<p style="text-align:center">UAP Meeting
Friday, February 16, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Altgeld 203</p>

Present: Arado, Ballantine, Coley, Comber, Daniel, Douglass, Gipson, Osorio, Siblik and Zack

Guests: Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education; Steven Howell Associate Professor, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education (by phone); David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education and Leslie Matuszewich, Chair, Department of Psychology

1. Announcements
   - No announcements

2. Assessment Plan for the Proposed B.S. in Sport Management
   - Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education; Steven Howell Associate Professor, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education (by phone) and David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education, were on hand to discuss the plan with the group
   - SLO #8 uses the verbs "develop and acquire". These verbs seem incongruent in terms of the "level of learning" they invoke, because to "acquire" seems lower-level than "to develop"
   - SLO #1 and #8 seem very similar, in that both refer to practical application of knowledge; they may need to be combined or further differentiated
   - SLO #3 and #5 also overlap, because legal issues (#3) are also modern issues (#5); guests mentioned these are differentiated due to accreditation standards; UAP members encouraged the guests to mention how accreditation informs their assessment in their Assessment Plan (or at least that their Plan is informed by "best practices")
   - SLO #7, which uses the verb "advance" is slightly vague; it isn't clear what students would do to advance their communication skills
   - Method - Rubrics are needed; the "Course-Related Evidence" method should already have rubrics available, since it is based on coursework done for other existing programs
   - Method - Also for the "Course-Related Evidence" method, the program-level target was slightly vague; it seems like 85% of students need to pass 100% of assignments within the portfolio, but the passing threshold for each assignment is unclear; just to note, it is uncommon to have different program-level targets for each aspect of an assignment
   - Method - For the "Internship" method, it seemed odd that your program-level target was for 100% of students to meet the student-level target (3 "average" or better on a 5-point scale); having 100% be "average or above average" is odd
   - Method - Currently, all methods measure most SLOs; can this be broken down further, based on which methods are the best at addressing specific methods?

<p style="text-align:center">1</p>

- Method - For the Curriculum Map, could interdisciplinary courses be evaluated for coverage of SLOs? For example, students' Business courses may cover some of your SLOs

Assessment Plan and Status Report for the B.A./B.S. in Psychology
- Leslie Matuszewich, Chair, Department of Psychology, was on hand to discuss the report with the group
- SLOs made sense, but it seemed like there weren't that many; are your current SLOs specific enough to discuss your students' performance? Furthermore, do they comprehensively describe all the essential ways your students are expected to perform?
- SLO #1 and #4 seem similar, regarding theoretical perspectives; however, as noted by the guest, it makes sense that their distinction is breadth vs. depth; this distinction could be clarified by rewording your SLOs
- When wording SLOs, always consider, "How will this be measured?" That is, how do students demonstrate that they have the appropriate knowledge/skills/etc.? Evidence of students' learning will go beyond a class grade, because a grade can indicate other things like attendance, assignment lateness, etc.
- The guest noted that students are expected to take 3 out of 4 Psychology content areas (currently unidentified in the Assessment Plan); it was suggested that the coverage of each content area in a course could be identified in the Curriculum Map; is each content area receiving adequate coverage of each SLO?
- Method - Similar to how grades are not good assessment methods because many factors can affect a grade, the same is true for using "whether or not students took a course" as an assessment method
- Method - Assessing early formative methods may be a challenge, because the guest noted that many 100-level and 200-level classes are comprised of non-majors
- Method - Assessment methods do not need to be complicated; as long as you have rationale for how a method assesses the learning described in a SLO, you can even use multiple-choice tests
- Method - If there are issues with securing other faculty buy-in, then you don't need to ask faculty to do additional work; simply ask them for the assignment data that they already have.
- Method - If you feel like you have too many students to conduct assessment efficiently, then consider accessing a representative sub-sample of assignments for each of your methods; then, conduct assessment with those sub-samples
- Reporting Results - Overall, in this section, specifications of program-level targets and student-level targets were a little vague; in addition, some methods include sample sizes whereas others don't
- Reporting Results - For results related to the first method of SLO #1, the breakdown of students' performance for different performance areas is very helpful; it not only conveys whether students passed, but also whether they did well; it is encouraged that the program do this for other methods as well
- Reporting Results - For results related to the second method of SLO #1, the anchors seemed to be the reverse of what is anticipated (i.e., low scores = better outcomes);

reverse-coding and making high scores = better outcomes may aid in interpretation of your table

