



Attendees: Alise Hagan, Ellen Cook, Fabrice Leroy, Lisa Broussard, Terry Chambers, Ross Chiquet, Chip Jackson, Jennifer Faust, Gwen Fontenot, Arun Lakhotia, Robert McKinney, Paula Montgomery, Susan Richard, Kim Warren
(not present: Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Michael McClure, Amy Desormeaux)

Minutes:

- Welcome and Introductions: Alise Hagan welcomed the Council, and members introduced themselves.
- UAC Charge: The primary role of the UAC is as an advisory / supportive capacity to champion the assessment process and merits within your units. Specifically, this council 1) provides assistance and consultation in formulating and implementing assessment plans; 2) annually reviews assessment documents and provides feedback for improvement; and 3) provides an annual report to the President, Provost, and University Council on assessment. The charge, as written, was passed down from the previous council which hadn't convened in a few years. We recognize that this charge may evolve in the next year and we will revisit the charge as needed. The immediate need of the council is in the second task of the council: "annually reviews assessment documents and provides feedback for improvement".
- Review of Assessment Plan Rubric: Two rubrics were distributed (one for academic units and one for non-academic units). The rubric draft was developed after researching what other schools were using to review assessment plans; the draft presented was selected because it used the WEAVEonline language. The draft rubric presented includes a cover sheet (page 1), and then 5 categories: 3 about the plan (outcomes/objectives; measures; achievement targets) and 2 about the results (findings; action plans). The Council then applied the rubric to Anthropology's 2014-15 assessment plan.

Summary of the discussion about the rubric:

- Paula Montgomery recommended we add a threshold (where exemplary = 3 points; acceptable = 2, and developing = 1). She also recommended swapping the placement of the "exemplary" and "developing" columns on the rubric.
- Jenny Faust offered that we consider having a question (perhaps a general section) that questions the "appropriateness" of the goals and outcomes.
- Robert McKinney thought that the mission should be reviewed, but perhaps could be in the next version of the rubric since most were not required to include mission statements for their units.
- Terry Chambers pointed out that the rubric exposes our focus on student learning outcomes within degree programs, but there is no place currently in WEAVEonline for academic units (at the department or college level) to track their plans and goals for retention of existing students, marketing the program, getting more students in the program, relationships with alumni, etc.
- Debate about when to release the rubric: for this initial review, it will remain in DRAFT status, but we will share it with academic and non-academic units at the launch of the

next WEAVEonline cycle. (And develop training around the rubric and how to put assessment plans together.) The expectation is to change the culture from one where assessment is considered “burdensome” and “once a year” to rather one where units recognize they can use these tools to continuously improve, and then use this information to make informed decisions about their programs / units.

- Clarification was provided the university must demonstrate to SACS-COC that we have a plan to assess our assessment. This rubric (and subsequent reviews) is one tool to begin the process of assessing our assessment. We fully expect that the process we establish now will be refined and modified in the next year (reviews on a rotating basis / review teams / etc.), but we need a benchmark now.
- Several council members asked for clarification on how to decide whether it was “exemplary”, etc. The bullet points are meant to be that guide, and we don’t expect 100% of the bullets to be met for it to be selected (~80%). Reviewers should put a “check mark” next to their selection then tally their results. They should provide recommendations for improvement.
- Selection of Assessment Plans for Review: Alise will assign each council member approximately six academic units to review using this rubric. For each unit assigned, the reviewer will look at the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 rubric. Reviews should be completed by April 15 (giving Alise a month to reach out to those whose plans are overall deemed “developing” and provide guidance on improvement prior to their May 14 deadline). In April, we will meet and then distribute the non-academic units for review (to be completed by mid-May).
- Next Steps for UAC:
 - Alise will update the rubric and distribute to the council to begin reviews.
 - Alise will assign the reviewers six academic units to review. DUE: April 15.
 - Next **University Assessment Council meeting: April 22 (2:00)**
- Upcoming Dates to share with your colleges and departments:
 - March 6: WEAVEonline 2014-2015 cycle opened
 - April 1: Objectives, Measures, and Targets due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
 - April 15: WEAVEonline training sessions (Moody 106; 9:00-11:00)
 - April 16: WEAVEonline training sessions (Moody 106; 9:00-11:00)
 - May 14: ACADEMIC UNITS: Findings and Action Plans due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
 - June 15: NON-ACADEMIC UNITS: Findings and Action Plans due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
 - Fall (TBD): University Assessment Council meetings (2)

