved changes to the rubric and assessment findings report.
- b. Training/submission timeline
 - i. The committee discussed the timeline for when program assessment trainings should occur. O’Neill shared that last year they took place in June and August, but that it may not be an ideal time for faculty on a 9-month contract. Dye reported that early April seemed to make sense. Other committee members agreed, stating that this timeline would be after advising/advanced registration is complete and also in advance of the end of the semester activities. An additional training could also occur in June for 12-month faculty. O’Neill will plan for this timeline and will record training session that occur.
 - ii. The committee discussed the due date for program assessment materials. Last year, two due dates were given, one in June and one in August, and programs could choose which date to use. The history of why there were two due dates was discussed, and committee members discussed that

having two official due dates didn't seem to make sense because programs could complete the materials in June if they desired. O'Neill shared that she had planned to have program assessment materials due the Friday before classes start. Reed asked whether the due date should be slightly later to better accommodate 9-month faculty (e.g., August 31). O'Neill shared that this was possible, but we would want to ensure that a later due date doesn't impact the committee's time to review the materials. O'Neill will plan to have only one due date in August, and will continue to consider the specific date.

- III. Discuss Potential for 2024 Assessment Extravaganza
 - a. O'Neill discussed that there is interest in re-starting the Assessment Extravaganza; one hasn't taken place since COVID. The history of the assessment extravaganza was discussed, as well as its purpose. Previously it has taken place around Valentine's Day in a roundtable format, and food/drink was provided. It is a way to let faculty know what is occurring in terms of university-wide and program assessment, and Kendall-Morwick shared that it is also a great way for assessment grant awardees to be able to disseminate their projects. The committee agreed to plan for an Assessment Extravaganza in February 2024, and discussions regarding the event will continue in future meetings.
- IV. Announcements
 - a. Please complete the HERI Faculty Survey if you haven't already, and encourage your colleagues to also do so.
 - b. Advise colleagues of Assessment Grant deadline on 4/7/2023
 - i. Grants subcommittee will review assessment grant proposals in April
 - c. Awards subcommittee will complete their review for assessment awards in April
- V. Plan for March Meeting
 - a. Presentation from SARR on oral and written communication USLO findings