

# Equitable and Useful Assessment Reporting ALE Compiled Meeting Minutes

2/14/24

| Breakout Room                                              | Facilitator              |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <a href="#">Co-curricular</a>                           | Patti Gregg              |
| 2. <a href="#">Core curriculum</a>                         | Jill Kern                |
| 3. <a href="#">Core curriculum</a>                         | Roxan Alexander-Arntson  |
| 4. <a href="#">Core curriculum</a>                         | Gretchen Meyers          |
| 5. <a href="#">Graduate program assessment</a>             | Yan Cooksey              |
| 6. <a href="#">Graduate program assessment</a>             | Bobbijo Pinnelli         |
| 7. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>        | Fiona Chrystall          |
| 8. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>        | Chadd Engel/Terry Barnum |
| 9. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>        | Amy Svirsky - no notes   |
| 10. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>       | Shannon Helfinstine      |
| 11. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>       | Jessica Turos            |
| 12. <a href="#">Undergraduate program assessment</a>       | Sarah Wu                 |
| 13. <a href="#">Post-graduation tracking and reporting</a> | Sarah Drummond           |

## Key Takeaways from the Participants

Room 1:

- Not adding work, tweaking what's already being done (helps with faculty buy-in).
- Showing how useful the data are.

Room 2:

- Assessment credibility depends on technical quality of the process and instruments.

Room 3:

- If you don't have a comprehensive assessment system, you're not alone.
- Bringing faculty from multiple disciplines together to build and critique rubrics brings perspective and weakens silos.

Room 4:

- This is a relationship job. Building relationships is key.

Room 5:

- Streamline the assessment process to make it more meaningful to faculty so they can demonstrate using assessment data for continuous improvement. .
- Have a process equitable but also take into account the individualities for especially for graduate programs that do things differently.

Room 6:

- Assuring equity/diversity in the assessment committee (decision makers).
- Institutional initiatives that prioritize equitable practices.
- Core outcomes at the graduate levels that support a common experience.

Room 7:

- Dedicated time to get the right people in the room together to talk about assessment is important
- Use peer review to do multiple things to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the assessment process
- "Partially met" judgments of assessment efforts can be helpful, particularly in getting faculty to appreciate the importance of a more detailed analysis of results in order to determine specific actions upon which to focus.

Room 8:

- Including a criterion in faculty annual evaluations for assessment of student learning. Helped get some "skin in the game" to ensure that the assessment work is done and done with integrity and care.
- Raising the importance of assessment as a way to improve student learning outcomes is essential; helpful to introduce comparison with peers to help faculty understand relative strengths and opportunities to improve.

Room 10:

- College/Program-level Liaisons (trained and visible) important for communication
- Getting usable, welcome assessment feedback to departments in timely manner

Room 13:

- Role of accreditation in post graduation tracking and the variety of data programs want to track.

# The burning question that brought you to this ALE?

## Room 1:

- Ongoing conversation about the connecting co-curricular learning to Program/Course level outcomes.
- Want to hear everyone's burning questions
- Institution felt like they had a good handle on academic assessment, now moving toward co-curricular; how to collect and analyze data to draw meaningful conclusions
- How does library demonstrate contribution to student success?

## Room 2:

- What can be done to constructively collect, integrate, and use assessment of student learning outcomes for purposes beyond accreditation?
- How can we make use of assessment results when our assessments are subjective? Faculty at my college do not want to share assessment methods or rubrics.
- How can we effectively assess the extent to which strategies to enhance DEI teaching and learning are implemented and succeeding in the college?
- How do we best disseminate action plans and GE committee findings with leadership and college-wide in a way that is useful to each group? No established process yet.
- How do we engage faculty in assessment – how to deal with faculty resistance?
- How can we demonstrate the value added for faculty of their involvement in these processes?

## Room 3:

- Software for assessment for Core Curriculum?
- How do you incentivize instructors to do rubrics?

## Room 4: none stated

## Room 5:

- What are some ways to help programs better differentiate between masters and doctoral programs?
- How can we make the assessment process meaningful and useful when there are differing requirements/expectations (e.g., internal vs external)?
- How to balance the reports for external and internal audiences, and keep the reports meaningful and useful.

## Room 6:

- To what extent do universities use common graduate Institutional Learning Objectives as the Program SLOs?
- What are strategies in graduate programs for more equitable assessment?
- What suggestions might people have for diversifying assessment committees at institutions so that diversity of thought and experiences are represented and influence assessment processes?

- How are others schools differentiating undergraduate from graduate assessment. We have courses and programs with undergraduate and graduate students in the same program or courses, and how are we assessing the different groups.
- How are people collecting and storing data in order to report to varying accreditation bodies?

