

University Assessment Panel (UAP) Meeting
Friday, December 7, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Altgeld 315

Present: Abendroth, Arado, Ballantine, Brain, Coley, Comber, Douglass, Doyle, Ferdowski, Gipson, Hathaway, Hogan, Holtz, Jackel, Osorio, Siblik, Subramony, and Zack

Guests: Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education; David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education; Pam Taylor, Director, School of Nursing; Daniel Boutin, Associate Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Health Professions and Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences

1. Announcements

- Shevawn Eaton is retiring later this month and will no longer be on the UAP and representing the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. Michaela Holtz, Director of Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning will now be representing the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs.
- Brad Cripe, Janet Hathaway and David Ballantine will serve as representatives of the UAP on the Mission Review and Revision Working Group.

2. Review of Assessment Plans and Status Reports

- i. B.S. in Athletic Training – Assessment Plan and Status Report
 - Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education; and David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education were in attendance to discuss the report.
 - Context: This program has been on campus for 20 years now. All B.S. programs in the field will be phased out now per a decision made by the accrediting body for the program. Master’s program will be the entry level for the field now. NIU’s Master’s program is launching in summer 2020. Also holding interviews to add some faculty to the program given that we had two leave earlier this year.
 - SLOs: clarify where feedback is provided e.g., SLO #7 – seems to be a run on sentence; part of the sentence doesn’t make sense; “critically appraised topic” explain what this is; many SLOs say they are being measured by “evaluation” but then it doesn’t say what that is.
 - Methods: Please include formative methods, double-check the matrix, and add Alumni Survey as a method. Further, Please clarify targets e.g., Page 8 – what is the individual student level target?
 - Results – sample size and date should always be included. Each SLO needs to have a result; not always the case here. Even though the program is closing, we want to make sure the last few cohorts have a strong experience in the program and the department learns from the closing and opening of the new program.
- ii. Ph.D. in Health Studies – Assessment Plan and Status Report
 - Daniel Boutin, Associate Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Health Professions; and Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences attended to discuss the report.
 - Context: Program opened in 2015. Fifty students are now in the program.

- Very precise SLOs; well-aligned measures; good assessment plan.
 - Methods – clear and appropriate; please add dates/timing of collection.
Program noted that they would gather alumni feedback once they have alumni.
 - Advisory committee – looking at forming one; it can also serve as employer feedback. Members asked if students had any interactions with community agencies as part of the program; it was revealed that many students come from community agencies, a lot of them bring personal/professional experiences with them into discussions during class participation.
 - Reporting results – very few students to work with on this; but it was mentioned that the program worked very well with what they had; very good structure set up for the future; breakdown results based on demographics too.
 - Use of results – limitations due to number of students currently in the program;
 - As students are graduating, maybe start doing an exit survey to see how the SLOs were experienced by the program participants.
- iii. B.S. in Nursing – Assessment Plan and Status Report
- Maryann Abendroth, Associate Professor, School of Nursing and Director of Undergraduate Nursing Program; and Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences attended to discuss the report.
 - SLOS: SLO 1 and 2 – clarify what “evaluates” encompasses. A member asked if “cultural diversity” is covered as a SLO in the M.S. should it also be in the B.S.? The program mentioned they would like to discuss adding it in the BS as well.
 - Methods: Having the rubrics in the appendix was very helpful. A suggestion was made to use more mid-level assessments. Alumni survey satisfaction results seemed really low; maybe add more supplemental questions to address the SLOs.
 - Results – presented by Method rather than SLO; it got confusing; wonderful data just not super clear; suggestion to report by SLO not methods. Very comprehensive otherwise. Program had some discussion of wanting to address “assessment of student learning” in faculty job descriptions.
- iv. M.S. in Nursing – Assessment Plan and Status Report
- Pam Taylor, Director, School of Nursing; and Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences attended to discuss the report.
 - Context: The program has gone through several changes the last few years. The program is currently online 100% (since 2015)
 - SLOs: Program clarified that some of the SLO language is essential in reference to their accrediting body. Suggestions were made for refining specific SLOs e.g., SLO 7, 9.
 - Methods: The program noted it has started to send out employer survey/advisory board surveys online, and are hoping to get a better response. Student level and program level targets should be the same but why are not they like that on some of the ones on pages 4 and 5? A note was made that Fall 2017 to Spring 2018 data shows a big difference in results between cohorts on page 8. Please address why:
 - Sample size is different between the semesters.
 - Consider disaggregating data to see why there is such a big difference.
 - Results: List by outcome rather than by method.

- v. Doctor of Nursing Practice – Assessment Plan and Status Report
 - Pam Taylor, Director, School of Nursing; and Beverly Henry, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences were in attendance to discuss the report
 - Context: Fall 2017 was the first cohort. There have not been graduates yet.
 - SLO's – very well done
 - Some seem dense, like SLO #5, but is this because they address PhD outcomes?
 - Methods: #3 – pull that one out – not really a good assessment on how well they learned. Use direct methods where feasible e.g., SLO's 4, 6 and 7 – only summative and indirect. Consider if there is a direct method to assess these?
 - Appendix C – how is this being used? Do all of the categories cover everything?
 - Expectations are high. No one has gotten to this part of the program yet so not sure, if this is going to be too hard or not yet.
 - Results: Student survey should focus more on environment, resources and DNP evaluation. Program Evaluation Committee – newly formed to just look at evaluations.

3. Other Business

4. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

Next meeting Friday, January 18, 2019, 10:00 a.m. in Altgeld 315