

## University Assessment Committee

September 30, 2021 2:00 PM (via Zoom)

Attendance: Lorraine Arocho, William Bajor, Paul Creamer, Michelle Donlin, Christopher Domanski, Christopher Dudley, Heather Garrison, Jeffrey Hotz, Josie Kraemer, Claire Lenhart, Adam McGlynn, Megan Smith, Denise Seigart, Jack Truschel, Daisy Wang, Laura Waters, Jennifer White

### Committee Discussion:

#### I. Update on Midpoint Peer Review, Dr. Bill Bajor

Dr. Bajor stated “the Mid-Point Peer Review, or MPPR, is a peer review of the accumulated financial data, student achievement data and responses to Commission recommendations (if requested in a prior Commission action) submitted by institutions through a series of Annual Institutional Updates (AIU).”

Last MSCHE Review, 2017: We received four recommendations that need to be addressed. Through documents like the Comprehensive Planning Process narrative, we’ve addressed pieces of those recommendations, but we’ve not explicitly nor in an in-depth manner addressed the recommendations through our AIU. However, we did address the recommendations in detail in our 2019 MSCHE Follow-up Report. There is also no category in the AIU to upload information explicitly addressing recommendations to the Commission.

Suggestions: The suggestion is to prepare ourselves as the UAC to be ready to begin submitting information in early 2022 to MSCHE, addressing the recommendations (if permitted) perhaps, through tabs like “Evidence” rather than the AIU, on our MSCHE portal. Dr. Bajor will inform the Provost of this strategy; and if accepted, will work with ESU’s MSCHE rep. The idea is to ensure we provide evidence of our work addressing the four (4) recommendations well in advance of the MPPR.

Progress: ESU has made substantial progress with recommendations #1 and #2; so it is just a matter of assembling the materials to demonstrate progress to date. That leaves us with #3 and # 4 to focus more of our energies on.

Anticipated Timeline: Between now and the next AIU, we submit evidence of progress addressing the four recommendations. We should be contacted regarding the MPPR around the time of the AIU (summer of 2022). However, this specific timeline could be accelerated.

The MPPR is scheduled for the fall of 2022. The MPPR Commission action - their verdict - is expected to be delivered in the spring of 2023.

“If moderate or serious concerns have been identified within the MPPR Data Report and/or the institution was asked to respond to Commission recommendations in conjunction with the AIU in prior years, the Commission will assign peer evaluators to conduct a peer review of the trend data for key data indicators in the MPPR Data Report.” Our strategy is to be proactive in regards to the four recommendations. We can expect MSCHE to offer to provide online training for us next July or August (up to seven people) in preparation for the MPPR.

#### II. GE Assessment Report Request, Dr. Adam McGlynn

Dr. McGlynn reports that we have not progressed as significantly with the recommendations from MSCHE on items #3 and #4. Last semester several people submitted their rubric for the reports they did evaluate. They gave valuable feedback, specifically on Gen Ed and the evidence presented showed two big things – there wasn’t a lot of evidence presented that the results of the Gen Ed assessment would be disseminated with the departments and second, while this is course level evaluation of the different GE courses it is not an overall

assessment. Not this year, but definitely for next year, we have to assess the GE program as a whole. We should consider a complete assessing of the GE program as a whole prior to the midpoint review.

Last year we requested student assessment and learning, program level assessment reports, we did not get a lot in. We have to let people know that we are requesting them and need them to be sent in - GE assessment data which is what we requested two years ago, as well as last year. The timeline for this is November. We did not request this in September because everyone was busy working on their binders, tenure, promotions, five year reviews, chairs were busy, evaluation committees were busy and we did not want to add to that. But we need those assessments by the spring.

Jennifer White confirmed that coming up this fall is the 20-21 GE report – based on data from the 20-21 academic year, they'd be presenting GE assessment results. If they want to submit for this year that is fine as well.

Request in November, due February, 2022. Departmental assessments are due in one year and GE is due the other. So it is one assessment report every two years. Dr. Dudley says to ensure that report gets sent to the coordinator. Dr. McGlynn said they would be presenting their GE assessment report. Dr. Domanski says we should send the requests to the assessment coordinators.