UAC Agenda (3/18/15; 2:00)

- I. Introductions
- II. Council's Charge
- III. Review of Assessment Plan Rubric
- IV. Selection of Assessment Plans for Review
- V. Next Steps
- VI. Adjourn

Council's Charge

The University Assessment Council (UAC) supports the process of research-based, ongoing, integrated, institution-wide systematic planning, evaluation and continuous improvement across the campus. Its primary function is in an advisory/supportive capacity to academic programs, service/support departments, and all other institutional units with respect to the assessment process. Therefore, the UAC: (a) provides assistance and consultation in formulating and implementing assessment plans; (b) annually reviews assessment documents submitted and provides feedback for improvement purposes; and (c) provides an annual report to the President, Provost and University Council describing strengths and weaknesses of the University's overall effort in assessment.

Members

- Alise Hagan, chair (Director, Institutional Assessment)
- Ellen Cook, ex officio (AVP, Academic Resources)
- Fabrice Leroy, ex officio (AVP, Academic Programs)
- Lisa Broussard (Nursing Department Head, College of Nursing & Allied Health Professions)
- Terry Chambers (Associate Dean, College of Engineering)
- Ross Chiquet (Assistant Department Head, Mathematics)
- Amy Desormeaux (Associate Registrar, Registrar's Office)
- Jennifer Faust (Director, First Year Experience)
- Gwen Fontenot (Interim Dean, College of Business Administration)
- Jordan Kellman (Dean, College of Liberal Arts)
- Ashok Kumar (Associate Director, School of Computing & Informatics)
- Arun Lakhotia (Professor, Computer Science)
- Michael McClure (Associate Dean, College of the Arts)
- Robert McKinney (AVP, Faculty Affairs)
- Paula Montgomery (Associate Dean, College of Education)
- Susan Richard (Associate Dean of University Libraries)
- Kim Warren (Assistant Director, Disability Services)

Upcoming Events

- March 6: WEAVEonline 2014-2015 cycle opened
- April 1: Objectives, Measures, and Targets due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
- April 13-17: WEAVEonline training sessions
- April 15: **University Assessment Council meeting (2:00)**; complete review of assessment plans
- April 29: Identify assessment plans (academic units) for inclusion in SACSCOC 5th year report
- May 14: ACADEMIC UNITS: Findings and Action Plans due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
- June 15: NON-ACADEMIC UNITS: Findings and Action Plans due in WEAVEonline for 2014-2015 cycle
- June 24: Identify assessment plans (non-academic units) for inclusion in SACSCOC 5th year report
- Fall (TBD): University Assessment Council meetings (2)



- Attendees: Amy Chauvin (for Maylen Aldana), Mickey Diez, Gene Fields, Jordan Kellman, Taniecea Mallery, Michael McClure, Paula Montgomery, Melinda Oberleitner, Angie Smith, Susan Richard, Alise Hagan, Melissa Lewis
- Absent: Dewayne Bowie, Terry Chambers, Ashok Kumar, Lise Anne Slatten, Kim Warren, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney

Minutes

Welcome: Alise Hagan welcomed the Council.

Overview and Updates: (slides 3-10)

- SACSCOC: Discussed two sections related to assessment: Section 7 (Institutional Planning and Effectiveness) was former section 2.5, and Section 8 (Student Achievement) was former section 3.3.1.1-3.3.1.5. The most significant changes to Section 8 are: 1) the removal of research and community service from the outcomes-based sections, 2) the addition of Gen Ed in this section, and 3) the elimination of the requirement that universities must “prove” a direct link from an improvement to a tangible outcome (instead the focus is on the process of seeking improvement).
- 2016-2017 Assessment Cycle:
 - Distributed handout of completion (since 2009). For SACSCOC we will focus on the assessment cycles of 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18. The Improvement Type, Improvement Narrative, and Reflection sections (in all three cycles) will be used to build the assessment narratives.
 - In 2017-18, we added a section to the start of the cycle called “Assessment Narrative” with prompts to try to capture a fuller assessment picture that may not exist in reviewing the goals alone. Encourage Assessment Liaisons to review the narratives for accuracy. Do the goals reflect the priorities of the program, and what is described in the narratives? Does it help tell the story?
 - By the numbers: 2016-2017 cycle had completion rates of:
 - Tab 1: Mission, 94.55%
 - Tab 2: Goals, 98.79%, Tab 2: Measures, 98.79%, Tab 2: Criterion, 98.18%
 - Tab 3: Finding Summary: 90.3%, Tab 3: Improvement Type: 74.55%, Tab 3: Improvement Type Narrative: 73.94%
 - Tab 4: Reflections, 91.52%
 - By the numbers: 2017-2018 cycle had completion rates around 85% for Tabs 1 and 2. Tabs 3 and 4 are due by September 15.

