University Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2014
Stroud 210
3:00pm

Attending: Margaret Benson, Alberto Alegre, Paul Creamer, Jennifer White, Eve Salzberg, Fernando Perez, Sonia Figueroa-Pagan, Jaedeock Lee, Michael Sachs, Kelly Weaber, Kelly Harrison, Pamela Kramer-Ertel, Chris Dudley, Laura Waters, Debra Ballinger, Eugene Galperin, Doug Friedman, Suzanne Fischer Prestoy, Tom Tauer, Adam McGlynn, Sheila Handy, Joann Stryker, Chris Willis

Structure/Organization

The University Assessment Committee has new stationary/branding materials designed by University Relations. This will be used for all future official business, such as agendas and flyers.

The group would like to welcome two new members to the committee:
Alberto Alegre, representing the General Education Committee
Eugene Galperin, representing the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty of Science

Minutes from the December 5, 2013 meeting were reviewed and submitted for approval. Motion carried.

Workgroup Updates

Institutional-Level Assessment

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is running a mobile compatibility pilot this semester. It begins February 25 and runs through early April. Incentives include $25 per week for one freshman and one senior in the form of a gift certificate to the university bookstore. One senior will also win a free diploma frame and cap/gown set, while one freshman will win a $200 textbook scholarship.

The Graduating Senior Survey begins March 24 at the Grad Fast. Because preferred seating at graduation is no longer an option, the group is working on getting incentives for this.

A big push for this workgroup is a focus on Student Affairs assessment, and getting those and other non-academic departments on board. The group has decided to tie assessments in all
departments across campus to the university GE outcomes. Of particular concern is getting non-
Student Affairs departments to participate, such as IT or campus police.

*Professional Development*

A workshop has been planned for Monday, February 24 on direct vs. indirect assessment, and a
flyer was attached as a handout. Committee members were encouraged to spread the word.

Regarding the proposed March panel discussion on examples of direct assessments in use at
ESU, Joann has received enough confirmations for at least one of the two proposed dates. She is
hoping to hear back from more so that there can be two separate panel discussions, scheduled for
Friday, March 28 and Monday, March 31. As Lower Dansbury is not available, the group was
asked to consider alternative locations for this workshop. Suggestions included Keystone Room,
Monroe lecture hall, or even simply a large classroom. However, no location was finalized
pending reservation.

In early April there will be a redo of a prior workshop on rubrics. Beth Sockman did a workshop
on rubrics at the Technology Conference in January; faculty in the Reading department have
expertise in this area as well. Pam Kramer-Ertel is reaching out to Maureen McLaughlin and
Mary Beth Allen for their input.

After spring break, Chris Willis is working on getting a few people from West Chester to come
talk to our faculty who are working in TracDat. Scott Heinerichs there has already volunteered
his time, and we will look into inviting other schools as well, such as Kutztown.

In late April, the Professional Development team is planning another workshop on direct vs.
indirect assessment, this time focusing on ESU’s first GE SLO, Global Citizenship. This is a
focus for the General Education Assessment workgroup. Faculty from this semester’s VALUE
rubrics pilot (discussed below), as well as those identified in the four question survey conducted
at the end of last semester will be invited as panelists.

Finally, the group was informed about an upcoming MSCHE workshop in Philadelphia on May
9. An email with more information will be sent to committee members. If you are interested in
attending, please contact Joann Stryker, Sheila Handy, or Chris Willis.

*Program-Level Assessment*

A major focus of this workgroup is the evaluation of the program-level annual assessment
reports that were submitted at the end of last semester. However, because there are not enough
active people in this workgroup, Adam McGlynn has reached out to some full UAC members
asking for assistance. There is a common rubric that all evaluators are using, and though the
sample is small, so far it seems as if most are looking at and evaluating the same things.

