University Assessment Committee (UAC)

Annual Report 2012-2013

May 2, 2013

Members: Graham Casssano (Chair), Aaron Bird, Tanya Christ, David Kidger (Fall), Maura Selahowski, Chris Kobus, Kuniko Nielsen, Sally Tardella, Linda Hildebrand, Cynthia Miree-Coppin, Laura Schartman, Marilyn Mouradjian, Barbara Joyce, Rob Nehmer

Support staff at OIRA: Reuben Ternes

Highlights of the year's work:

- Reports and/or plans reviewed for 22 programs, including an assessment plan for one new program, the Masters in Public Health.
- The UAC began the process of updating templates for plans and reports.
- The UAC made a systematic attempt to contact programs who have been late or non-responsive to UAC assessment report requests. In most cases, this opened lines of communication between the programs and the UAC, allowing the UAC to assist programs still finding difficulty with the assessment process.
- UAC teams continued to meet with departments and programs face-to-face as needed to support plan and report development.

Events held:

- Assessment Open House – February 6th & 7th

Assessment Award:

- The UAC decided that no single report for the assessment period met the criteria for an assessment award.
- The UAC awarded an assessment grant of $500 to Anthropology in order to pursue methods to quantify qualitative assessment data.

The Assessment Committee's activities related to the "Senate's Charge to the Assessment Committee" in 2012-2013 appear below:

Charge:

1. *To coordinate and advise on the planning and implementation of assessment by academic units.*
   a. The assessment committee distributes report due dates over a two-year cycle, so reports for approximately 25% of all programs/departments are due each semester. Programs which still lack an approved assessment plan (of which there are very few) or

which fail to submit reports in a timely manner are sent reminders each semester.

b. Assessment committee members work in teams to review plans and reports. The team provides a summary to the committee and prepares a response letter for the program/department.

c. When a program/department receives a letter responding to their plan or report, they are given names of the team members who reviewed the plan/report to contact with questions or concerns. In addition, if the team members have any questions or concerns about the plan or report, they will often meet face to face with a representative from the program/department to address their concerns before the response letter is sent. These face to face meetings have proven to be very helpful for both the committee and the programs/departments.

d. Names of the plans and reports reviewed during the 2012-2013 academic year are listed at the end of this report.

e. An "open house" workshop was held in February of 2013 for representatives of university programs and departments to work directly, but informally with UAC members. The event was held over two days and was very well attended. There were two primary benefits from this workshop. First, draft versions of assessment plans and reports were given a 'first look' by UAC members so that suggestions for improvement could be incorporated by program representatives before a final draft was officially submitted to the committee. Second, the event was low key and supportive of faculty members in attendance, which served to enhance good will between the UAC and university programs.

2. *To prepare an overall University Assessment Plan which meets the requirements of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and to consult with the staff of that Association, as appropriate, to insure that the Plan and its implementation continue to meet Association standards;*

a. The plan was updated in 2005/2006. NCA conducted a site visit in April 2009 that included a review of the university's assessment activities. The assessment committee continues to evaluate their processes and is making improvements as needed. It is our goal to further review the UAC plan and report templates and discuss possible future implementation of a more user-friendly approach.

3. *To advise and cooperate with the General Education Committee in planning and carrying out assessment of the University's general education program;*

a. Two OIRA members (one of which is the Director of OIRA) sit on both the UAC and the GEC and act as liaisons, providing valuable insight to both committee and apprising each committee of the other's work.

4. *To advise the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University Committee on Undergraduate Instruction, and the Graduate Council on the findings of the assessment program and their implications for specific program reviews and for maintaining and improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction in general; and*
   a. Copies of all response letters to plans and reports are sent to the relevant deans and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

5. *To report to the University Senate and the Assemblies of the organized faculties on the findings of the assessment program and their implications for maintaining and improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate curricula and instruction at the University.*
   a. This annual report serves as the Senate report on assessment findings for 2012-2013; a copy is also sent to each assembly.

Plans reviewed 2012-2013

1. Master of Public Health
2. Master of Training & Development
3. Master of Reading & Language Arts
4. Master of Industrial & Systems Engineering

Reports reviewed 2012-2013

1. Systems Engineering (PhD)
2. Linguistics (UG)
3. Psychology (UG)
4. Women & Gender Studies (UG)
5. General Management (UG)
6. Safety Management (MS)
7. Master of Education in Educational Leadership
8. Social Work (UG)
9. Counseling (MA)
10. Master of Public Administration
11. Master of Training & Development
12. English (UG)
13. History (UG)
14. Wellness, Health Promotion, & Injury Prevention (UG)
15. Math (UG)
16. Political Science (UG)
17. Information Technology Management (MS)
18. Communication (UG)