### III. Formation of Committees to work on MSCHE Recommendations #3 & #4

Organize sub committees and disseminate different areas to them. For students coming to ESU who may not have the ability or skill they need to truly be successful with our curriculum, what are we doing to support them? Work has been done with changes made to the 090 courses, made changes implementing FYE, now revising FYE. We have the student success network. The pieces are out there but we are not in a position to report on them and explain what changes were made and why they were made. What we need are subcommittees to work on each of these recommendations

#### MSCHE Recommendation #3

The committee would go back to the people who were involved with the changes in the 090 course and student success network and FYE and see what data they have, from their meeting minutes to process interviews to understand evidence based decision making, why the changes that were made, made? What the justifications were and how we felt this aligned to our mission goals. Getting this together would be the work of that committee. So this subcommittee seems to be more organizing and gathering. Subcommittee #4 is more work.

#### MSCHE Recommendation #4

We've come a long way in assessment and learning and going back to the concern Dr. Bajor expressed, if we don't show we are addressing recommendations or that we have ignored them that is when we get the site visit. *We do not want to get hit in this area again.* Assessment seems to be taking place in the non-academic divisions like the Business Office, Student Affairs. We need to check to see if some of these areas do have assessment plans in place and/or are creating assessment reports and data; many of them do not. Prior to leaving, Dr. Rob Smith sent out unit inventories to all of the non-academic divisions to get an idea as to what they were charged with and whether they were assessing it. Many would do five year reviews but nothing more. Do they have strategic plans? Are they making evidence based decisions, allocating resources? We need documentation to build an assessment infrastructure similar to what we did before on student learning. How are they going to report on this information, what are we going to do as an assessment committee? The one big caveat to all this is something Drs. Bajor and McGlynn have discussed and it has to go up the ladder. Senior administration, President's Council is going to have to approve us getting this done and saying to these divisions yes, you must engage in this process to ensure we are meeting standard # 6 under MSCHE. What this subcommittee would be doing is again, just as we had that assessment report framework or how you report your assessment data and a

rubric to evaluate it; we would develop these instruments then senior administration would step in to inform them we must start engaging this process – we could assist with guidance.

Whoever is on this subcommittee will have the inventories and unit reports previously submitted. We do have divisions and unit inventories, however we need further documentation and follow up – who did it and what was done. Dr. Bajor brought up that Rob Smith was starting new, establishing a clean slate, and he provided two page inventories to a number of non-academic units like the Graduate School & Extended Studies. Some were not filled out completely and require follow-up. Others, like Billing, the Bursar's Office, need to be contacted soon. Just to get a sense of what the non-academic departments do, they should have an annual report, complete a strategic plan, and regularly evaluate the work they are doing.

#### Sub-committee Guidelines

We need people to serve on each of these subcommittees and this would be their task. Bill and Adam will be supplying support on these issues. Adam will be on both committees to assist as this needs to be done. We are going to submit evidence on #1 and #2 but by the end of the academic year we must submit more robust evidence on #3 and #4. We need to have the new members coming into new positions on board. We need a standardized recording framework with the rubrics all online.

Adam is opening up these committees to the members of this meeting to share and participate in these two groups – what they're interested in, etc. He has asked for volunteers to submit their preference no later than Monday. Chris Domanski said he is willing to be assigned to wherever he is needed. Denise Seigart said to put her on #4. Paul Creamer volunteered for #3, Daisy Wang wherever she is needed. Student Success Network member Laura Waters said they met collectively as a group but were not assigned to teams due to the Covid pandemic hitting, many changes in faculty, administration offices, and departures led to the downhill slide. Bill added that having so much turnover is a key point. HR needs to know if we are going to have such a high turnover we must do a good job of onboarding people. Switching people and moving them around not knowing what their tasks are, is critical so that those coming into new positions know what their charge is and step in and fill that. Without HR involved we must ensure they are aware where the gaps need to be filled, what each one has to do. It is not only on Academic Affairs but the university.

It makes great sense then to have standardized reporting, framework, rubrics all in line, guidelines made very clear so that if someone new steps in they are not lost and follow the same path we are all following.

The site visit report is on the website. Bill suggests we post all agendas and minutes on the UAC Access drive.

This committee was focused mostly on self-studies and midpoint reviews and from there we picked up the non-academic depts. This is something where the UAC is actually going out of its traditional mode. Again, this committee wasn't really formed for non-academic unit assessment. So we are not starting from scratch.

We are not assessing them, they are assessing themselves. Every single division should be assessing themselves.

Meeting adjourned.