

Assessment Council Minutes

Fall, 2022

Contents:

[September 12, 2022](#)

[October 10, 2022](#)

[November 14, 2022](#)

[December 12, 2022](#)

Assessment Council Meeting Agenda
September 12, 2022, 2:00-3:00
Zoom (link in calendar invitation)

Members:

Chad Bebee, Assessment, Council Chair (incoming)
Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair (outgoing)
Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business
Brienne Markowski, University Libraries
Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning
Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary
Heidi Muller, Faculty Senate
Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success
Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Vacant, College of Natural and Health Sciences
Vacant, College of Performing and Visual Arts

1. Welcome and Introductions—welcomed Chad Bebee, the new Director of Assessment and Heidi Muller who has agreed to be the LAC Assessment liaison, and also the Faculty Senate rep for Council.
2. Approval of May 9, 2022, minutes. Approved.
3. Announcements and Updates
 - a. Faculty Assessment Liaisons appointments and projects which came about as a result of the recommendations that were made after our evaluation of assessment in HLC last year. Kim worked at setting some infrastructure to address some of the things that were identified as potential issues. One of the strategies was to recruit faculty assessment liaisons to help work on some specific issues. We were successful in not only filling all three positions but adding a fourth faculty member.
 - Assessment Methods – Kathie Records, Nursing. Kathie and Heidi will be working on the LAC assessment, starting to establish some infrastructure and using Canvas as a method of collecting assessment data.
 - LAC Assessment – Heidi Muller, Communication Studies
 - Program Learning Outcomes – Jeri Kraver, English, and Nancy Sileo, Special Education have already started working with the colleges to get this going, collecting the program learning outcomes and curriculum maps for all programs.
 - b. Membership vacancies—Kim has been in conversation with both of the deans from both colleges and she heard just yesterday from the Undergraduate Council, and they are working on a name. So, hopefully, we will have a full slate by our November meeting.
4. Academic Year 22-23 Priorities
 - a. Continuation from 21-22
 - Advance Assessment Policy with Faculty Senate. Kim has met with Dawit Senbet who is chair of the Faculty Senate, to talk about the process for getting the assessment policy actually approved. There's some question about whether this is the kind of policy that needs faculty Senate approval, but we were in agreement that it would be much better for UNC if the Senate could get behind and endorse this particular policy. Kim will be working with Dawit,

and also Oscar Levin who was the chair last year and is chairing the Academic Policies Committee (APC). The Faculty Senate has a very full slate this Fall so Kim & Dawit decided to wait until Spring to bring this project forward.

- Develop strategy and plan for piloting proposed changes to assessment process. Kim is hoping that the Council will continue to work on this through the year and actually develop a proposal for how we might file a transition to a more learning, improvement—focused type of assessment.

b. New item

- Codify formal role for Assessment Council—Kim addressed the fact that the Assessment Council has been convening since about 2010 and she is very proud of the work that this group has done. She feels that the time is right to move into a more formal role for the Assessment Council on campus to move it beyond an advisory kind of group to the assessment office, to a group that has a defined and formal process in overseeing assessment at the University. As a result, one of the things she is going to charge the Council with this year is coming up with basically a charter for the Council that establishes membership, responsibilities, and when we're ready to move the assessment policy forward to the Senate those roles we identified for the Assessment Council in the assessment process will be tied together and will work seamlessly as we move forward.
- Chris asked the question “who needs to codify us”? Do we know that? Kim said that once Chad gets here formally and has had a little time to get his feet firmly planted in the UNC soil, then she will be scheduling a meeting with Chad, Dawit and Oscar to talk through whether this is a Faculty Senate approval, or a Faculty Senate information item, or something that, like some of the faculty governance bodies on campus are codified in Board of Trustee policy? Is it University regs? Does it live outside of either of those? Kim pointed out that because of our organizational restructuring we don't have Student Affairs programs represented on the Assessment Council anymore, but we do have co-curricular areas as part of the Assessment Council. Consequently, it's not clear whether Faculty Senate has jurisdiction over things that go beyond faculty. Those are some of the questions we are going to have to resolve, but she doesn't want to let those questions keep us from moving forward because for long-term sustainability we need something more formal than just her putting together a group ten years ago and inviting representatives from all of the colleges to help us work through assessment.
- Assessment Grants – we'll start talking about this a little later in this semester. Kim feels that there is some opportunity to think about the pilot for the new assessment process, whether we want to allocate some of the grant funds as an incentive for programs to adopt that pilot. Chad will be leading some conversation around that.
- Another possible topic for conversation as we move forward defining the role of the Council is whether we want to establish a co-chair that would be a faculty member for this Council?

