

**PROVOST'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE *for* LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
(PACLOA)**

**College Assessment Representatives Sub-Committee Meeting
Spring 2020**

February 7, 2020 | 1:30 – 3:00 PM | Bizzell Library, Lower Level 2, Room LL2111

MINUTES

Present: Felix Wao, Petra Klein, Leehu Loon, Afshin Marashi, Randa Shehab, Beth Stetson, Donna Wade, and Jennifer Kisamore via zoom.

1. Review and approval of minutes of the February 1, 2019 meeting.

The meeting was called to order by Felix Wao. He welcomed everyone and ask that they themselves. A motion was made by Beth Stetson to approve the minutes from the February 1, 2019 meeting, seconded by Afshin Marashi. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed.

2. State of program assessment at OU.

Felix gave brief explanation and history about the committee. He directed attention to a handout which showed the percent of degree programs by college the met or exceeded expectations in all four steps of the assessment process. He noted that the only exception was the Graduate College because this year was the first year to submit a report. Felix also said that each committee member received their individual college level reports. He said that the inactive or about to be terminated degrees were not included.

Felix spoke about the individual college level reports and brought to their attention that on the far right side there are comments to aid in the process. He asked committee members to please let him know if there is anything that we can do to help in the process. He mentioned that there is no need to submit a report for a terminated program but if it is just inactive there may still be students enrolled and there needs to be a plan in place to for assessing the degree.

Felix presented a power point touching on the following topics.

Key Challenges:

- Non-submission of assessment reports
- Late submission of assessment reports
- Incomplete assessment reports
- Focus on compliance instead of enhancement of student learning
- Lack of documentation/info for assessment for: *inactive* and being *terminated* programs

Felix said that since new system (Nuventive.Improve formerly called TracDat) is in place the only information needed to be entered each year is the results and use of results.

STEP 1: Articulating Student Learning Outcomes

Common Challenges:

- Using process verbs instead of active verbs.
- Using statements that are not student specific, overly broad, and appropriate at the department level.
- Documenting bundled student learning outcomes.
- Complete lack of information on student learning outcomes.

STEP 2: Identifying appropriate direct assessment methods

Common Challenges:

- Using electives to address program student learning outcomes.
- Lack of brief descriptions in some SLOs of how students were assessed.
- Using end of course grades as evidence of program assessment.
- Using indirect assessment methods (e.g., surveys) as the primary and/or sole assessment method.
- Exclusive reliance on culminating experiences for graduate programs' SLOs.
- Using Licensure Exams not required for graduation as the sole means of assessing learning outcomes.
- Complete lack of information on assessment methods.

STEP 3: Describing student performance on aggregate

Common Challenges:

- Lack of brief descriptions in some SLOs of how students performed on aggregate.
- Using actual student names.
- Providing raw data or data in table/graph form.
- Complete lack of information on description of how students performed.

There were questions about graduate courses reporting asked. Clarification was given by Felix to questions from Randa and Petra. Afshin's question is there a distinction between MA and PHD programs in reporting was answered by Felix who gave an explanation and talked about samples used. The group asked if he could share the examples of graduate advising evaluation used by some departments. Felix will get permission from the departments and then share with the committee.

PART 4: Describing student performance on aggregate

Common Challenges:

- Stating that no improvements are necessary.
- Providing personal views of how results should be used for improvement that does not involve other faculty.

- Stating consistently (every year) that faculty are in the process of reviewing the data.
- Providing statements that have nothing to do with student performance.
- Complete lack of information on how faculty intends to o have used results for continuous improvement (e.g., curriculum modification, course sequencing, request for resources, etc.)

Felix said that some liaisons have developed templates and rubrics by which to get information from faculty that they need to complete the report. He said that we see from year to year is the statement that faculty does not see the need for changes, when document curriculum changes should be used for continuous improvement.

Felix was asked if the subject of assessment was addressed at the new faculty orientations. He said he was allowed only five minutes during the orientations. He is working with the Faculty Excellence to develop workshops for this purpose. Felix will seek information from the committee about which topics should be used on course level assessment.

3. College level updates regarding program assessment.

The committee members were asked to share what is going on in their respective colleges regarding assessment.

- Beth Stetson, College of Business, shared that an email reminder sent to faculty of the information needed by the liaison.
- Afshin Marashi, International Studies, shared that they have a course that is taught by three different faculty so they had group meeting with faculty and the graders. They went through an excel spreadsheet student by student. He asked if the spreadsheet can be uploaded to TracDat. Felix said that he needs to write a short blurb about each outcome but yes you can upload it in the documents.
- Petra Klein, Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences, said she has nothing to report but glad to see they are all in the green!
- Leehu Loon, Architecture, said he has nothing report but will follow up with Felix for the yellow and red areas that are on his report.
- Randa Shehab, Engineering, said ABET is their accrediting agency. We have one program that is always in the red because there is only one student enrolled and very little data. Felix said it is ok to mention in the report of the small enrollment and we will follow up when more are enrolled. Felix added that you need to focus on the students that are already in the program even if it is a small number. Felix and Randa will have a conversation regarding this to get a plan.

4. Review of proposed changes to the program assessment review rubric.

Felix gave the members a copy of the current rubric that was created with faculty input but feels it needs some changes. He is trying to come up with a more usable document which he created a draft of and handed out. Will talk with faculty members about the new rubric for use in the future.

There was a discussion about the draft rubric. Some thought the old rubric is easier to understand. Felix said that maybe we should refine the old rubric instead of changing the entire thing. He will get with faculty about this.

5. Preparations for the 2020 Assessment Forum (Fall 2020).

Due to time this item was not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.