- Use of Results - The Alumni Survey method is being removed, but is something replacing it? According to the guest, the most informative parts of the Alumni Survey involved questions of critical thinking skills, but those were removed from the survey
- Psychology used to do its own alumni survey, but the guest was unsure of the status of that survey
- Use of Results - An alternative to the Alumni Survey might be exit interviews, which would be relatively easy to conduct

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

- Leslie Matuszewich, Chair, Department of Psychology, was on hand to discuss the report with the group
- SLOs - Out of all psychology programs, only one is a terminal M.A. (School Psychology); therefore, there is a lot of overlap between the M.A. and Ph.D. programs; some students stop after earning their M.A., too; the SLOs between the M.A. and Ph.D. programs overlap out of necessity
- SLOs - Having two sections ("Primary Objectives" and "SLOs") at the beginning of your Assessment Plan was confusing; the Primary Objective looked very similar to SLOs, and it wasn't clear what they were or why they needed their own section
- SLO #4 mentioned completion of a dissertation, which seems inappropriate for a M.A. Assessment Plan
- SLO #7 regarding diversity is a program goal and not a student-specific learning outcome; therefore, it will be important for Program Review, but it shouldn't be in your Assessment Plan
- SLOs - During the UAP, there was a discussion of procedural knowledge vs. content knowledge; students need to at least understand research procedures in order to discern if they agree with research-related conclusions; should SLOs distinguish between procedures and content? That may be a useful distinction related to student learning, and it is missing from the current SLOs
- Methods - The panel having access to rubrics and other assessment tools (e.g., items on the internship survey) would be helpful (Also suggested for PhD Psychology program)
- Methods - The writing center rubric may provide a good example of the skills/abilities that students should be practicing on assignments; understanding these will help you to understand which skills/abilities should be written into SLOs, so that these skills/abilities can be demonstrated with your methods; again, grades don't provide much information about these individual skills/abilities, because grades are too high-level and contain too much other information (e.g., attendance, assignment lateness)
- Methods – The staff in Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation can have a consultation with the Psychology program to help enhance understanding of assessment
- Reporting Results - Same comments as B.A./B.S. program

- Use of Results - Clinical accreditation came up during the Panel; evidence provided to the accrediting body could be collected on an annual basis from all psychology students, which would provide the foundation for your program-wide assessment efforts

Assessment Plan and Status Report for the Ph.D. in Psychology
- Leslie Matuszewich, Chair, Department of Psychology, was on hand to discuss the report with the group
- Methods - The goal of assessment is to continuously assess students throughout program; for example, additional formative methods would help you identify if students are doing well in the program prior to reaching certain milestones several years into the program (e.g., milestones such as taking comprehensive exams after being in the program for a few years)
- Methods - Formative methods allow you to improve the curricula for current students, whereas summative methods are only helpful to future students
- Methods - If collecting data each year proves cumbersome, then you don't have to; the goal of assessment is to get an idea of whether your students are learning in your program… and to obtain that idea in a way that is convenient and informative to you
- Reporting Results - Some SLOs had no data (e.g., SLO #5), but the guest acknowledged that these data will be collected soon
- Use of Results - It sounds like there was a method (i.e., mock interviews) that would be useful for involving employer feedback, aside from the current internship evaluations; if this would be informative to your program, you may want to consider using it as an assessment method in the future

3. Program Review Summary Report for 2017 – Carolinda Douglass

4. Assessment Expo 2018 – Ritu Subramony

5. HLC 2018 Assurance Argument – Ritu Subramony

6. Other Business
- No other business

Meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.
Next meeting Friday, March 2, 2018, 10:00 a.m. in Altgeld 203