Brian asked if Kim is perceiving the role of the Council as being analogous to like the Graduate Council that reviews faculty's applications for graduate faculty endorsement, only we would be doing it in terms of looking at programs, assessment plans and their outcomes? Kim said that she feels that is one option and possibility. She reminded that when we were talking about implementing our new assessment process, that in that process it was imagining a role for the Assessment Council in reviewing those improvements, plan proposals in reviewing the outcomes of those assessments and providing feedback along those lines. There's nothing right now that formally establishes that as a role for the Council, but that would be the direction she would like to see the Council move in. Brian asked if there is an office, or individual, on campus who is now providing that role, and the answer is “No”. So, this would meet a

need. Kim said that it is not uncommon for assessment councils or committees across the nation to have a more formal role in some type of oversight of how assessment is being conducted at kind of a larger level. Kim said she is not envisioning the kind of oversight where all programs have to submit assessment reports every year, meaning that the Council would have to look at 150 assessment reports a year—that's not manageable. What she envisions is that it be linked to the program review cycle where there are maybe eight to ten programs in a given year that would be interacting with the Council.

Brian asked a follow-up question: Do you see the role of the Council as being “regulatory” versus “advisory”? Is there going to be some type of criteria that is developed that we're going to need to evaluate programs against? Kim's response was that she thinks over the next few years if the Council works more as advisory of reviewing and giving feedback, and less regulatory, that we will be more successful. She also suspects that people will continue to want to engage and serve on this Assessment Council, where if we move to a regulatory body, then it changes the nature of our work, and she doesn't think we can be as effective if we become the “assessment police”.

Assessment Council Meeting Agenda & Notes
October 10, 2022, 2:00-3:00
Zoom (<https://unco.zoom.us/j/94391002652>)

Members:

Olga Baron, Office of Global Engagement
Chad Bebee, Assessment, Council Chair (incoming)
Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair (outgoing)
Sonia Brandon-Schaible, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Loree Crow, Undergraduate Academic Engagement
Scott Franklin, College of Natural and Health Sciences
Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business
Brianne Markowski, University Libraries
Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning
Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary
Heidi Muller, Faculty Senate
Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success
Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Vacant, College of Performing and Visual Arts

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of Sept. 12, 2022 minutes—Lyda moved to approve, Brian seconded. Approved.
3. Announcements and Updates
 - a) Faculty Assessment Liaisons projects
 - LAC Assessment – Heidi Muller, Communication Studies & Chad Bebee. Chad said that in the last LAC meeting, the discussion was around the use of Canvas for assessment, and it will be the policy that when an area is up for assessment (and it will go in a 5-6 year cycle). The first year is going to be a pilot (sort of a “proof of concept”); the whole area will not be assessed in the pilot year, but it appears that LAC is going to ask History and Mathematics to be the guinea pigs.
 - In the year that areas are assessed folks will have to use Canvas, at least for the gradebook and to assess the other rubrics with the hope that maybe folks will like Canvas and will continue using it outside of the years that they are being assessed, but that will not be an explicit mandate. Also, the LAC unanimously approved the use of the State GT Pathway rubrics for use in assessment as is. Chad reviewed the rubrics, and they are essentially the AAC&U VALUE rubrics with some slight modifications to try to improve focus, but otherwise the verbiage down to the criteria are the VALUE rubrics.
 - The LAC also decided that when areas are assessed it will not be assessed by criteria; rather, when an area falls under assessment in the cycle that area will assess all of the criteria associated with that area in that one year. This could be done via signature assignment or multiple assignments, but those assignments don’t, according to the State anyway, have to assess each and every competency criterion. There are usually two to three student

outcomes in those rubrics that are effectively mandated by the State to be addressed in specific courses whereas the others then become optional. Lyda asked when the LAC says “They are applying the rubric, who is the ‘they’”? Chad replied, “The instructors”. The instructors are going to evaluate the assignments for grading purposes, and then they will by virtue of using the rubrics assign a score for those required areas on the statewide rubrics. This could be done all as part of grading on one rubric, or they will have the option to use those statewide rubrics separately as assessment rubrics only. Lyda also asked who was going to be training the instructors to score the rubric. Chad said that was a great question and he has no answer to it at this point. It seems like it is something that would be a good idea.