- Student Evaluations of Instruction:
 - Distributed handout of response rate: Increase overall from 34% in Spring 2017 to 44% in Fall 2017. Discussed the new outreach efforts to faculty and students, and also the continued efforts from past cycles.
 - Discussion: Melinda recommended sending the parents an email that evaluations are due.
 - SEI Class Climate / Moodle Integration: Full roll-out this Spring (after Fall pilot was postponed). Showed what the portal looks like for students (can see when surveys are due and link directly to them) and faculty (can see completion % in real time).
 - SEI Faculty Satisfaction Survey: administered to faculty after SEIs close with open-ended questions. Responses fell into the categories of administration (timing, distribution), incentives, online courses, response rate, survey redesign, other.
 - Discussion: Addition of course-specific questions such as from a clinical or other sequence may help response rate. Melinda offered to pilot this in College of Nursing; Michael also volunteered to pilot in Architecture if we need a second.
- NSSE 2018: Discussed survey schedule as well as the response rate as of March 22, 2018 (14.4%). Will have responses in Fall (November) and may use this in conjunction with other surveys as part of a data retreat.
- Assessment Calendar: call for attendees to SACSCOC Annual Meeting in New Orleans in December (Susan).

Upcoming Dates:

- April 18-29: Spring SEI (Full and B term) open/close
- May: Senior Exit Survey (spring graduates)
- June/July: Summer SEI (A, Full, B terms; study abroad) open/close
- July/August: Senior Exit Survey (summer graduates)
- September 15: 2017-2018 Assessment Cycle closes (all tabs complete and submitted)
- October: 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle opens
- October: Fall SEI (A term) open/close
- November: 2018 NSSE results received
- December: Senior Exit Survey (fall graduates)
- December 8-11: SACSCOC Annual Meeting (New Orleans)



Attendees

- Present: Terry Chambers, Ellen Cook, Sherry Curry (proxy for Susan Richard), Mickey Diez (proxy for Amy Desormeaux), Alise Hagan, Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Melissa Lewis, Christie Maloyed, Robert McKinney, Lise Anne Slatten, Angie Smith, Kim Warren
- Absent: Ross Chiquet, Gene Fields, Fabrice Leroy, Michael McClure, Paula Montgomery, Melinda Oberleitner

Minutes

Welcome: Alise Hagan began the meeting shortly after 3:00 pm and welcomed the Council; went around the table for self-introductions.

Overview and Updates:

- Office Staffing (*slide 3*): Alise introduced Melissa Lewis as the new Assistant Director of Institutional Assessment and as of April 3, and indicated that the Data Analyst (SEI) position she formerly held is in the process of moving from Institutional Research to Institutional Assessment, pending approvals.
- NSSE Task Force (*slide 4*):
 - o Purpose of Task Force "To meet and review the 2016 NSSE results, prepare findings, and make recommendations as appropriate"
 - o Discussed key takeaways from the meeting; next meeting scheduled for April 27
 - o Kim asked about the status of the QEP (First Year Experience); Jordan and Robert indicated a new QEP would be identified later this year for the next SACSCOC report; Christie mentioned that OFYE has a lot of information but 2016 was a particularly bad year for retention because of the 2016 flood and TOPS.
- General Education Assessment (*slide 5*):
 - o Showed current version of the "General Education Assessment Matrix" which includes revised goals and objectives developed by the hosting departments; shared that committee is asking the departments to now look at which courses currently identified as "Gen Ed" address the objectives.