An issue is that some assessment reports have come in at the department level, not the program
level. This makes it difficult to evaluate what each program is doing. There is a possibility that
the group will consider revising the current template to allow that, but at the same time to make
it easier to parse out information at the program level. Tracdat use should assist with these
issues.
General Education Assessment

The newest workgroup has been very busy since it was created in October. Its focus this year is on assessment ESU’s first student learning outcome concerning Global Citizenship. They are in the midst of conducting a pilot study with 10 faculty across campus using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. Faculty teaching Spring 2014 courses mapped to this student learning outcome were asked to participate. Four VALUE rubrics are applicable to the ESU student learning outcome. Faculty were asked to pick 4-6 aspects of the larger rubric, and use them to assess 10 random students on one particular learning artifact. Per Joann’s report, faculty at the initial meetings held last week were very engaged and open. They had lots of questions, but also saw the value in this work for the larger campus community.

Paul Creamer, one of only 2 UAC members involved in this pilot, gave his impression of it so far from a faculty point of view. As a faculty member, he acknowledges that concentrating on 10 random students for one specific artifact is not overly burdensome such that some faculty might not participate. The purpose of this pilot is to see if VALUE rubrics are a viable direct assessment method for ESU’s general education outcomes. More information on this can be found in the handouts provided at the meeting.

Jennifer White drafted items for the Graduating Senior Survey addressing students perception of their gains in Global Citizenship concepts. This question will be added to the Spring 2014 administration. Suggested revisions should be submitted to Jennifer via email.

This workgroup is also working on creating a GE assessment calendar.

Assessment Consulting Team

Originally, this team was set up to be a reactive group. If someone on campus had a problem related to assessment, they asked group members for help. Moving forward, the group is going to be more proactive. This will begin by helping the Program-Level Assessment workgroup evaluate program annual assessment reports. Afterwards, they will work to set up meetings with those programs who might be struggling a bit. For those rated 3 or 4 out of a 4-point scale, meetings will be offered. Those rated 1 or 2 will be strongly encouraged to meet with ACT members to discuss their assessment efforts and ways to improve.

ESU Assessment Flowcharts

The assessment flowcharts have been updated by Tom Tauer. These were created last Spring and have been updated to reflect the addition of the General Education Assessment workgroup.

TracDat Pilot

In the roll-out of the TracDat software, Chris Willis and Joann Stryker have been working with a few volunteer academic departments. The aim is to have a mix of both accredited and unaccredited programs, but to keep the group small to ensure one-on-one contact as we move forward with implementation. So far, meetings have been held with 4 departments:

- Computer Science
- Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management
- Business Management
- Exercise Science (focusing attention on their Clinical Exercise Physiology, MS program)

Theatre will be introduced to this in mid-March. Discussions are underway with both Athletic Training and Physics as well. Tina Rey in the College of Education, who works extensively with the TK20 program, is also looking at how to integrate TK20 into the TracDat system. The Math Department is also considering use of TracDat, pending further discussion.

**Institutional Assessments**

*National Survey of Student Engagement 2013 Results*

Chris Willis presented the results of the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement to Student Affairs and Student Activity Association managers Wednesday, February 19th. Data relevant to that group was compiled for the presentation. Student Affairs members were encouraged to consider the data provided and come to their next meeting ready to discuss it further.

Joann Stryker has reached out to the Deans regarding presenting information most relevant to faculty at the College meetings in February and March.

There will be a presentation of information at the University Senate Meeting March 10th.

*National Survey of Student Engagement 2014 Pilot*

Finally, as the Institutional Workgroup mentioned there is a mobile pilot for NSSE beginning February 25. All committee members are asked to encourage their freshmen and seniors to check their emails so they can participate. Michael Sachs has also asked Student Affairs to push participation in their groups as well.

Committee members are encouraged to look at the NSSE communication brief provided in the handouts for information on this pilot, and what faculty and staff can do to help.

*Proficiency Profile Senior Administration*

A communication brief was provided to committee members outlining this semester’s administration of the ETS Proficiency Profile to seniors. It is going on NOW through the end of the semester. In large part due to the continued snow days at the start of the semester, participation is not very high at the moment. There are no incentives offered for this.

The group discusses possible ways of increasing senior participation. This included reaching out to faculty who teach classes with 75% or more seniors, having an open lab time each week, or even making the Proficiency Profile a requirement to graduate. Incentive discussions included an extra ticket to graduation, weekly prizes, or an honorific for the top 3 academic performers. One person suggested included the test as part of a course, such that every department identifies a course taken in students’ last semester and makes it part of their final grade.