- Stephanie suggested that Chad might want to talk to Heidi Mueller, as Chair of the LAC, what has been observed in the past regarding rubrics and such. She asked if this was one of the projects that Tara started, and Chris said that there are two separate LAC projects going on—one is for this indirect assessment and another for Program Learning outcomes. The PLO project is being headed by Jeri Craver and Nancy Sileo, and Heidi and the LAC is directing the indirect assessment. The first round of those has gone out to faculty in some areas where they needed additional information. Chris doesn’t have the impression that a lot of resources are being directed to the sort of questions Lyda was asking. Chad added that the LAC has an assessment sub-committee that he is going to be a part of with Heidi Mueller, Kathi Records and others. He expects that that will be a great place for these kinds of issues to be addressed.
- Sonia added that she is also concerned, in terms of norming, would also be limited by the fact that we are only requiring this to be set up only at the unit level and not on the criterion level. Chad agreed that we will have to see how this work progresses after the pilot year. Some of the “rough spots” will emerge and allow us to have a better sense of what to tackle, but he agreed that the “norming question” is a good one, especially if we want to generate assessment data that’s going to be useful to us and say something about the general education curriculum.
- Chris noted that Heidi had just joined the meeting and she asked her if there has been any discussion about norming that will occur for faculty of learning how to use the rubrics. Heidi said she feels that is the purpose of this pilot year and then they will be able to communicate what we are trying to achieve and how people fit into that and then work on some potential understanding the rubric and knowing how the rubric works. They don’t have a plan at this time, but the assessment sub-committee is planning on using the pilot year to start fleshing out what the assessment plan is going to be.

4. Academic Year 22-23 Priorities

- a) Old Business: Continuations from 21-22—Chad said that he had read through the minutes of past meetings where these items were discussed. He asked the members to give him their thoughts about these items. This is very important policy considerations moving forward and as he is just getting started, he would like to know their perspectives on these things, particularly what do you think are the qualities of a good formal policy for the Assessment Council? He has looked at Kim’s draft of the policy and he is working on updating some things, but he is very interested in the members’ thoughts and feedback on how things have been going and what they feel is needed.

- Milan addressed what he had seen in previous minutes regarding the question of whether the Council serves more of an advisory function vs. policy, oversight & generation committee. Last year it seemed like the general consensus was of it being more advisory, and he would be inclined to favor that more than policy and oversight. Chad said that in his past experience any good assessment group needs to be advisory. His observation is that with assessment, you don't want to become the "assessment police", but there is a continuum of things that fall under an advisory role, and he has seen various permutations of that. For Senate for example, as part of our charge, it might fall to us to review assessment plans from each area, at least once in a cycle of program review. It's one thing to be advisory and say "This is good. These things need improvement," and then maybe those suggestions are taken or not. What he sees as a useful goal for the committee in terms of providing that feedback is that it carries some weight, at least in the sense that programs maybe act to make the improvements or changes that this group puts forward and spends its time creating, but he wouldn't want the Council to spend a lot of time on this and then it really comes to naught. At the same time the Council shouldn't be a police force that mandates changes. Chad asked, "Where would you like to see it fall in that spectrum?"
- Milan responded that people see this group with our HLC accreditation process, and with that there is an assessment piece to it, so to be able to have that accreditation probably wouldn't have a lot of debate or push-back. Beyond that, in terms of best practices, the value-add comes into the conversation, such as, "What are you doing in terms of knowing how well your program is meeting learning objectives, and how are you coming full circle to capture that and understand that you're moving in the right direction?" So, at a base level the assessments we would need to have in place or the processes that HLC requires us to have would be the starting point and beyond that, he's not sure how much structure or rules or guidelines the committee would be enforcing.
- Stephanie said that she hasn't had the impression that we are becoming "policy police"; however, we have spent the last two years working in sub-committees to develop guidelines. She would still call them policies, for palatability we're saying guidelines, but she doesn't think that it is an advisory role. As the group spent some real time on this in a really focused way, we're recommending that there be some clear guidelines and that's to support the institution that it would be equitable in what's expected as opposed to depending on who you report it to. That is, for her, a little bit stronger on the spectrum of advisory—we're not on the light side. It really is intended to provide some shared structures that are reasonable and that also help us in our commitment to meaningful outcomes in terms of learning and advancing what we have set forth in our learning outcomes and other things as our commitment to the kind of education and experience we want for students and faculty.
- Chris added that in welcoming new folks to this Council, if they haven't had a chance to read the policies that the working groups established last year, that might be a "homework assignment" they take on for next time, and then she asked that Chad check with Kim regarding where the proposals are in the process and what the next steps might be to move them forward. Chad said that he has seen some of the materials that Kim has drawn up, although he hasn't seen the individual documents that the working groups submitted. He will take that "homework assignment" on by the next meeting.