#### Room 7:

- Looking for new reporting formats that move to action... not just compliance.
- What does "partially met" in an assessment outcome mean? I have been stating that there is only not reported, not met or met.

#### Room 8:

##### *How to make the results transparent and equitable?*

- ACC: Had to disambiguate the assessment of student learning outcomes from individual faculty evaluation of effectiveness. Transparency achieved by using D2L LMS to archive assessment reports so that the campus can see the results. Another hurdle to overcome is focus on compliance with accreditation standards rather than focus on improving student learning over time.
- LCC: Still determining the best method to disseminate assessment results.
- UIndy: Focus on sharing at campus convenings; try to cultivate culture of assessment.
- McGill: Reporting to various disciplinary accreditors; without outside professional orgs; reliant on good will and interest of local academic units. Find that some faculty units are excited about SLO assessment for understanding student growth but uneven. Sharing to campus the various ways that units are using to assess student learning and program outcomes.

##### *Equitable:*

- ACC: Group on campus called Equity & Inclusion Committee. Director of E&I leading group. That campus leader reviews SLOs to evaluate through equity lens, including scoring rubrics.
- Former institution: Focus on gaps in DFW rate; looking at disparate outcomes.
- McGill: Bringing DEI into program level outcomes - looking at Knowledge, Skills, and Values that each program includes.

##### *How to use an assessment report to motivate actions for improvement?*

- ACC: Earlier, assessment results showed strong outcomes; no motivation to grow or adjust expectations for student performance.
- Courtney: At former institution; created template that organized the responses for the assessment report to emphasize improvement steps and timelines.
- McGill: Cyclical program review schedules in about a 5-year cycle; not all involve review of SLO at the program level.
- Josh: Introduced comparison with peer group on SLOs at program level. Was instrumental in helping faculty understand both norm-referenced differences and criterion reference differences in performance at the program level.

##### *How to communicate assessment results to different audiences: administrators, faculty and staff, students, legislatures, accreditors, and the public?*

- Faculty want to drill down in the data, review their own courses; administrators and accreditors prefer data at the aggregate level.
- McGill: Question about how communicate differently to each audience; what works well for faculty vs students vs others?
- ACC: Tend to do an uneven job communicating to students about assessment results.

Room 10:

- Broader dissemination - useful and welcome, moving from silos (using Anthology)
- Approaches to making assessments more useful; lack of published student learning improvement
- Making assessment reporting easier for specialized accreditation; building in the “story” so easier to report out
- Looking for ideas - how to get people to listen - magic words?!?!

Room 11:

- How frequently program reviews are done and who coordinates the process?

Room 12:

- Best practice of assessment and managing, reporting. Software learning, manage resistance, use technology, direct assessment for hi-tech programs

Room 13: none stated

## The experience, tips, strategies, or resources can address your question?

Room 1:

- When we talk about co-curricular assessment, are we focused on what students know, or on student perceptions of services and activities?
- Quizzes about co-curricular knowledge embedded in courses (linked through LMS, no real work required by faculty)

Room 2:

The group voted to focus on the following “burning question”: How do we motivate faculty to collaborate on program-level (or institutional-level) assessment—that is, assessment beyond the individual course-level and using methods that are not specific to a given instructor?

- Define the learning outcomes; defined the objectives that align with the learning outcomes; engage faculty whose disciplines have attributes that will result in the learning outcomes; Engage faculty from different disciplines to share how their courses engage students to attain the learning outcomes; Engage faculty in discussing criteria/rubric that

will allow them to assess students' performances that demonstrate attaining the learning outcomes.

- Create a committee for program or institutional level assessment. Have the committee devise a plan to assess the program or institutional level learning outcomes. Also, charge the committee with creating processes for involving faculty in the program-/institutional assessment of results and the dissemination of findings.
- Faculty professional development is insufficient - mechanisms for incentivizing (internal and external) action must be determined and implemented.
- I believe orientation of faculty to student interest, describing the value of program as well as course level assessment, requiring faculty mechanisms for curriculum review and approval to include and consider details related to indicators and assessments and development and implementation of meaningful incentives for faculty to engage in critical assessment and curriculum work (beyond the usual short shrift given to "service").
- As the associate provost for DEI I am currently meeting with different constituents in the college whose roles are related to DEI to learn about their activities. I am also engaging f
- Empowering faculty (and providing clear expectations) have helped at my institution. Each department is responsible for submitting plans, analyzing, creating action plans, etc., and we have a workshop each semester to help with training and sharing experiences. I also involved the deans in process decision-making, which really helped with buy-in at that level. We started pretty simply - with a shared proficiency scale across the college. Some areas now have a full shared rubric.