**Upcoming Monitoring Report**
Tom Tauer reminded the committee that our September 1, 2014 monitoring report will focus on MSCHE standards 12 (general education) and 14 (assessment of student learning). Meanwhile, it is unclear if the current accreditation standards or new accreditation standards will need to be followed for the self-study scheduled for the 2016-2017. A decision will be forthcoming from MSCHE this summer.

New Business

There will be three faculty writers for the September 1, 2014 Monitoring Report. Sheila Handy will serve as the lead writer. If you are interested in working on this during Summer 2014, please contact Sheila Handy.

Late last semester, UAC members were asked to identify up to five questions or issues they were hearing around campus regarding assessment of student learning. Those results were categorized and summarized and presented in a handout to committee members. Though there was no time for discussion, Sheila Handy said she would email the group about constructing an FAQ document based on the common questions that arose from this survey.

Meeting adjourned.
Planned Spring 2014 Events

a. FEBRUARY 24th – Introduction to Indirect vs Direct Measures

b. MARCH – 2 Panels – Examples of Direct Assessments In Use At ESU
   i. Brief overview of Indirect/Direct Measures
   ii. 3-4 ESU Examples presented by faculty/staff at each
   iii. Inviting Faculty from each college and also a non-instructional unit
   iv. Tentatively Scheduled Friday, March 27th and Monday, March 31st
   v. Location – Lower Dansbury NOT Available ---- IDEAS???
   vi. Will Record
   vii. Panel Participant Confirmations To Date:
      Rick Donnelly – HRTM
      Mark Stewart – PHYS
      Bob Cohen – PHYS
      Pats Neelakantan – ECON
      Michael Sachs – Student Affairs

c. EARLY APRIL - Rubrics – A Redo of Prior Workshop
   i. Reading – Maureen McLaughlin and/or Mary Beth Allen

d. POST SPRING BREAK – TRACDAT Pilot Group
   i. West Chester
   ii. Others?

e. LATE APRIL – Third Panel – Examples of Direct Assessment in Use at ESU –
   Global Citizenship Focus
   i. Review of Global Citizenship Student Learning Outcome, Indirect/Direct
      Assessment, VALUE Rubrics
   ii. GE Faculty – Survey Information from Fall 2013
   iii. GE Faculty – Pilot of VALUE Rubrics Spring 2014
Direct vs. Indirect Measures of Student Learning

- What are direct assessments?
- What are indirect assessments?
- What does the Middle States Commission on Higher Education expect?
- Examples provided with an opportunity to apply what you learn.

Learn from your peers!

Location: Lower Dansbury
Date: Monday, February 24
Time: 3:00-4:00pm
ALL ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND!
Being a citizen of a diverse, global society includes identifying with a community, participating in political and social processes on multiple levels, understanding and appreciating diverse views and perspectives, and tolerating the varied beliefs and practices of our multicultural and interconnected world.

In thinking about your ESU education, please evaluate how well you feel prepared to put into practice each of the following components of global citizenship.

- Understand local, state, and national political institutions and processes
- Understand local, state, and national, social institutions and processes
- Participate in governmental, non-profit, and private organizations in ways to improve society
- Understand international political institutions and processes
- Understand international social institutions and processes
- Possess a familiarity with the diversity of world cultures
- Understand diverse views and perspectives
- Appreciate diverse views and perspectives
- Exhibit tolerance for the beliefs and practices of those different than you
- Understand what it means to be a responsible citizen of a globally interconnected society

Rating Scale:
Not at all Prepared, Not Prepared, Not Very Prepared, Neutral, Somewhat Prepared, Prepared, Extremely Well Prepared (this is the scale on the critical thinking question)
Focus on Global Citizenship Student Learning Outcome

1. Four question survey of faculty teaching courses mapped to this outcome in Fall 2013, focused on Global Citizenship:
   a. What will you continue to do?
   b. What will you stop doing?
   c. What will you begin doing?
   d. What evidence do you have that students are learning this SLO?

-------- Identification of direct measures. Request to share in Prof Dev Workshop.

