

## University Assessment Steering Committee (UASC)

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

Summary Notes #83

Monday, November 28, 2011

2 p.m.

Room 3150, Schneider Hall

Learner-Centered. Discovery-driven. Globally-engaged.

**Attending:** Katharine Cummings (CoEHD), Christina Stamper (HCoB), Brad Dennis (LIB), Laura Darrah (RHL), Marcia Fetters (COGE), Betty Dennis (EUP), Scott Slawinski (CAS), Dave Reinhold (ASUGS), Andrew Kline (CEAS), Kevin Knutson (ADV), Suzan Ayers (CoEHD), Cari Robertson (SHC), Karen Stokes Chapo (AIA), Marianne DiPierro (TGC), and Beth van den Hombergh (ASUGS), Sue Brodasky (OIT), Marilyn Kritzman (AAUP and USC), Patrick Benton (CoA),

### 1. **Acceptance of the Agenda:**

Brad Dennis moved to approve the agenda, supported by Stamper, all approved.

### 2. **Acceptance of UASC Summary Notes #82 (October):**

Brad Dennis moved to approve summary notes 82, October 24, 2011. Supported by Ayers, all approved.

### 3. **Chair remarks:**

- WMU Assessment in Action Day, Friday, March 23, 2012.
- Keynote speaker is Dr. Marilee Bresciani
- **Suggested Topics:**
  - Have fellow grant recipients available for active discussion
  - Helpful tips
  - Non-degree granting units: Tips and pointers for successful assessment
  - Evaluation of proposal process
  - Rubric session
  - Process orientation: forward suggestions to Karen Stokes Chapo
  - Karen Stokes Chapo received her 15 yr service pin.

### 4. **Finalize Graduate Student Assessment Grant:**

**Discussion:**

- Cummings moved to accept the grant application changes, supported by Ayers, all approved.

### 5. **Review of sample assessment plan from the CoEHD:**

**Discussion:**

CoEHD sample is ready for approval

### 6. **Assessment Plans:**

**Discussion:**

- Assessment plans are **due Wednesday, February 1, 2012**, to unit Consultation on Assessment and Review Team. (CART).

## **Assessment Plans Continued:**

### **Discussion:**

- This ensures enough time for revisions and resubmissions in March.
- 1/3 of Chairs have received plans.

## **Discuss Final Assessment Reporting Process:**

- See Roles of the UASC Sheet

## **7. Discuss Role of UASC in General Education Assessment:**

### **Rubrics:**

- Very good at the process, see 2004-2005 series of rubrics
- Some distribution areas were putting in their own learning outcomes.
- Made new rubric, following WMU learning outcomes.
- Course evaluation/rubric discrepancy. Reinhold purposed 2004-2005 data final report numbers, data gathering vs. assessment
- Who manages benchmarks? Application? Goals & Objectives?
- Rewrite outcomes for class, Reinhold to Faculty Senate.
- Reinhold suggested proficiencies, COGE manage general education area
- Reinhold suggested distribution areas made up of faculty that teach in that area.
- Does the UASC need to be involved in this process, and if so how?
- What is UASC involvement?
- Suggested:
  - UASC received report
  - Value in keeping separate the process and evaluation process. COGE representation from all colleges.
  - Faculty Senate model work with any general education area
  - Area eight is struggling
  - UGSC: (Undergraduate Studies Council) curriculum committee to make changes.
  - Reinhold may suggest to Faculty Senate, add proficiencies to COGE, then make recommendations to UGSC.

### **General Education Comments:**

- Model should fit TracDat. Distribution area, tell Reinhold.
- Distribution groups decide the action areas for data. Benchmarks, what to do?
- Time-line, review again, will not assess every year. Faculty would know one year in advance, three year cycle.
- Look at overall outcomes, area eight, etc..
- Criteria = learning outcomes
- COGE-Courses there after three years, 3, 6, 7yr, go to COGE. Decide, what stays/goes.
- Action plan may change criteria, go to department for review
- UASC support and coach committees, reach out to academic areas that are spread out.
- What units are underway, and what units need more attention?
- Help faculty with assessment and distribution areas.

### **General Education Details:**

- UASC help faculty with assessment, especially distribution areas: For example, history and geography.
- History should be assessed by history.
- General Education courses need to be assessed, find in COGE.
- Learning outcomes for major, not Gen ED, look for assessment in general education distribution areas.
- Get faculty to use rubric first, then move to assessment plan.
- Cryptic information:
  - How to find course outcomes?
  - Distribution areas criteria/learning outcomes/rubric, how much more?
  - Sometimes learning outcomes do not match criteria.
  - Disconnect, we need to change.
    1. Reinhold suggested distribution area faculty are looking at assessment data, write report to UASC
    2. UASC offer assistance to faculty.
    3. Some distribution areas are not tied to one department, need to be reviewed, others are more complex.

### **8. Individual and Unit Assessment Awards:**

#### Discussion:

- Awards given at Assessment in Action Day
- Individual 1yr, Unit 2nd yr.
- What is our pattern?
- Both awards, or one per year? Offer both, allocate?
- Offer both awards every year?
  - Motion supported by all to offer both awards, (individual and unit) every year.

### **9. Revising UASC wording in manual and website:**

#### Discussion:

- UASC website, change purpose to goals
- Bullet points for purpose
- Executive group will review
- Also UASC manual on website, looking for consistency
- Stokes-Chapo will review the document and update purpose to Goals/Purpose
  - Motion made by Stokes-Chapo and seconded by Darrah, to have Stokes-Chapo make the above changes. Supported by all.

**The next meeting is Monday, January 30, 2012, at 2 p.m., room 3150, Schneider Hall**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m. (Betty Dennis/Darrah)

Respectfully submitted: Beth van den Hombergh