

UAP Meeting  
Friday, April 2, 2021  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
ZOOM

**Members**

**Present:** Andrew Setterstrom, Alecia Santuzzi, Nicholas Grahovec, Hasan Ferdowsi, Hyun-Mee Joung, Elizabeth Moxley, Dennis Brown, Therese Arado, Jenn-Terng Gau, Nestor Osorio, Carolinda Douglass, Carrie Zack, Tawanda Gipson, Jeanie Sparacino, Audra Jensen, Taylor Atkins

**Guests:** Shengde Zhou, Vishnu Zutshi

1. Announcements

- a. Update from the Assessment Task Force- Alecia Santuzzi gave an update. The task force has broken into three sub-groups to address three main components of the issue: education/professional development, process aspects involving AAE and dynamics within programs regarding assessment practice, and adjustments to the reporting template for the annual update. The task force members have reviewed survey data and are in the process of drafting a report for the UAP and the Faculty Senate by April 15<sup>th</sup>.
- b. Update on General Education Assessment- Carrie Zack gave an update. The GEC is getting ready to present a draft plan to the UAP at the next meeting. She and Ritu have been helping translate the plan into what the UAP template asks for. Primarily, the presentation to the UAP will review the SLO's they plan to use and the presenters will be looking for feedback from UAP members on this. Future plans will involve identifying which courses will address which SLO's, how the SLOs will be assessed and according to what schedule-logistics. A small pilot test of the process will be conducted this semester with a couple of faculty members who are members of the GEC. This will provide a preview of how the process might work and what may be needed to be addressed prior to a larger pilot.
- c. HLC Quality Initiative Update-Carolinda Douglass gave an overview. Jason Rhode granted UAP members access to the QI materials in Teams for the UAP members to see what progress has been made.

2. Continuing the Conversation on Equity in Assessment

- a. UAP Equity and Assessment Subcommittee Update- Therese Arado gave an update, having the subcommittee helps to keep the conversation going and moving forward, thinking through and discussing ways to improve the process for everyone while addressing equity.
- b. Proposal to amend the Bylaws – Voting next meeting. Carrie Zack reviewed the language of the proposed addition to the Bylaws regarding the UAP. The purpose of the amendment is to make the Equity and Assessment Subcommittee a permanent feature of UAP. This proposal is submitted for a first read at the April 2 meeting. It will be revisited for voting and discussion at the April 16 meeting.

3. Review of Assessment Plans and Status Reports – Introductions were made
  - a. B.S. in Biological Sciences – Shengde Zhou was present for the program  
UAP Panel gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
    - i. SLOs – Consider using higher level action verbs and adding more specific information to specify how the learning will be demonstrated by the student.
    - ii. Curriculum map – Very thorough
    - iii. Methods – Methods tend to focus on experiences at the end of the program (e.g. capstone). Consider adding formative assessments to measure where students are prior to senior year.
    - iv. Results – The line chart was a helpful visual display of the data.
    - v. Use of results – Consider making the more use of data by disaggregating it. For example, examining results for different groups of students (e.g. those pursuing different emphases in the degree program) to look at whether performance is equitable.
  - b. M.S. in Biological Sciences  
UAP gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
    - i. SLOs- Most of the SLOs are identical to those of the B.S. program. It would be helpful to differentiate in terms of level of skill expected; what should M.S. students be able to do by the end of their programs that would not be expected of B.S. students?
    - ii. Curriculum map – Almost all courses address all outcomes at proficiency level at one point are students just introduced to materials and/or developing skill with them?
    - iii. Methods – Consider whether there may be too many outcomes attached to each assessment method. Perhaps each method focuses primarily on a few SLOs.
    - iv. Results – Results are reported by methods rather than by individual outcomes. More ‘granular’ data would be beneficial (e.g. data specifically related to each individual SLO for each assessment method).
    - v. Use of Results- Further disaggregation could be done and good information could be revealed by going deeper into the results (e.g. gender, race, Pell status, transfer/freshman, international students, or other variables relevant to your student population).
  - c. Ph.D. in Biological Sciences  
UAP gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
    - i. SLOs – The verbs used in the SLOs do not appear consistent with what is required at a PhD level, nor are they measurable as written. Consider using verbs that speak to higher level learning on Bloom’s taxonomy.
    - ii. Curriculum map – All SLOs are listed as proficient in all courses. Are there no formative measures?
    - iii. Methods – Consider whether too many outcomes are attached to each assessment method. Perhaps each method focuses primarily on a few SLOs.

No assessment tools (e.g. rubrics, surveys) were provided to illustrate how each assessment method measures performance on each SLO.

- iv. Results – The charts are helpful; however, more specific information is needed to show the program-level target outcomes.
  - v. Use of results – Further disaggregation could be done and good information could be revealed by going deeper into the results (e.g. gender, race, Pell status, transfer/freshman, international students, or other variables relevant to your student population).
- d. B.S. in Physics – Vishnu Zutshi was introduced  
UAP gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
- i. SLOs – Consider whether too many outcomes are listed in each SLO. Consider rephrasing SLOs to speak specifically to learning versus simply awareness, similar to M.S. SLOs.
  - ii. Curriculum map – Good
  - iii. Methods – There could be additional methods to look at things on a more specific level. Half the methods are connected to all three SLOs
  - iv. Results – Data are not reported for specific rubric items or survey items related to the individual SLO; it would be helpful to see scores on each of the items on the four point rubric described rather than the overall score.
  - v. Use of results – Make the most use of data-disaggregating, such as examining results different groups of students, different emphases, helps examine whether performance is equitable.
- e. M.S. in Physics  
UAP gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
- i. SLOs – SLOs are not measurable as written; for example, how will critical thinking be evident or demonstrated?
  - ii. Curriculum map – Similar to the B.S.
  - iii. Methods – Discussed Advisory Committee as an option for employer and alumni feedback.
  - iv. Results – Reporting more granular data showing performance on each SLO would provide information on areas students may be stronger or weaker at in order to target improvements appropriately.
  - v. Use of results - Make the most use of data-disaggregating, such as examining results different groups of students, different emphases, helps examine whether performance is equitable.
- f. Ph.D. in Physics  
UAP gave feedback and suggestions on the major areas:
- i. SLOs – Discussed the writing of the SLOs so that they are measurable and to identify what it is that is desirable for the student to learn/accomplish.
  - ii. Curriculum map – All outcomes are ‘P,’ are there areas where outcomes are introduced or developed?

- iii. Methods – Assessment targets are relatively vague
- iv. Results – Similar to the master’s program, the data was summarized in general terms rather than with specific criteria to demonstrate areas needing improvement and growth, and the integration of goals, not all methods have been implemented.
- v. Use of results –Make the most use of data-disaggregating, such as examining results different groups of students, different emphases, helps examine whether performance is equitable.

4. Other Business

5. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:59 a.m.  
Next meeting Friday, April 16, 2021