2. Graduating Senior Survey Question Addition

3. Free NSSE Pilot --- selected Civic Engagement and Global Perspectives modules

4. Pilot use of VALUE rubrics to assess student learning for Global Citizenship

Development of GE Student Learning Outcome Assessment Calendar
PILOT ESU VALUE-BASED RUBRIC
FOR
ASSESSING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP GE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME

Currently, ESU has no direct measure of the Global Citizenship General Education student learning outcome. During Spring 2014, the General Education Assessment Workgroup of the University Assessment Committee is piloting the development and use of a rubric, based on the American Association of Colleges and Universities' developed VALUE rubrics, to assess ESU's Global Citizenship general education outcome.

The spring 2013 curriculum mapping of courses to the general education student learning outcomes, was used to identify Spring 2014 courses mapped to the Global Citizen student learning outcome. The week prior to the Spring 2014 semester, faculty teaching these courses were invited to participate in this pilot project. Eight (possibly 10) faculty have agreed to participate.

The pilot will consist of the following:

A. Initial Meeting

The purpose of this meeting will be to review materials (Global Citizenship Student Learning Outcome Expanded Definition; Relevant VALUE Rubrics), discuss overall intent of project, and discuss approaches with participating faculty.

Issues for discussion:

- How to develop final rubric for scoring? The rubric for scoring will be a subset of the relevant VALUE rubrics: should the participating faculty develop one consistent rubric all will use or should each faculty member select from the combined rubric (4-6) categories most appropriate for their class?
- What level of performance is expected for each class?

B. Pre-Implementation Meeting

The purpose of this meeting will be to finalize implementation plans.

Issues for discussion:

- Identification of specific rubric and performance levels for each course.
- How will sample be selected for each course?
- What artifact (paper, presentation, holistic overall assessment, embedded test question(s), etc.) is to be scored? Discuss pros/cons and share approaches.
- Can this rubric be incorporated into grading for each course?

C. Implementation
Professor will score identified artifact for sample of ten students in their course.

D. Aggregation and Analysis of Scored Rubrics

Professors will provide completed rubrics to Chris Willis, Assessment Specialist in Institutional Research and Assessment, for compilation. No information will be shared with others at individual student or section level.

E. Assessment of Pilot

The purpose of this meeting will be to review the aggregated results and discuss appropriateness of this approach for assessing our student learning. Obtain professor feedback and discuss the usefulness of this approach for the individual class and for the GE program.

Specific Topics:
- What worked?
- What did not work?
- What would make this better?
- Would this work as a routine, periodic assessment of this student learning outcome?
- Would you recommend application of this process to other GE student learning outcomes?

Participating Faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level at which Global Citizen is Addressed</th>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12516</td>
<td>ART 101</td>
<td>Geiger--Melissa</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12517</td>
<td>ART 101</td>
<td>Geiger--Melissa</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12535</td>
<td>CMST 111</td>
<td>Geiser-Getz--Glenn</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12537</td>
<td>CMST 111</td>
<td>Geiser-Getz--Glenn</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12648</td>
<td>ECON 111</td>
<td>Dellipriscoli--Domenic</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12868</td>
<td>POLS 211</td>
<td>McGlynn--Adam</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>12869</td>
<td>POLS 211</td>
<td>McGlynn--Adam</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>13096</td>
<td>MLFR 116</td>
<td>Creamer--Paul</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>13097</td>
<td>MLFR 116</td>
<td>Creamer--Paul</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduction</td>
<td>13480</td>
<td>PHIL 171</td>
<td>Kim--Heon</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>13481</td>
<td>PHIL 172</td>
<td>Kim--Heon</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Introduced</td>
<td>13482</td>
<td>PHIL 172</td>
<td>Kim--Heon</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Emphasized</td>
<td>12524</td>
<td>ART 251</td>
<td>Farris--Darlene</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Reinforced</td>
<td>12663</td>
<td>ECON 311</td>
<td>Behr--Todd</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Advanced</td>
<td>12817</td>
<td>SOC 102</td>
<td>Ray Müller - Possible</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Advanced</td>
<td>12846</td>
<td>SOC 102</td>
<td>Hooshang Pazaki - Possible</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Improvement of Student Learning: Four-Step Cycle

1. Articulate Goals
2. Offer Programs, Services, and Initiatives
3. Collect, Analyze, & Report Assessment Information
4. Use Results for Improvement