#### Room 3:

- No Assessment Software for Nevada State, but have been looking [CourseDog Assessment](#) and [Canvas Insights](#) (eLumen, for Canvas Outcomes)

#### Room 4:

- Elizabeth is at a small community college. She is the only assessment member. Shares on campus with transparency but does not share publicly. Sharing information through their self-study. She is interested in assessment dashboards. Determining the best ways to draw data and create a dashboard that is visible to the public.
- Kim and Becca are in transition to have direct assessment. In the process of getting Watermark. Using grades for program assessment. Focus on building the culture of assessment- Integrated Knowledge Community. Build trust.
- Elizabeth looks at all assessment. She has been challenged to close the loop. She is working on ways to share results on a large scale. They are changing their general education and identifying where to get direct assessment. Indirect is unsatisfying. Currently, she can send out the data to the faculty and staff but they are working on whose responsibility it is to do something with the data. She is working on ways to meaningfully communicate general education assessment out to students in a way that is meaningful.

- Has anyone done a big data meeting? Gretchen shared that her University used to do large data meetings. Some were very successful and others were poorly attended or some faculty would dominate the conversation.
- We discussed how to ensure that the actions from the assessment reports are implemented and tracked.
- Elizabeth shared her strategy of letting other departments know what good is occurring and encouraging

#### Room 5:

- Work with programs and find a way to look at their student performance and what they are doing throughout the year rather than completing the report at the end of the assessment cycle.
- Disaggregating data (i.e., transfer students vs non transfer students, first gen vs. not) helps faculty members and programs be more engaged. Helps us find a way to do better in areas that we are already doing well.
- Having an hour-long meeting listening to the program what they did, and help them complete the annual report.
- Showcase exemplar programs.

#### Room 6:

- Use Niloa toolkits (rubrics to assess processes)
- Establish rubric to review equity in assessment processes (already a resource?)

#### Room 7:

- Annual Assessment Questions
- Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.
  - 1) Briefly, based on the current data available, what is the status of your program? Use the data provided in your annual assessment and explain what it tells us about your program.
  - 2) Looking backwards over the last 1-3 years, what recent changes to this program appear to be having any appreciable effect on your current annual assessment results?
  - 3) Looking forward, what changes to the degree program and/or to your current annual assessment measures, targets and expected outcomes appear to be needed in light of what is summarized in Questions 1 and 2?
- Use of sharepoint as one of the technologies for sharing information and practices
- "Partially met" judgments of assessment efforts can be helpful, particularly in getting faculty to appreciate the importance of a more detailed analysis of results in order to determine specific actions upon which to focus.

#### Room 8:

- Create a template for reporting and continuous improvement to the close loop.
- Compare assessment results to peer institutions to motivate improvement.

#### Room 10:

- Feedback rubrics

- Juried assessments
- Reports, but getting “stuck” at Dean level
- Annual reports - out early Jan (with fall due dates); early fall with summer due dates
- Moving to a 3-year cycle - formative feedback possibly on off years
- Qualtrics allows to collect rubric data (program level)
- Quantitative vs Qualitative feedback
- Have department/college point people/liaisons to approve - very important!
  - Pretty upper level; send out emails; trainings important (guidelines, rubrics), monthly meetings
- Only allow a smaller window for the Plan to be open for submission, e.g., Sept 1-Oct 15
- Separate Reports Vs Plans
- 5 year cycle - 4 years “on”, one year for self-reflection (like program review)

#### Room 11:

- Wayne State - academic program review every 7 years; start with a self study and site visit and follow up meeting with leadership; action plan and follow up on action plan; year 2 meeting and review; self study broad (not just assessment)  
<https://provost.wayne.edu/apr/resources>
- Bowling Green State University - program review every 5 years  
<https://www.bgsu.edu/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-effectiveness/program-review.html>
- SUNY system - program review every 5 years and share across campus
- American Public University System - program reviews used to be every 3 years and now every 5 years
- How do we broaden access to program reviews?
- Repository of best practices for program review
- Data governance - standardizing data across campus
- Listening tour - identify what has worked and not worked for academic program reviews
- Creating community of practice
- \*How to shift from general assessment to DEI considerations?
- SUNY - required DEI in GenEd and required for Middle States Accreditation
- [https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/general-education/suny-ge/FCCC\\_UFS\\_GER-DIVERSITY-ASSESSMENT-RUBRIC-Template\\_Framing-Language-Enumeration-and-Revision.pdf](https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/general-education/suny-ge/FCCC_UFS_GER-DIVERSITY-ASSESSMENT-RUBRIC-Template_Framing-Language-Enumeration-and-Revision.pdf)
- DEI challenges based on state pressures
- Oklahoma - ideal graduate (DEI competencies without using DEI language)

