

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT PANEL

Notes from Meeting of
21 April 2017

The University Assessment Panel (UAP) meeting was held on Friday, 21 April 2017, at 10:00 a.m. in Altgeld 203.

Assessment Plan for Jobs PLUS

The Assessment Plan for Jobs PLUS was discussed. Chad Glover, Director, Jobs PLUS, Chris Budnick, Graduate Assistant for Assessment and Research, Jobs PLUS, Rushika De Bruin, Graduate Intern, JOBS Plus and Anthony Guzzaldo, Program Advisor and Assessment Coordinator, Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning were on hand to discuss the report and answer any questions the group may have had. Feedback will be sent to the program.

Assessment Plan for General Education

The assessment plan for General Education was discussed. Leslie Matuszewich, Chair, Department of Psychology and Bette Montgomery, Area Coordinator, School of Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences were on hand to discuss the plan and answer any questions the group may have had. Carolinda Douglass gave a brief history on the General Education Committee (GEC) starting back in 2004 when HLC was here and had some concerns about us assessing our general education outcomes. NIU had committed to being more engaged in the Gen. Ed. assessment process at that time. Data from the past three and a half years would be needed as evidence for the HLC 2018 Review. If there is not data from the previous Gen. Ed. goals or the new Plus goals, that could raise concerns. The GEC does hope to get some data this spring that hopefully we will be able to add into the report that will be submitted for HLC review.

Re: Gen. Ed. Assessment Plan. For some of the members it was hard to figure out in the Mission, Goals and Objectives section what the “objectives” were. The suggestion was given to say “Objective 1:” and then list the objective and explanation. Listing it that way might be an easier way to understand it in the report rather than having them listed in bullet form. Members noted that the goals and objectives were not discernable. Ritu Subramony noted that if you refer to the assessment plan and status report template it will walk you through the sections. Another suggestion was to ensure the goals that are listed in the current plan are goals of the General Education Plus program and not the goals of the assessment plan.

Some of the questions raised by the group were “how will faculty provide data to the GEC?” and “who is responsible for collecting it?”. Some comments were made from the group that the Methods section focuses on the history of Gen. Ed. rather than explaining what methods will be used to collect data on Student Learning Outcomes.

Ritu Subramony suggested that the UAP request the GEC to resubmit their assessment plan to the UAP in fall 2017. The staff in Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation would be happy to meet with them over the summer and help them revise their plan so they can submit it in the fall. The group agreed this would ultimately benefit the Plus program. Feedback will be sent to the GEC.

The UAP is recommending that the GEC come back with a revised assessment plan with objectives that are measureable in fall 2017.

Feedback from the 2017 Assessment Expo

Ritu Subramony, Director, Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation and Sarah Coley, Graduate Assistant, Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation presented a PowerPoint presentation on the feedback from the 2017 Assessment Expo. Comments and suggestions were made from the UAP members. A few members said they like participating in Brown Bags and other types of gatherings that are similar to that and likes the idea of the Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation (AAE) office putting together those types of gatherings. It was also mentioned that they liked the idea of partnering up with the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center (FDIDC) office to put together some events or workshops. Several members thought it might be a good idea to partner with FDIDC to get some help on developing online tutorials. Short quick online tutorials on assessment topics that are only 2-3 minutes long on very specific topics might be very useful to staff/faculty. A few topics that were suggested were “how to write a SLO” and “language of assessment”. For example, words such as “formative”, “summative”, “indirect”, and “direct”. Having a quick tutorial explaining what these words mean would be very helpful.

Another suggestion was to ask the staff/faculty member who wrote the report “what would have helped you?” and then do tutorials on those topics. It was also brought up that we need to provide more support for academic support units as not all units report on SLO’s. It was asked if we could take all the rubrics from this year and put them all together and see what the overall problem areas were and where reports suffered the most. Then see how we can help programs in the future in those areas.

Another suggestion that was made for future expo planning is to send out a survey to see what topics people would like to see addressed at the expo. Do they have questions they would like addressed? Maybe some discussion questions?

HLC 2018 Assurance Argument

Ritu gave an update on the HLC 2018 assurance argument reminding the group that the report is due in June 2018. This will be a standing item on the agenda for the 2017-2018 academic year. Ritu reminded the group of the five core components: Mission; Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct; Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support; Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement; and Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. See you in fall 2017! Have a great summer!