Continuous Improvement of Student Learning
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Seven University Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes

Continuous Improvement of Student Learning

- Use Results for Improvement
- Articulate Goals
- Collect, Analyze, & Report Assessment Information
- Offer Programs, Services, and Initiatives

Department Faculty

Department Chair

Academic Dean

Office of the Provost

Office of the President

General Education Assessment Workgroup of UAC

University Assessment Committee (UAC)

Office of the Provost

Office of the President

Office of the Provost

University-Wide Curriculum Committee

General Education Committee

ORANGE: Assessing Levels of Achievement
GREEN: Evidence-Based Resource Allocation
PURPLE: Evidence-Based General Education Program Curriculum Improvement
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment:
Program Student Learning Outcomes

Use Results for Improvement

Articulate Goals

Continuous Improvement of Student Learning

Collect, Analyze, & Report Assessment Information

Offer Programs, Services, and Initiatives

(Assessment Reporting)

Department Faculty

Department Chair

Academic Dean

Office of the Provost

Office of the President

Departmental Program(s) Assessment Committee/Faculty

Department Chair

College Level Assessment Entity

Academic Dean

Program Level Assessment Workgroup of UAC

University Assessment Committee (UAC)

Office of the Provost

Office of the President

GREEN: Evidence-Based Resource Allocation

ORANGE: Assessing Levels of Achievement
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Mobile Pilot

What is NSSE?
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is an online student survey administered to all freshmen and seniors during the spring semester. The NSSE survey asks students questions relating to the following five Benchmarks of Engagement:

- **Academic Challenge** – Including Higher-Order Learning, Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, and Learning Strategies
- **Learning with Peers** – Including Collaborative Learning and Discussions with Diverse Others
- **Experiences with Faculty** – Including Student-Faculty Interaction and Teaching Practices
- **Campus Environment** – Including Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment
- **High-Impact Practices** – Special undergraduate opportunities such as Service-Learning, Study Abroad, Research with Faculty, and Internships that have substantial positive effects on student learning and retention

When is the NSSE Mobile Pilot?
The NSSE mobile pilot will be administered between late February and early April 2014. *The first invitation will be sent February 25th to student ESU email accounts.* ESU will receive our survey data and reports in August 2014.

Why the NSSE Mobile Pilot?
In the 2013 NSSE administration, 22% of our students accessed the survey on their smartphones. For this reason ESU was given the opportunity to participate in this free pilot administration. The pilot will allow ESU to be at the forefront of current technology, and it will give us a better chance to learn how to best reach our students as communication modes shift.

Student Incentives:
Students are being offered incentives to complete this survey. Each week, a first year and a senior student will be randomly selected from survey respondents to win a $25 gift card to the ESU bookstore. Additionally, on April 5th one first year respondent will be randomly selected to receive a $200 textbook scholarship and one senior respondent will be randomly selected to receive a cap and gown along with a diploma frame valued at $200, provided by the ESU bookstore. The Institutional Workgroup of the UAC, Student Affairs and SAA are working to collate ESU-related contributions (such as athletic event tickets) as additional incentives.

What Can FACULTY and STAFF Do?

- Help get the word out at ESU about NSSE.
- Encourage students to take the survey.
- Look at the survey instrument and identify items of interest to your work at ESU.
- Obtain and use NSSE results to inform your work.

Additional Information: [http://nsse.iub.edu/](http://nsse.iub.edu/)
Past NSSE results: [S:\Acad. & Inst. Effectiveness\Assessment\ESU Specific\National Survey of Student Engagement - NSSE](S:\Acad. & Inst. Effectiveness\Assessment\ESU Specific\National Survey of Student Engagement - NSSE)
Proficiency Profile Administration to Senior Students

What is the Proficiency Profile?

The Proficiency Profile is a standardized test that assesses four core skill areas — critical thinking, reading, writing and mathematics in the context of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. In short, the Proficiency Profile is intended to measure academic skills developed, versus subject knowledge taught, in general education courses taken during a university educational experience.

ESU has chosen to administer the 36 question abbreviated 40 minute form.

When is the Senior Administration Proficiency Profile?

NOW through the end of the Spring 2014 semester.

Why are we administering the Proficiency Profile?