- Chad noted that he would be meeting the next day with representatives of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Policies Committee to have an initial conversation around these things. Kim's timeline was the spring to move some of that forward. He understands that there has been some debate on whether the Senate has to approve that or whether it is an information item, but he feels like the consensus has been that at a minimum having the Faculty Senate blessing of those things, even if it is an information item, is the preferable way to go.
- Chad said he would indeed get the final drafts of the documents mentioned so everyone has access to them in Sharepoint to do their "homework" before the next meeting.
 - Advance Assessment Policy with Faculty Senate
 - Develop strategy and plan for piloting proposed changes to assessment process
 - Codify formal role for Assessment Council

b) New Business

New Assessment Director and Council Member introductions and priorities brainstorming

Chad invited everyone to introduce themselves and briefly state why they are serving on the Assessment Council since assessment is not typically one of those things that everyone gravitates toward, so he was curious why each member gravitated in that direction, even if it is just "Well, somebody needed to do it." He also asked that everyone tell one thing that has been most beneficial about assessment at UNC and one thing that they feel like to see changed or strengthened or in some way better benefit UNC.

- Sonia—she volunteered to be on this Council because that's what Directors of IRE usually do.
- Milan—he chairs, in MCB, the assessment committee and they merged it just last year with the curriculum committee, so the college felt it was a good place for him to serve on this Council to be a part of this conversation at the assessment level with the university.
- Chris—has been on this council in one shape or another for a long time. She leads the HSS Program Review and Assessment committee and in that role makes sure that they are following the processes, and they still have a very involved group of faculty evaluating and providing commentary to other units in the departments which has been helpful.
- Brianne—she feels that one of the things that has gone well with assessment on this campus is that the Assessment Office in its various forms has provided a lot of professional development opportunities that were usually faculty-led to get folks on campus more knowledgeable about assessment and how to do it and that have faculty fellows train folks and then get people in various pockets on campus working on assessment has done a lot of good work. However, she feels that we have hit the point where "pockets of assessment" are happening, especially in the accredited programs, but that we are missing certain areas that are not doing a lot of, or possibly any, assessment and that is why we were working on the policies so that we could get more across the board.
- Scott—new to this Council and is still trying to figure out the Council's function. He doesn't have a "huge" background in assessment although he has been a part of the process in NHS since they do it every five years or so. He understands that component but is still trying to

get on board with the standardization we are talking about here.