Discussion on Senior / Graduate Exit Survey (slides 6-7):

- Explanation of past surveys provided to group (2008, 2009, 2012) and how questions fell into the following categories: first destination / post-graduation; student experience; academic / educational experience; other. Some colleges / departments / programs are administering their own surveys; there is a need for the "first destination" to be captured by Career Services for others.
- Open discussion in response to questions on slide 7:

- (Ellen) In Grad Act report, we mention that students must pass through the survey before graduation, and that some of the questions are follow up from NSSE
 - (Mickey) Other departments / units have asked for their surveys to be entered into Banner in a way that forces a user through. We aren't there yet, but there may be something to enable this in 2017-2018.
 - Grad school has their survey built into their graduation checklist, but what isn't clear is who is checking to make sure that it is done. Logistically that's not feasible for the number of undergraduates.
 - (Lise Anne / Robert) There is merit to having questions about the student experience, and not limit ourselves to just asking First Destination questions
 - Even without a full implementation plan for Strategic Plan, should we ask students about it this year to gather a baseline?
 - (Mickie) Student who get this graduating senior survey are our success cases – they made it. What about those we lose or don't retain? What services did they use or not use before they left? How can we survey them?
 - (Alise) NSSE engagement indicators – Seniors marked these as high, but marked their overall university experience with ~81% satisfaction. Perhaps we can re-ask some of these engagement questions to them.
 - (Ashok) Provide open-ended questions that ask students for a solution.
 - (Kim) We need to consider some mid-point surveys to find the issues earlier, and not wait until our Seniors identify something and we can't help them anymore.
 - (Jordan) Goal may be to have the same survey issued with minimal change for a set time (like 10 years) so we can watch for patterns.
 - (Terry) Lots of other things impact student experience beyond SEIs, but that is the one survey they all see every semester. Perhaps we need a series of surveys at specific points.
 - (Christie) There is a survey for the Living Learning Communities and they send a version to parents when students don't continue on (parents have a lot to say).
 - (Robert / Mickey) Incentive for survey completion – maybe parking at graduation? Has no financial value. But would have to put a deadline on the survey in order to have the random drawing. Mickey agreed to look into further, but made no guarantees for this year.
 - If we want to issue the survey at 3-, 6-, or 12-month intervals, do students have access to emails at that time? Can they have a university-issued email address for at least 6-months? (we believe so, but need to confirm with Gene)
 - (Terry/Ashok) For accreditation, they need to show what graduates are doing 3-5 years after graduation (job titles, promotions, salary, still in field, what are they doing to advance professionally such as conference attendance or additional education, etc.). Response rates are very low.
- Wrap-up:
- University Assessment Council agreed that a university-wide senior exit survey is merited and that it should include some student experience questions. Be careful about the length. Focus should be on what the institution needs to know for Grad Act or other agencies (things like Gen Ed, Strategic Plan KPIs (ie: reframing undergraduate research), NSSE, open-ended).

- Alise and Melissa will draft a version in the following week and distribute to UAC for input.
- Registrar's office will assist in identifying students who have applied for graduation and will send out correspondence as needed to promote the survey. Mickey will also look into possibility of an incentive.
- Need to begin to map all surveys in order to identify what (if any) may be duplicative, what could be streamlined at a university-level, and what remains in departments. Will ask liaisons to send names / distribution frequency of existing surveys.

Discussion on "Excellence in Assessment" Rubric (slides 8-11):

- This rubric provides a very specific set of "best practices" and in the next six months we will dig through these "dimensions" as a council. The "dimensions" and the corresponding criteria for excellence were distributed. The council was asked to review over the coming days and to think about whether or not they would like to participate in a given section. Then in the fall, we will share our findings. This will, hopefully, provide a solid framework for where we are as a university.
- Open Discussion:
 - Approval by council that these are a set of "best practices" and that we should participate in this process of "assessing our assessment". It's time.
 - (Lise Anne): what do we do with those in non-compliance?
 - (Terry): Conversation must be driven by data – not sure what to do if they aren't motivated to make those decisions or provide the data to drive the decisions.
 - (Ashok): We need carrots – bucks of money to provide recognition such as advising awards. We can and should recognize departments who are doing assessment well – not the minimum for compliance, but truly excelling.

Upcoming Dates (slide 12):

- April 10-11: Assessment Q&A in the Library
- TBD (week of graduation): Building Curriculum Map discussions
- Early fall (before next assessment cycle launch): Assessment Panel discussion
- Assessment Cycle 2016-17 deadlines:
 - May 1 – September 15: Results and Improvements (Tab 3) and Reflections (Tab 4) DUE
- SACSCOC Annual Meeting – December 2-6 in Dallas, TX. Registration will be opening soon!