#### Room 12: none stated

#### Room 13:

- Ways to track student data after graduation
  - Student data for purchase (employment data)
  - State database tracking students from state institutions (salary data)
  - State licensure data is available for gather data after graduation

- Survey data response rates can be low
- Types of data to collect
  - Certification
  - Career data
  - Building mentorship data
  - Curriculum Review

## Project/challenges shared and feedback.

### Room 1:

- Low response rates to surveys; how to get better feedback.
  - Find champions, faculty who are willing to devote some class time
  - Disaggregate SLO assessment data, share with entire campus community, so that co-curricular units can collaborate with faculty
- How to get good data?
  - What are you already collecting/tracking? May not need to add new layers

#### *Feedback*

- Needs/goals/barriers/solutions
- Nimblewise (software platform) more affordable than most others, but now part of WEAVE

### Room 2:

- Convincing faculty that assessment and reporting is important and valuable
- Having an organizational structure for assessment is necessary but not sufficient for faculty to collaborate on assessment

### Room 3:

- Faculty showing skepticism about rubrics
- How to do revisions on rubrics properly?
- How do you make sure the Core Curriculum Group is using Data?

#### *Feedback*

- Making Gen Ed Data Retreat Meetings regularly.

### Room 4:

- Elizabeth is working on a graphic that will help students understand the connections between goals.
- Kim and Becca's largest challenge is to get everyone on board with the change to direct assessment and building the culture of assessment.

#### *Feedback*

- This is a relationship job!!!! Building relationships is key.
- Ask the question, "Do we need to assess all of this?"

- Using the tools you have to map but not have to constantly report on everything.
- Elizabeth's group is working on using BlackBoard data to eventually be able to pull data reports that can be shared directly with the faculty.

#### Room 5:

- How is your institution assessment process? Is it integrated with your LMS?
- Reporting templates are more customized for undergraduate programs, do you have any customized reporting templates for graduate programs?

#### *Feedback*

- Streamline the assessment process to make it more meaningful to faculty so they can demonstrate using assessment data for continuous improvement. .
- Have a process equitable but also take into account the individualities for especially for graduate programs that do things differently.

#### Room 6:

- Need a tool that can be used to audit equity in assessment processes and course designs

#### Room 7:

- How do you get reporting formats that get to action, rather than just compliance?
- Are there good examples of formative assessments that supplement summative assessments and perhaps allow us to determine where the need for change within the timeline of a program should occur?
- When do you know you, as an assessment professional, that you are doing something right?

#### *Feedback*

- Make the reporting format end-user friendly and as much a format to plug (in results) and play, as possible.
- Try to ensure that the collective faculty teaching in the program review the results together so they can identify places earlier in the curriculum where changes could be beneficial to address issues identified through summative assessment.
- When the faculty are coming up with ideas on their own and experimenting with new ways to assess without your input, you have done your work well!

#### Room 8:

- How to role a program up to a higher-level program (LCCC). How are you dealing with the assessment when a stackable credential is involved (e.g. certificate to AS)?
  - If certificate is included in degree, just assess degree (ACC); make assumption that any of the assessment of student learning at the program level is embedded in the certificates.
  - Full Sail: Assess at the level of the program, Cert, UG, Grad, etc. Program Learning Outcomes assessed at all levels. Enrolled in only one program at a time.

- How to deal with teams that are behind/not buying in?
  - Courtney: At last institution, some programs were not working on assessment; provided feedback on HLC requirements and got Provost backing at general meeting. Sequencing of communications to campus that ensure wide understanding. McGill: for program SLOs, identify a champion in each department to move forward the culture of assessment; doesn't have to be in leadership role but needs good working relationships with faculty. Invite student input on draft SLO statements that reflect the experiences and learning intended in each program.
  - Jennie: Faculty/departmental-level champion who can help to move initiatives forward; inviting student reflections / feedback on their experience (e.g., what's an assignment that helped you learn?) that can reflect back to instructors specific examples of learning already happening.
  - Robin: Challenge to keep track of data, resources.

#### Room 10:

- Problem with getting feedback to all programs in a timely manner
- Having productive liaisons - relationships important
- Trends over time - added a textbox to report on re-assessing
- Assessing a % of PLOs each year
- Specialized accredited programs - separate reporting

#### *Feedback*

- Interact with liaisons on campus as much possible

#### Room 11:

- Undergraduate Program Coordinators - How to support enhancing the assessment process?
- Curriculum Audit

#### *Feedback*

- Importance of asking "gentle" questions and helping faculty think through the assessment
- Reviewing curriculum via a Bloom's Taxonomy lens