- Brian—he has been a part of the Council for a while and was an assessment fellow, and as such went through the training. His program actually has three different national accrediting bodies they work with, so he’s been active with all of the various accreditations they have to keep an eye on. He feels the Council has done a nice job of looking at what other universities are doing in terms of assessment and trying to implement best practice, and now it’s a process of rolling out the actual more formal program and seeing how it works.
- Lyda—she has been on the Council since it started. She seconded what Brianne said we’ve done well and an accurate assessment of why we’re not moving forward. She is on the Council because teaching and assessment can’t really be separated.
- Lori—she is new to the Council and is serving because Nancy Matchett, her supervisor, asked her to serve to represent the academic areas outside of the colleges, which includes the whole undergraduate academic engagement area. And, as far as what we are doing well, she “called out” Lyda, Stephanie, and Kim because having some of those individuals that really, truly care about assessment and understand how assessment leads to improvement and improvement of outcomes for our students.
- Ku—has also served on the Council since its inception. One of the reasons he has continued to serve is he has enjoyed serving with the original group, and under Kim’s leadership. He feels that the Fellows and the Council delivered very effective training and workshops to faculty members, and they brought about some program improvements and then focused on student learning. One thing he would like to see improve is that programs currently focus on the accreditation and then the program evaluation part because there is no specific policy in the past, he is hopeful that in the next couple of years we’ll see some kind of improvement in this area, especially the information dissemination from the administrators to faculty members. He feels we need more transparency so everybody is on the same page.
- Olga—her membership on this council is important because Office of Global Engagement bridges both academic and administrative functions. They provide student services, but also teach. They teach English language for ELL’s. Assessment is a critical function of the work they do and here at UNC it’s been one of the weak links that she has observed in terms of international program assessment specifically.
- Chad—introduced himself, including his background at Vincennes University where he was the assessment director for seven years. As to the Why Assessment? for him—he got involved with assessment simply because at the time he wanted to be involved in the improvement of student learning. As a part of that process, he got to meet people from across the institution and then saw how doing good assessment really can lead to the better student experience and to a better institution as a whole. He also saw that it can be a contentious and time-consuming, and frankly a “drag” sometimes, especially depending on how the institution goes about assessment. He feels that, as an assessment director, UNC has a gold mine of disciplinary knowledge and skills and expertise that assessment needs to harness, and that it isn’t the role of Council to dictate disciplinary knowledge to faculty.

5. The Good of the Order
6. Adjournment

Assessment Council Meeting Minutes

November 14, 2022, 2:00-3:00

Meeting held on Teams

Members:

Olga Baron, Office of Global Engagement
Chad Bebee, Assessment, Council Chair (incoming)
Kim Black, Academic Effectiveness, Council Chair (outgoing)
Loree Crow, Undergraduate Academic Engagement
Scott Franklin, College of Natural and Health Sciences
Brian Johnson, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Heng-Yu Ku, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Milan Larson, Monfort College of Business
Brianne Markowski, University Libraries
Chris Marston, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Lyda McCartin, Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning
Berniece Mitchell, Recording Secretary
Heidi Muller, Faculty Senate
Schaible Brandon, Sonia, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Stephanie Torrez, Student Academic Success
Tara Wood, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Sally Murphy, College of Performing and Visual Arts

Agenda:

1. Welcome—confusion regarding Zoom vs. Teams. Chad introduced Sally Murphy who is joining Council starting today.
2. Approval of Oct. 10, 2022 minutes. Chris moved to approve, Brian seconded. Minutes approved.
3. Announcements and Council Member Updates
Heidi told the group that units should have received the “indirect Assessment memos” so if your course is up for indirect assessment this year for the LAC, they will be proceeding with that in the Spring. If you or anybody you know has questions about those memos, please direct them to Heidi.
Sonia announced that IRE has taken down AAECD131 from Insight and replaced it with a new departmental data form called the ACD002 Departmental Data. It has everything that Program Assessment used to have, the methodologies are a little bit different (the methodologies are lined up more with State and Federal methodologies). If you have comments, feedback, etc. please contact Sonia directly.
4. Old Business:
 - Update on Assessment Policy with Faculty Senate—Chad has met with the chairs of the Academic Policy Committee, as well as Faculty Senate. They are both aware and supportive

of the Assessment Policy as he “broadly laid it out for them.” Once we have signed off on this policy it will then move to those two committees. The idea being that those committees will take up those policies and move them forward next Spring for finalization by the end of the year if not before. They were highly supportive. One of the things that came out of that discussion was that they had the distinct sense that there has to be some form of annual reporting to sustain the work. That without some form of annual reporting programs are apt to “just languish” without some sort of annual reporting requirement.

Chad invited comments from the group regarding what the process has been like in the recent past in terms of assessment, reporting or documentation from programs—how would you characterize it?

Heidi’s reply was: “We collect it every year, but I don’t think we really do much with it until we need to for our program review or anything like that. We have our processes and we do them every year Occasionally an assessment report will be due and we’ll do that, but it’s not super recurring.”