Attendees: Ross Chiquet, Alise Hagan, Lucy Henke, Jordan Kellman, Fabrice Leroy, Michael McClure, Robert McKinney, Paula Montgomery, Melinda Oberleitner, Susan Richard, Lise Anne Slatten, Kim Warren, Glen Watson

Absent: Terry Chambers, Ellen Cook, Amy Desormeaux, Jenny Faust, Ashok Kumar, Arun Lakhotia (sabbatical)

Minutes:

Welcome: Alise Hagan welcomed the Council.

Overview and Updates: (slides 3-13)

Alise discussed the following four overview and updates:

- 1) 2016 Assessment Plans and Priorities (slide 3): The four priorities for 2016 were reviewed, along with the plans for achieving each of the priorities. Additional detail was provided later in the meeting. The 2016 priorities are: Assessment Outreach for 100%; NSSE 2016; Review Assessment Plans; and WEAVEonline alternative.
- 2) Outreach (slides 4-11):
 - a. 2015 Annual Assessment Report was reviewed and approved by the UAC (March-April 2016) and submitted to the University Council on April 11, 2016. The report contained six sections, two newly added since the January UAC meeting (Assessment Structure; By the Numbers). These additional sections were presented to the UAC.
 - b. Assessment Handbook. Drafted January-February with UAC input and approval in February. Distributed via "Spring Assessment Update" email (2/17/16). The other components of the email were to remind assessment coordinators about linking to the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan elements, and to provide access to the "Designing Quality Rubrics" webinar. Michael McClure stated that outreach like the Assessment Handbook will go far in terms of changing the culture and understanding of assessment.
 - c. Liaison Training. Training is not yet confirmed, but will cover upcoming deadlines, linking to strategic plan, information about new assessment system, Gen Ed assessment, and answering questions. A discussion about the current Gen Ed status ensued; Robert McKinney shared the current status and Alise clarified that until new goals were approved by the committee, she would be working with liaisons to identify contacts for those assessments that were course-embedded from the old matrix. Melinda Oberleitner and Susan Richard both shared that they were part of the original matrix development and were disappointed that the system that committee had worked hard to create did not have a foothold and was not running as smoothly as intended. It was suggested that a template of what we need them to submit be designed / distributed.

- 3) NSSE 2016 (*slide 12*): NSSE survey went out between February 16-March 15 (five emails from NSSE); response rate was 16.6% (1,140) compared to the 2014 response rate of 19.5% (1,059) and the Average Size by Category rate of 21%. Next steps include customizing comparison groups (May-June), customizing Major Field Report information (August), and receiving annual results and Major Field Reports (November)
- 4) Review of Assessment Plans (*slide13*): We discussed tabling efforts to research a formal assessment process until a new assessment system is identified; it is possible that LiveText will have this capability built-in and thus not a prudent use of time to create a formal process at this time. We will continue one-on-one outreach as issues are discovered (after running reports in WEAVE for compliance). We also will be hosting joint meetings with Grad Coordinators and the Dean of the Grad School. The first meeting is scheduled for this week (Criminal Justice); during the UAC meeting, Paula Montgomery asked to schedule a meeting as well for the graduate programs in Education.

Discussions: (slides 14-15)

The following two topics were brought up for group discussion:

- 1) Live Text vs. WEAVEonline (*slide 14*): Shared survey results from the April 7 Live Text demo, and also conversation with Renee Hicks from Nicholls (current Live Text subscriber). Overall, significant enthusiasm for Live Text and that it would be worth the trauma of transitioning. The flexibility of Live Text had tremendous appeal, as did the alignment with accreditation processes and report functionality. Next step: bring Chuck back to campus (likely in May) for additional demo; ask for answers to the following questions (or have this part of the May demo):
 - a. Administrative uses
 - b. Cost
 - c. Carry over from year to year
 - d. Student portfolio system transition points (such as in Education or Nursing)
- 2) Analysis Questions (*slide 15*): Because 2014-15 was the first cycle in which Analysis Questions were introduced, we discussed whether or not they provided the information needed to write the narratives for the Institutional Effectiveness standards (for SACSCOC). Overwhelmingly the answer was yes, these questions did provide that necessary information. Two minor changes were recommended. First, on question 3, add “Why?” to the end. Also, clarify the “last year” vs. “next year” as that caused confusion.

