

UAP Meeting
Friday, February 2, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Altgeld 203

Present: Arado, Ballantine, Coley, Daniel, Doyle, Gipson, Gorman, Osorio, Subramony, and Umoren

Guests: Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Mike Ezell, Acting Chair, Department of Sociology;

1. Announcements

- No announcements

2. Assessment Plan for the Proposed M.S. in Health Sciences

- Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, was on hand to discuss the plan with the group
- This is a new program and we are hoping it helps fill in some gaps in Health Sciences; we are still developing it
- SLOs – thought they were pretty broad in terms of numbers but they were well defined and well written
- SLO #8 – this is a method to measure an outcome – how does that work? Would be stronger as just a method and not an outcome
- SLO #1 – level of evidence – what does that mean? One should be able to sort through the level of quality and quantity of research; the word “level” might not be the right word for this; could just say “evaluate evidence” and leave out the word “level”
- Don’t have a thesis option or master paper at the end
- Curriculum Map – need to complete 30 credit hours
- Curriculum Map - Electives – foot note should be added to more define what an “elective” is, this area just needs some more explanation
- Assessment Methods – could you add more course imbedded info from other courses? Can they give you data?
- Professional Development Plan – there will be a portfolio they will put together for comprehensive exam
- Methods by Outcomes Matrix needs a few corrections
- Core courses will be offered online but they will not be taking all of their courses online
- Employer feedback? That will become a Program Outcome down the line

Assessment Plan and Status Report for the B.A./B.S. in Sociology

- Mike Ezell, Acting Chair, Department of Sociology, was on hand to discuss the report with the group
- By doing this exercise it has pointed out to us that the SLOs were wordy, perfect for a sociologist to read them but not for just anyone to read them. The Assessment committee is currently updating SLOs and looking over them and making sure they fit the with department better and the students better; while also making sure they still get faculty buy in with them and the changes they are making
- SLOs - trying to break out qualitative and quantitative skills

- SLO #5 – First half very career preparation oriented and the second have talks about theory; maybe switch them?
- SLO #1 – too dense, some levels seem too high for a bachelor’s degree
- SLO #3 – the second sentence and after, is almost like rubric language
- SLOs - Should things be in some sort of logical order?
- Curriculum Map – 400 level courses – they are required to take two of those courses – that needs to be said, it is not specific, maybe add a foot note stating they need to take two 400 level courses and a general statement about the electives
- Assessment Methods – Some of these are voluntary exercises and that is a concern if you will get the data that you need
- Internships – not a requirement, just an option; how many students take it? About 15 each semester takes it (out of about 300 students); more students would like to do it but there are different reasons why they can’t – they have a job, too much gas money, no car to get there, etc.
- Assessment Method - Add more course imbedded for courses early on for data collection
- Assessment Method by Outcomes Matrix – typo – Evaluation and Internships section recheck
- SLO #2 – Assessment Method Result – the percent’s presented are confusing; may need to be rewritten to be more clear

Assessment Plan and Status Report for the M.A. in Sociology

- Mike Ezell, Acting Chair, Department of Sociology, was on hand to discuss the report with the group
- Program has undergone significant changes due to the audience; target audience has changed; an internship route has been created, a thesis is not beneficial to them; internship allows them to apply skills to career goals; this Masters for a lot of students is a terminal degree and are not looking to go on to a Ph.D.; some students will go onto a Ph.D. though
- Go deeper into the rubric that is being used for the overall
- At what point do they take the comprehensive exam? Depends on what route they are on; that information should be clear and added in
- Clarify “Theory Component” as part of the “Comprehensive Exam Assessment Rubric”
- You could add in Performance Indicators or examples of them in the Assessment Rubric in the High Pass, Pass and Fail areas

3. HLC 2018 Assurance Argument – Ritu Subramony

- HLC Criteria’s has submitted narrative’s. It will be combined into one document and will be sent to the Review Group, which includes Carolinda Douglass, Beth Towell and Brad Bond. It will also be sent to Senior Leadership for review after changes have been made by the Review Group.

4. Other Business

- No other business

Notes – Not on our Rubric but maybe it should be (suggested by David Gorman) – SLO – Should things be in some sort of logical order?

Meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

Next meeting Friday, February 16, 2018, 10:00 a.m. in Altgeld 203