Chris added that what Heidi said is true for the majority of HSS. She feels that folks are looking at their data, but in terms of some sort of discussion review process between the units and the Deans office, it’s not a regular piece right now.

Chad said that this is something Kim has tasked him with, trying to embed some greater level of systematicity, and while he agrees it is needed, we don’t want to overburden programs with assessment reporting. He’s seen both sides of that equation so trying to strike a balance is going to be a really important key here.

In light of the rest of today’s agenda, he would like to table this until next meeting to address some of these things and start brainstorming around it.

- LAC Assessment and Canvas Update—Heidi, Kathi Records & Chad have been working to work with the GT Pathways rubrics. Those that are to be used in next year’s pilot assessment are in the Canvas system now. Chad has been given access to Canvas at the root level which means that he can create institutional level outcomes and rubrics, but he cannot get down into the individual program level. We will have to work within the programs because they are the ones who will have that access at the programmatic level should they want to use Canvas for outcomes assessment.

He has updated the LAC on where that stands and it appears that the materials are pretty much ready to go for the LAC pilot assessment in the Spring. Chad will be working with Aaron Haberman as History and Mathematics are the two areas that will be undertaking that pilot. The first pilot year will really be a proof of concept and the LAC is trying to insure that we actually can derive the data that we intend through Canvas via that assessment. He is aware that Canvas is not necessarily used widely or consistently. He’s thinking that might be something that the Assessment Council might want to consider putting forward a recommendation because as we think about more systematicity with assessment via assessment reporting, thinking about outcomes assessment across the institution, Canvas is an underutilized resource. Once you’ve built the materials on the front end of Canvas, the system really does automate a lot of the work for you, certainly a lot of the data collection work so this is something we might consider how programs might be able to utilize that if they so choose. If we could help programs see how they would be incurring more work upon themselves by not using Canvas it might help them consider using Canvas more often.

Chad invited comments from the group regarding past experiences or opinions regarding the use of Canvas for those things. Scott said that he knows the Undergraduate Committee is also thinking about some standardization to the use of Canvas. He knows it is an ongoing conversation and he could try to help facilitate this group talking with that group if we're all on the same path to get something a little more standardized for Canvas use.

Chad said he had just wanted to put this on everyone's radar so we can be thinking about it going forward. It's certainly not something we want to mandate, but maybe encourage highly.

Loree Crow added that what she hears from the students' perspective is that anything that the institution can do to encourage universal use of Canvas in classes, even if it's just used minimally, would help because they're looking for information in a "single housed space" and when instructors choose to not use Canvas it becomes a greater challenge for the students. She went on to say that from an inclusivity perspective, if we're trying to really reach students and be as student-first as possible, maybe coming from this Council of "highly, highly, highly" encouraging its use because this is the right thing for students, and then if it also helps on the assessment side, maybe it would gain more traction.

Sonia added that we also see a higher retention rate with the more programs engage with Canvas.

5. New Business:

- Assessment Council Charge Document—Chad posted both documents in Sharepoint. He invited feedback about this Charge. There being none, Chad asked specifically if everyone is in agreement that this document should constitute the membership of the Council and be the basis for the rotation through those membership positions? And, if the timeline laid out in the document were reasonable. By the consensus of silence, Chad said this will be one of the two documents that he will share with folks outside of this Council. He went on to say that Kim had been working with the Co-curricular units to try to encourage them to be a member of this Council and thus far they have declined. As a result, Kim felt that maybe the name of this Council should be changed from the "university Assessment council" since it doesn't represent the entirety of the University. Chad had floated the idea of "Academic Assessment Council". However, it's unclear whether Co-curricular will eventually come into the fold. He has a meeting with the DEI for some of their work with outcomes in the near future, so it feels like they are reaching out to him.

Sonia said that she has been contacted by Marcie in Cedric's area, regarding assessment. She is happy to help them with data, but she is encouraging them to join forces with this group because Marci is really working blind without much guidance.

Stephanie added that she wonders if there should maybe be a second assessment group that is the Co-Curriculars to help bring them up to speed, and she "volunteered" to sit on both groups until "we get to a point where we can maybe bring them together". She went on to say that what Sonia is describing means that it's also not a good use of their time to sit in on this discussion yet, because they're not there yet and that group might need to start at the very basic of "what is assessment?".