Upcoming Dates:

- TBD: Liaison meeting (late April / early May)
- TBD: Gen Ed meeting with department representatives
- May-July: Benchmark #2 for assessment coordinators
- September 30: Deadline for 2015-2016 assessment cycle
- October 3: 2016-2017 assessment cycle begins



Attendees

Present: Terry Chambers, Ross Chiquet, Alise Hagan, Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Fabrice Leroy, Michael McClure, Paula Montgomery, Melinda Oberleitner, Susan Richard, Lise Anne Slatten, Kim Warren, Glen Watson

Absent: Ellen Cook, Amy Desormeaux, Christie Maloyed, Robert McKinney, Angie Smith

Minutes

Welcome: Alise Hagan began the meeting shortly after 3:00 pm and welcomed the Council, introducing new members.

Overview and Updates:

- 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle update (*slides 3-7*):
 - o Alise shared a timeline of all communication regarding the current cycle; reminder that it ends on Friday, September 30.
 - o Completion status as of Sept. 15 (final numbers will be run on October 3 after cycle closes). As of Sept. 15, 51.89% of findings had been entered; 39.46% of action plans; and 32.97% of analysis questions. Additional tables were provided with the breakdown for academic and administrative units, as well as a comparison of completion annually since 2009-10.
- NSSE 2016 (*slide 8*):
 - o Distributed 2016 “Snapshot” (NSSE Summary Report)
 - o Discussed opportunity for providing guest access to two online NSSE portals: NSSE Report Builder and NSSE Report Online
 - o Call for volunteers: Dr. Savoie has requested a “task force” to dig deeper into the university’s NSSE results; J. Kellman and K. Warren volunteered to join D. Bowie and T. Mallery.
 - Caution about sharing results without context
 - Recommend a spokesperson to watch the narrative to limit “knee-jerk” reactions.
 - o Reminder that NSSE Major Fields reports will be distributed in November.
- Live Text (*slides 9-10*):
 - o Alise provided updates on the purchasing process, and explained that her students are downloading all DARs and all documents currently in WEAVEonline. The tentative training plan was discussed (with a note that it is subject to change pending the first training on Sept. 27). Brief explanation of the kinds of outreach that will be used for the roll-out (e-blasts, trainings, presentations, website, etc.)
- Discussion: UL Lafayette “Best Assessment Practices”
 - o The council reviewed two documents (available online) from NC State. The first (“Best Practices”) was quickly identified as being too generic and not relevant or worth re-creating here at this time. The “Guiding Principles” was well-received and the council

agreed to move forward on drafting something similar. Specific discussion points included:

- Developing a “culture of evidence” through data
 - “Involvement” – the key word here was “value” – do people feel valued for their work? How do we show this? What else can we do? Some ideas: Job load / part of descriptions; thank you letters / annual celebratory recognition; on serve category (evaluations); necessity of Dept Head buy-in
 - Must come from Provost-level of support for rewards in order for it to be fully part of culture; currently there is little to no value for this work.
- Alise will draft a version of the Guiding Principles and distribute for review.

Upcoming Events

- September 27: Live Text training for administrators
- September 30: Deadline: WEAVonline users must enter and mark “final” all findings, action plans, and responses to analysis questions
- TBD (early October): Live Text training for liaisons
- TBD (October / November): Live Text training by college / VP area (with liaisons)
- November 3: University Assessment Council Meeting

Council’s Charge

The University Assessment Council (UAC) supports the process of research-based, ongoing, integrated, institution-wide systematic planning, evaluation and continuous improvement across the campus. Its primary function is in an advisory/supportive capacity to academic programs, service/support departments, and all other institutional units with respect to the assessment process. Therefore, the UAC: (a) provides assistance and consultation in formulating and implementing assessment plans; (b) annually reviews assessment documents submitted and provides feedback for improvement purposes; and (c) provides an annual report to the President, Provost and University Council describing strengths and weaknesses of the University's overall effort in assessment.

