University Assessment Committee

Retreat Minutes

September 13, 2011 Location: **SC 105**

8:30-11:30 a.m. (light breakfast refreshments available 8:00-11:30)

1. Introduction of (New) Members and Announcements
2. Welcome to Tracy Chapman, Chad McBride, and MarySue Wydeven (and Brian Kokensparger, ex officio)
	1. Special thanks to Jeff Maciejewski, Lee Budesheim, and Linda Miers for their service to our committee.
3. Announcements
	1. HLC Call for Proposals
		1. Request for proposals was made; no one volunteered during the meeting to work on a Creighton submission.
		2. Following the meeting, Gail Jensen volunteered to work on a proposal describing the development and implementation of interdisciplinary programs.
		3. On September 27, Jensen, Isabelle Cherney, and Mary Ann Danielson submitted their proposal (which included participation by Scott Chadwick, Xavier University).
	2. College of Arts and Sciences will be discussing and approving the Learning Objectives of/for the Core Curriculum (revision), as reported by Kevin Graham. The Learning Objectives have been posted and written amendments to the proposal filed with the A&S Faculty Senate President. The vote on this document is scheduled for October 4, 2011.
		1. Requests were made to share that document with the UAC, once approved.
4. Greeting by Patrick Borchers, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
	1. Borchers shared his appreciation for the work of this committee; reported on the HLC changes, as described at a recent HLC-sponsored Pathways Session; and articulated a strong commitment to “closing the loop” and moving beyond a culture of self-satisfaction to authentic assessments of student learning.
5. Updates on current initiatives
6. University Policy on ~~Program Review and~~ Annual Assessment
	1. All components of the Program Review policy were stripped from this document, in light of the Academic Excellence workgroup examining multiple facets of new program approval, program review, and program discontinuation/sunset.
	2. The revised document was discussed and a suggestion to add examples from Student Life was accepted as a friendly amendment.
	3. The amended/revised document has been shared with the Academic Vice Presidents and will be inserted into the correct format and forwarded to the Cabinet for final approval (anticipated approval in October ).
7. Electronic Assessment Reporting System Taskforce
	1. Danielson reported on the process of reviewing electronic assessment reporting systems, the status of the current campus LMS reviews, and will meet with the taskforce for their recommendation for next steps (e.g., campus presentations).
8. ULO data collection
	1. Data uploaded to dSpace for review. Not all information received has been uploaded and ready for review, but each school’s representative will be notified when their materials are ready for review. Schools who have not yet submitted their information will be individually contacted for their past reports.
	2. A preliminary review of existing materials highlights the “search-ability” of the database but we still need to work on improving the “view-ability” and “review-ability” of the documents stored in dSpace.
	3. In fall 2011, UAC will review process and template, make necessary improvements, and return to fall solicitation of assessment data reporting for previous academic year (2010-2011).
9. Program Template
	1. Program Template completed and ready for review.
	2. The next step is for each school to review the template, updating and correcting program titles and provide/update required information that is currently missing.
10. HLC Taskforce
	1. Pathways Initiative informational sessions were attended by four Creighton faculty/administrators: Mary Kunes-Connell (Nursing), Pat Borchers (VPAA), Gail Jensen (Graduate School/UC) and Mary Ann Danielson (AEA). (August-September 2011). Based on information shared, a number of actions will ensue, to include:
		1. Electronic Evidence File (construction to begin)
		2. Credit Hour Policy development
		3. Discussion of Creighton’s Quality Initiative Project

BREAK—Following the Break, each sub-committee met to review/update/amend their current committee charges and outline their agendas/timelines for 2011-2012 projects.

1. Committee Retreat “Work”
2. Charges (Proposed “starting point”)
	1. Peer Review and Policies: The sub-committee will lead efforts to keep the UAC informed of policy implications/need for development (e.g., program review) as well as introduce/pilot a system of peer review of assessment (utilizing the existing technological structures and/or recommending necessary changes for electronic reporting).
	2. Bridging Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning: The sub-committee will lead efforts to identify and link (dSpace, Program Assessment Template) co-curricular programming outcomes with the University Learning Outcomes, so as to aid “mapping our ‘invisible’ curriculum’” and share preliminary data/findings.
	3. ~~Campus Conversations~~/~~Faculty~~ Professional Development: The sub-committee will identify and articulate faculty development needs relative to growing a culture of assessment at Creighton University; partnering with the AEA Office, it will organize and/or lead a series of assessment workshops/programs.
3. Committee Membership
	1. Peer Review and Policies: Brenda Coppard (Chair)
		1. Jim Bothmer
		2. Gail Jensen
		3. Mark Turner
		4. Colette O’Meara-McKinney
		5. Jim Knudsen
		6. Chad McBride
	2. Bridging Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning: Teresa Cochran (Chair)
		1. Tracy Chapman
		2. Kevin Graham
		3. Susan Naatz
		4. Rich Rossi
		5. Stephanie Wernig
	3. Faculty Development: Katie Huggett (Chair)
		1. Michele King
		2. Eileen Burke-Sullivan
		3. Erin Gross
		4. Tom Meng
		5. Palma Strand
		6. MarySue Wydeven
		7. Brian Kokensparger
4. Summary of Committee Conversations
	1. Peer Review and Policies

The Peer Review and Policies Committee reviewed a variety of forms suitable for peer review. The “Marquette model’ appeared to be the most appropriate; therefore, following completion of the program-level reporting by each school and college’s programs, the committee will ‘audit’ the programs to generate reports on completion of submission. Subsequently, one (or more) program(s) will be selected to pilot the peer review document. Creighton may wish to contact Gary Meyer of Marquette for additional thoughts about introducing a faculty-directed process of peer review on our campus. Following these preliminary discussions and application of the tool to evaluate programs, refinements will be made and this committee will work with the Professional Development Committee to help prepare faculty for their peer review roles.

* 1. Bridging Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning

The Co-Curricular Programs Committee discussed plans to:  1) conduct a collaborative meeting with individuals from various campus units (e.g., Student Life, Campus Ministry, etc.) who will help identify programs that would be defined as “co-curricular” in nature; 2) create a programmatic “map” to identify the program’s purpose, any link to academic credit, goals, and any existing assessment (or evidence) of program’s outcome or impact.  This framework will then allow discussion related to measureable goals (if needed), methodology and support of University-level Outcomes.  We would solicit support of the Faculty Development Task Force in delivering a development session related to “Assessment of Co-Curricular Programs.”

* 1. Professional Development

The Professional Development Committee will develop professional development activities to promote learning about assessment at Creighton University. We also plan to conduct a follow-up survey of the Campus Conversation retreat participants. The purpose of this survey is to identify assessment needs and ideas.

Retreat ended by 11:15 a.m.

Reminder:

**2011-2012 Meeting Dates (Tuesdays 8:00-9:15):**

September 13 (1/2 day workshop/retreat)

October 11

November 8

December 6

January 24

February 21

March 20

April 17