Sonia said the other group does know about CAS standards, but that is where it starts and stops, and that's not a framework, that's just best practices.

As a result of this discussion, Chad said he will reach out to the to the Co-curricular group and offer the idea of setting up a smaller second group with Stephanie's support/input and sort of work with them at a foundational level and see where that goes. He feels that this would be wise for us to do before the HLC arrives here in the next few years.

Stephanie and Loree would be interested in helping work with the second group. Chad invited anyone else who feels an interest to let him know.

- Assessment Procedure Policy Document—The document Chad shared it is an “updated” version of the document the Council was working on back in April. Chad has added some details, particularly concerning the procedures and the minimum expectations. He elaborated that what we're trying to articulate here are minimum expectations. So, if we were to examine an assessment plan, what we're trying to codify here is what do we expect minimally that an assessment plan will do, and that programs will, in terms of their process for assessment, provide as part of that plan? Some of this should not be new because there are current efforts to articulate program learning outcomes, along with the mission for each degree certificate and/or concentration in a program, aligning those program learning outcomes to the institutional learning outcomes via a mapping document. And then indicating how each of those outcomes are going to be assessed in the program and on what timeline. As a minimum expectation we would expect to see those alignments spelled out in a template document (he has a template he will post for the group before the next meeting), but we're also interested in is looking at the methods, so it's important that we see at least one direct method of assessment for every learning outcomes. It's going to be very important that those direct methods are able to differentiate learning across the outcomes.
- Chad pointed out that when he speaks of “best practices” in the document, that is to some degree discipline-specific, but we're talking about applying good assessment practice within the context of disciplinary conventions. Points of importance:
 - Whether it is quantitative or qualitative data is more of a disciplinary decision as long as they're engaged in good assessment practice: things like direct assessment, disaggregating results, and having well written, clear program learning outcomes that are measurable
 - And then, what is going to be very crucial to this process is not only that those alignments occur that the data is collected and that they are able to disaggregate results, but that they have follow-up revisions that they are showing improvements or adjustments based on the results of that assessment. (This is what HLC loves to call “closing the loop” and it becomes one of the most central things to any HLC review of assessment).
 - He feels that this Council has the opportunity this year to define what UHC's systematic practice is in terms of “closing the loop”, using assessment data and having an institutional conversation around those things.

Chad asked the group: Do these seem like reasonable minimum standards?

Chris directed a question to Sonia: “When we have the academic program review tab in that academic overview in Power BI, are we thinking that most academic units would be able to get the information they need to talk about from that?”

Sonia talked about the new “program health check” dash board, at least form the Provost

level. Heidi interjected that “that is all enrollment management—that’s not assessment data” to which Sonia replied that it doesn’t tie to learning outcomes, but it does tie to the program reviews. It seems that the Provost is saying “we want something that is quick, easy for folks to categorize and check to just see how programs are doing”.

Heidi asked how that is relevant to our current discussion—are we talking about program review here, or are we just talking about the assessment plan? Chad replied that while he thinks that they are two separate things, they are interconnected. When a program goes up for program review, part of that is a review of their assessment plan and findings across the five-year lifecycle of the program review cycle. The documentation that he is putting together would marry their assessment planning process with program review in the sense that it is that five-year cycle, which would mean that they are going to assess at least one program learning outcome every year, depending on how many program learning outcomes they have.

He also brought up the fact that Kim has mentioned to him that ideally, if programs decide to use Canvas for learning outcomes assessment that we might be able to automate that reporting and collect that data, extract it from Canvas and then create a dashboard for assessment learning outcomes results similar to other kinds of data points that programs would have access to via Power BI.

Chad proposed that maybe we could use programs who are currently using Canvas in this way as a pilot to illustrate what it would be like. Then we could take this to the Provost and say “here’s some examples of programs that have already done this and this is what it would mean to bring this to scale for all programs.”

- 12/12 Meeting Homework—Chad would like to break the Council into to sub-groups. One will be a Process Sub-committee and the other a Planning sub-committee.
 - The Process sub-committee is going to be interested in the questions regarding “what’s it going to take to review an assessment plan? What does that entail. What does it look like? He has some guided questions that he will post for each sub-committee.
 - The Planning sub-committee is going to be looking at the Office of Assessment Strategic Planning documents and thinking about the larger institutional level concerns for this as well.