Council Members

Terry Chambers
Ross Chiquet
Amy DesOrmeaux
Jordan Kellman
Ashok Kumar
Christie Maloyed

Michael McClure
Paula Montgomery
Melinda Oberleitner
Lise Anne Slatten
Angie Smith
Susan Richard

Kim Warren
Glen Watson
Ellen Cook (ex officio)
Fabrice Leroy (ex officio)
Robert McKinney (ex officio)
Alise Hagan (chair)



Attendees: Terry Chambers, Ross Chiquet, Lori Chain (for A. Desormeaux), Bridget Hester (for J. Faust), Jordan Kellman, Michael McClure, Paula Montgomery, Melinda Oberleitner, Susan Richard, Lise Anne Slatten, Alise Hagan, Ellen Cook, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney

Excused: Ashok Kumar, Arun Lakhotia (sabbatical), Kim Warren

Resigned: Curtis Matherne

Minutes:

Welcome: Alise Hagan welcomed the Council, and introduced the new members and guests.

Old Business: UAC Moodle Site Created: Alise discussed the creation of a Moodle site for the University Assessment Council, and reminded members that all 2014 NSSE reports are in this site.

Old Business: NSSE: Alise discussed the customization options of NSSE including the Major Fields Report for 2016 (UL majors will be sorted by UL-specified colleges) and the Topical Modules available in 2016. The university can select two of these topics to “add on” to the NSSE questions; UAC was asked to discuss which of the topics were most pressing and the Development of Transferable Skills (Nursing); Learning with Technology (Education, Engineering); Civic Engagement (AVPFA); Experiences with Information Literacy (Education; Engineering; Library); and Global Learning (Engineering). There was a recommendation to delay the First Year Experience & Senior Transition topic area in 2016 because of the new initiatives that have just been rolled out on campus in this area. UAC also discussed:

- Create choice assignment in UAC Moodle site so council members can vote
- Share the sample questions for each topic with the council
- Consider rotating through all 9 over the next few survey years
- Whichever ones we pick (and in the order we pick them) should align to the strategic plan priorities
- Determine if we can pull out NSSE results by DEGREE or PROGRAM (rather than just at the college-level) for the Major Fields Report.

Assessment Compliance: Preparation for SACSCOC 5th Year Report: Alise thanked the liaisons for their dedication and commitment this fall. The task would have been impossible without their tremendous support and efforts. She discussed use of liaisons going forward as an extension of the council and the OIA – continue to be part of a consistent message of assessment.

Alise shared that there were four trainings about the Achievement Summary feature in September with 53 attendees; there was one training for liaisons about the overview documents with 5 attendees (and an additional 3 one-on-one meetings).

As of October 12 deadline, 8 out of 13 college / VP areas had submitted their summaries. The “other” areas that fall under the Provost / President have until October 22 to submit.

The Council reviewed several charts about the completion of “Findings”, “Action Plans” and “Achievement Summary” based on DES reports run between October 9-12, 2015. The handouts included a one-page summary, charts with results from cycles 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-2015, and then results by college / VP area.

Council Discussion & Vote: 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle Roll-Out Plan: Alise presented a coordinated roll-out plan for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. The council went through proposed dates and events, giving extended discussion to the following:

- Assessment Outreach Event: recommendations to piggy-back some other campus event; to make note of two accreditation events happening the first week in November; to consider lunch (everyone has to eat); consider possibly two events; look at the alumni house, Dupre 221, or the ballroom. The goal will be to elevate assessment.
- Topics for Training (beyond WEAVE): 1) a WEAVE beginner course for new academic programs / department starting from the ground up; the “whys” and “hows” of assessment = true quality improvement; 3) forum showcasing / highlighting assessment success stories / performance; 4) technique of WEAVE (like reporting); 5) how to use an action plan that is helpful; 5) integrating assessment into everyday life; 6) how can they assess their own plans (to be meaningful); 7) other assessments (beyond student learning; direct / indirect); 8) data-driven decision-making – how to make decisions; 9) evolutionary change; 10) users and structure; 11) Gap Analysis / findings and summaries
- Whether or not to keep a mid-May / July deadline: overwhelmingly yes, but with the focus on sharing the findings internally and discussing results, then in September, everything would have to be in WEAVE

Two handouts were distributed:

- Assessment Cycle for Continuous Quality Improvement
- WEAVE Structure and Terminology

Upcoming Dates to share with your colleges and departments:

- October 20: 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle will open
- November (TBD): Outreach Event
- November 10: WEAVEonline users complete “Assessment Plan” elements (as needed)
- November 11: 2:00-3:30: UAC meeting