

University Assessment Committee Meeting
Tuesday, January 26, 2016: 2:00 – 3:30 PM
John Spotts Room

Minutes

Members Present: Paula Lucas, Enda Meisel, Andy Hermansdorfer, Britt Frye, Susan Imes, Loukia Dixon, Asad Salem, Larry Sheret, Marty Laubach, Doug Nichols, Tim Melvin, Karen McComas, Andrew Gooding, Kim DeTardo-Bora, Mary Beth Reynolds

Members Absent: Mindy Allenger, Sherri Smith, Sherri Stepp, Caroline Perkins, Maribea Barnes, Alex O'Donnell, Lori Howard, Nicki LoCascio

Agenda Items

1. **Introductions:** Members introduced themselves, with a special welcome back to Susan Imes.

2. **Minutes** from the December 14, 2015 meeting were approved with one spelling correction.

3. **Quick Updates**

- **Higher Learning Commission Site Visit** (October 12 and 13): Mary Beth Reynolds showed committee members Marshall's updated Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Accreditation website, which can be accessed via a link on the Academic Affairs website. On it are Marshall's Assurance Argument, Site Visit Team Report, Institutional Actions Council Letter of Reaffirmation, and an overview of the Open Pathways Review process. She noted that Marshall met all five criteria for accreditation. The Institutional Actions Council continued the accreditation of Marshall University with the next Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2025-2026. The only interim monitoring required is a report on student complaint policies and procedures embedded in our next regularly scheduled assurance review, which will be submitted in fall 2019. Mary Beth also reported that the HLC has asked if it can make a copy of Marshall's assurance argument available to other institutions to use as a model. Loukia Dixon said that she found the assurance argument to be a nice review of all that is happening at Marshall University. Mary Beth asked members of the committee to share this information with colleagues.

4. **Specific Discussion Items**

- **Syllabus Review:** Mary Beth outlined syllabus review findings from the past two years. She explained to committee members that, during spring 2014, we attempted to review one syllabus for each faculty member whose syllabus was uploaded to the syllabus repository in MUBERT. During academic year 2014-2015 (fall and spring), we evaluated only syllabi for faculty who had one of more issues with syllabi from spring 2014 and those of faculty whose syllabi were not evaluated in spring 2014. We will continue this process for the next few years before returning to another random sample. Mary Beth noted that the items most frequently missing from syllabi were the assessment grid, the link to University policies, and the course description from the catalog. A discussion ensued regarding the reason for including a course description from the catalog. The reason for this requirement is that, if the faculty find that the catalog course description no longer adequately (or correctly) describes the course, the faculty need to update the catalog description through the curricular process. She noted that is it fine for

instructors to include a more detailed description in addition to the description from the catalog. Mary Beth said that, following the spring 2014 syllabus assessment, we noted improvement in inclusion of most elements on the syllabi evaluated. There was a discussion about syllabi for online courses. Mary Beth said that Tim Melvin has revised the syllabus review template so that reviewers can indicate whether the course is face to face, online, or hybrid. Mary Beth asked that committee members complete syllabus evaluations for spring 2016 by April.

- **Annual Assessment Report Review:** The only change we're putting into place for this year's assessment reports is that we will ask people to summarize their planned actions (this box will become mandatory in the reporting template). Then, for 2016-2017, that box will be imported and will go into Step 2 with a box for programs to comment on the status of the actions taken. Doug Nichols reported that he is working on the expansion of the mission statement to include goals for students and will include college mission statements for the 2015-2016 reporting template. For all graduate programs, he will use the mission of the Graduate College, rather than the missions of the specific major college. Programs will not be asked to make their mission statement alignments more precise until the report for academic year 2016-2017.
- **CLA+/Senior Assessment** (spring 2016): Mary Beth reported that she and Tim are starting senior assessments on February 8. She distributed a schedule and asked that committee members share with their colleges and encourage capstone instructors to either require or encourage their students to participate.
- **Blackboard Outcomes:** Doug updated members of the committee on Marshall's plans for Blackboard Outcomes. First, we intend to pilot this product during the summer to test the system and see how well it meets our needs. Our hope is that, starting in fall 2016 we can use Blackboard Outcomes to replace GEAR. Doug explained that instructors will tag assignments in Blackboard in a way similar to what they do in GEAR. However, using Blackboard Outcomes will result in students having to submit the artifact only once into Blackboard rather than twice (as many are now doing) into both Blackboard and GEAR, making the process more seamless for both instructors and students than it has been in the past. We also discussed having some degree programs pilot the use of Blackboard Outcomes for their program assessments. Asad Salem asked if we had selected the programs that are interested in participating. He said he wanted to talk with his faculty and if they are in agreement, he would like Engineering to be involved in the pilot. Although for degree programs, Blackboard Outcomes will not replace the current reporting tool (Open Pathways Portal) that Doug has created, it will help with data gathering and analysis, and may have the capability of allowing more flexibility with reporting, e.g. allowing separate reporting of results of multiple assessments (both direct and indirect) for the same assessment point and reporting for more than two assessment points. Non-academic units, such as Student Affairs and Housing and Residence Life, may also be interested in investigating the use of Blackboard Outcomes.
- **Assessment Day Plans:** Did not include in this meeting.

5. **Additional Business:** None.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Beth Reynolds