This test is one of three tests used by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) as a gauge of general education outcomes. All fourteen PASSHE institutions are required to participate in the VSA.

ESU has chosen the Proficiency Profile as one of our optional PASSHE funded Performance Measures.

The Proficiency Profile is a direct measure of several of our general education student learning outcomes providing valuable information regarding the level of proficiency of our incoming freshmen as well as the overall growth achieved by our seniors in these areas.

What Can FACULTY and STAFF Do?

- Identify ways to get seniors to take this standardized test. Contact Chris Willis at cwillis4@po-box.esu.edu or call 422-3459 to set up an administration time for your students. With the high number of snow days, options other than in class administration need to be determined.
- Encourage students to take the test seriously – the results are important to ESU.
- Obtain and use Proficiency Profile results to inform your work.

Resources:

Proficiency Profile: http://www.ets.org/proficiencyprofile/about
Voluntary System of Accountability: http://www.voluntarysystem.org/
Past Proficiency Profile results: S:\Acad. & Inst. Effectiveness\Assessment\ESU Specific\Proficiency Profile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorized Responded Ranking by Popularity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  How?/What Form?/How Often?</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Why do this?</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Direct vs. Indirect</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Resources/Time</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Data - Use and Maintenance</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Speculations on Purpose</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Consistency/Streamlining</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Who's In Charge?</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Large Classes</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Not Useful</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rubrics</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 What is It?</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Who's Paying?</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Grades</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Academic Freedom</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Answers: 55

Speculations on Purpose of Assessment - speculation on why we're doing this - accreditation, outside regulations, etc.
Other - questions on rubrics, assessing outside of the classroom, course-level assessment, common syllabi, etc.
Is there a way to streamline all of the assessment data we collect for our programs? Why do we have to do assessment in so many different formats?

What is the difference between direct and indirect assessment measures?

What is indirect assessment?

My assessment report feedback indicates we lack direct measures. What direct measures can I use to assess my program?

What are indirect and direct assessments?

What is the definition of "direct" assessment?

What is direct assessment?

What are examples of direct and indirect assessment?

What is assessment?

Why do we need to do this?

What is the point of all of this busy work?

Why do we have to do all this busy work?

For what exactly are we required to provide assessment information?

Will anyone do anything with all these reports?

Why do we have to do this?

Why do I need to complete the university assessment report since I complete an accreditation report?

Who makes the decisions as to where assessment data is collected?

What format should my assessment report be in?

How do I get started?

How is the general education requirements assessed?

Not sure how to do it

Using advanced functions on D2L

Not sure what to assess

How often do I need to be assessing my SLOs? Do all students need to be assessed?

Assessing programs

How often do we have to measure/report this information?

Who is going to pay for this?

How to effectively assess writing in large classes.

How can a do authentic assessment for a large class?

More resources need to be given to university assessment of learning.

Lack of willing faculty to serve in leadership roles in order to move forward with student learning initiatives.

That the kind of data we're being asked/advised to collect isn't useful, or to put it another way, that to collect truly useful data requires resources beyond what we have.

I don't have the time?

Collecting this type of information is too time-consuming and it takes away time from more important activities such as research.

No time

That assessment is empty paperwork to justify the existence of (and high salaries/fees collected by) Middle States.

We are only doing this for the accreditors, correct?

That assessment is part of an attempt by local and national administrators to impose the unsuccessful K-12 model on higher education.

Some Arts and Sciences faculty don't think there is any value in assessment. They think we are doing it as busy work to satisfy external forces.

Why aren't grades evidence of assessment?

Where will the data be maintained and how will it affect the future of my department's curriculum?

We do all this assessment and don't know what to do with the data we collect.

My area does not have student learning, so do I need to do it?

How can I use rubrics?

Will all faculty be required to adapt their syllabi to a common template?

This is a way to infringe on academic freedom of faculty.

Not sure how to use results

How do I measure student learning outside the classroom?

What should I do at the course level?

Why do students drop out of ESU - is it due to dissatisfaction or failure to achieve a GPA?

Using assessment to improve student learning

Do we have to use rubrics? If so, are rubrics available someplace or do we have to create them?

That ESU administrators do not/will not make assessment based decisions, but will cherry-pick findings to suit preconceived ideas.