If anyone has any feedback on the two documents we discussed today please give him that feedback before the end of November. You can put comments directly in those documents in Sharepoint as well. He welcomes your feedback on those documents directly because he will need to move those forward to those institutional committees, Faculty Senate and the Policies Committee, so that he can get that on their radar for early in the spring.

Also, please let him know if you are interested in the Planning or Process sub-committees. You will find the guided questions, the template form, the strategic plan draft in the meeting documents folder in the Teams Sharepoint channel. It is his goal to have those finalized and implemented by the end of the academic year. Email Chad your

sub-committee preference by the end of this week (11/18). He will schedule short meetings with both sub-committees before our next general session in December.

6. The Good of the Order

7. Adjournment

ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

12/12/22

Minutes

Members Present:

Brianne Markowski

Sally Murphy

Chris Marston

Milan Larson

Stephanie Torrez

Olga Baron

Sonia Schaible Brandon

Heidi Muller

Heng-Yu Ku

Chad Bebee

- I. Greetings and Breakout Room Setup
- II. Allocation to Rooms and Task Reminders
 - a. Charge and Policy documents finalized
 - b. Planning and process documentation feedback--
- III. Read-out of the discussions and recommendations of the subgroups
 - a. The Planning group:
 - i. Had a question whether the Assessment Council has a designated budget for the Assessment grants and did Chad want that written into the charge? **Chad responded to this question by saying that it is his understanding that he and Kim Black will be following up his Strategic Plan with a budgeting conversation and so there may be a broader budget conversation that occurs and that is where the mini-grant budget would appear.**
 - ii. In addition, they had a couple of edits (Breanne will send Chad her notes):
 1. it seems like there is some switching between University Assessment Council and Academic Assessment Council in the documents,
 2. question of whether it is the Council or the Office of Assessment that is sponsoring the Teaching and Assessment Symposium, **Chad responded that actually it is both because really the Assessment Council approves the Assessment grants and applications while the Office of Assessment works with CETL on the Symposium.** Stephanie suggested that in light of the fact that no one remembers the Council ever being an active part of the Symposium process, it needs to be clarified in this document that the Symposium isn't a function of the Council.
 3. a suggestion that maybe it would be best not to put in the document which day of the week the Council will meet on so that you don't have to update the charge every time you need to change the meeting day (saying "once a month" instead).
 4. It was noted that the area Loree Crow represents is the Division of Undergraduate and Academic Engagement, not Undergraduate Studies, but if you put Undergraduate Studies it begs the question whether we need to have Graduate Studies?

- iii. Switching to the Policy for Assessment of Learning Outcomes document:
 - 1. it was felt that the timeline might be a little aggressive for the first few years. The feeling was that it would take a few years to get everything built and put together and that process would need a little more time and once it has been established then the timeline that was proposed might make sense.
 - 2. Felt that the Missions, Visions and Values looked great and so did the Strategic Goals and Strategies.
 - b. Process group:
 - i. Thought overall the documents are good with some minor comments about feedback or clarifying.
 - 1. Felt that when we look at overall faculty morale and what faculty are being asked to do that we want to be a little bit more up front and hope that this would come from the Provost and AALT about why this important work and we appreciate that you do it and that it is a value to our students and of how it connects to the other kinds of important work that we are doing around students first, etc.
 - 2. We don't currently have a process for programs who don't take this seriously as we might want them to of are there any consequences? If we are adding additional steps back in we want to make sure from the top down and the bottom up that there is support.
 - 3. Heidi added that the question here is, if "my" report this year is "our students meet our goals" the fear that that is going to be used punitively against a program or against a department and again that needs to come from the top down what the messaging is about why we're doing assessment and how that data is going to be used in terms of programs. **Chad responded that there is nothing that will kill genuinely good assessment work faster than using it punitively. Having said that, if a program never meets its goals and it is setting reasonable goals then there needs to be an honest conversation about why can't we meet our goals? But that is very different from being punitive because they didn't meet their goals. That is using assessment data to inform practice and try to imbed improvements rather than trying to assign blame for the results.**
- IV. Discussion and Final Approvals
- V. Good of the Order
- VI. Adjourn