

**Assessment Input Group**  
Monday, August 13, 2018  
2:00 pm to 3:00 pm

**Meeting Notes - FINAL**

<b>Present</b>	<b>Not Present</b>	<b>Guests</b>
Molly Albart Dr. Curtis Andressen Dr. Pranesh Aswath Dr. Ann Cavallo Dr. Andrew Clark Dr. Sergio Espinosa Dr. Greg Frazier Dr. James Grover Dr. Timothy Henry KJ Jacobson Dr. Douglas Klark Dr. Rebecca Lewis Dr. Beth Mancini Dr. Andy Pagel Dr. Glenn Phillips Dr. Toni Sol Natassia Tyler Dr. Sonja Watson	Dr. Shanna Banda Dr. Brian Brown Dr. Minerva Cordero Katie Gosa Dr. David Gray Katie Hageman Greg Hladik Dr. Joe Jackson Dr. Diane Lange Brady Minor Dr. Lynn Peterson Dr. Ashley Purgason Dr. Les Riding-In Heather Scalf Melissa Thompson Laura Wolf Dr. Debra Woody	

<b>Call to Order</b>	Meeting called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. Rebecca Lewis
----------------------	---

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendations/ Actions/Follow-up</b>
<b>Sign-in</b>	Individual introductions were made, and attendees signed in.	
<b>SACSCOC Accreditation Update</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response for the 17-18 cycle is due to SACSCOC on September 7, 2018.</li> <li>• IIER has submitted a solid draft and it is currently being reviewed by administration.</li> <li>• IIER has begun to connect UEP evidence to the report.</li> <li>• On target with report; all units have been working hard on getting evidence submitted, for which we are grateful.</li> </ul>	Dr. Rebecca Lewis

<p><b>Excellence In Assessment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsored by the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)</li> <li>• Applied for the designation for the 3rd time, however was not successful</li> <li>• NILOA complemented the IER website, and provided valuable feedback. The goal of IER is to take the feedback and address it specifically. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Commented that there should be evidence of improvement based on assessment data, and the UTA President has made the connection that SACSCOC has provided similar feedback.</li> <li>○ Recommended IER website to be featured on the NILOA website</li> <li>○ The assessment process should engage boards of trustees and other stakeholders, such as faculty, adjunct faculty, instructional staff, and students, and showcasing broad scales of adoption of assessment</li> <li>○ Would also like to see more evidence in support for faculty and staff assessment activities via promotion and tenure templates and documents</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For an institution of UTA's size, winning the Excellence in Assessment award is extremely difficult, however there is great value in just getting the feedback to make our processes better. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NILOA is specifically interested in the ways that faculty use assessment data for their own teaching, research, and service improvement outside of the classroom. This is not something that we necessarily capture in our office. Moving forward, we should bring external persons on-board to gain a better understanding of what is going on across the institution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rebecca asked if there were any in attendance who would like to serve on a committee of faculty or administrators to sit down with IER and discuss what can be done to respond to the provided feedback. The following have volunteered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dr. Toni Sol</li> <li>○ Dr. Andrew Clark</li> <li>○ Dr. Sergio Espinosa</li> <li>○ Ms. Molly Albart</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Dr. Rebecca Lewis, Dr. Glenn Phillips</p>
<p><b>UEP Update</b></p>	<p>I. Due dates have passed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On November 4<sup>th</sup> nonacademic and college-level Improvement Reports will be due <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The goal of the Improvement Report is to showcase that assessment data was used for improvement. Academic units are encouraged to showcase curricular and course-level improvements that advance student learning.</li> <li>○ 17-18 Improvement Reports will be used as evidence in response report to SACS. Many units have already completed their improvement reports and submitted them to IER, as Improvement Reports are crucial to our responses to SACSCOC and being removed from monitoring. If reports have any holes, IER will reach</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Dr. Glenn Phillips</p>

back out to those units to revise the Improvement Reports.

- II. At the last input group meeting, the idea of changing the current biennial cycle was put on the table. Proposed cycles and their due dates were provided and discussed (see attached).

Those in attendance (16 out of 16) unanimously agreed in favor of moving to an annual assessment cycle. Of the scheduling options provided, Option A was preferred by most.

- a. Plans and results would be due in May of each year. Improvement reports would be due in summer or fall of each year.
- b. Plans would only require 3-5 outcomes (instead of 5-8) is on an annual cycle
- c. Annual cycle would promote more sustainable UEP leadership.
- d. Data could be used immediately for plan changes.
- e. Provides more opportunities for good practice to occur.
- f. Would contribute to a culture of assessment instead of a culture of ‘getting it done’.

AIG members cautioned IER on the following when considering the logistics of an annual cycle:

- a. Stay away from plans where assessment is due in the summer
- b. Having plans and results due in the same month is too much from a workload perspective
- c. Consider separate dates/cycle for non-academic units since many are present during the summer months

#### I. Assessment Recognition

In what ways will honoring units get them to do what IER needs them to do?

Who gets to make the decision?

AIG members suggested the following:

- a. Committee Review to select award recipients
- b. Campus Vote
  - i. Encourages ‘best practice’ because most units do not know what other units are doing – Provides clarity and examples for other units
  - ii. Allows units to be appraised on what they plan and how they evaluate the plan
  - iii. Showcase student success in connection with guiding aspirations
  - iv. Assessment Input Group to offer the best, but let the campus decide which is the best

How would units want to be recognized? (IER website, award, letter from the Provost, etc.?) (see attached for a list of proposed awards and what they would be awarded for)

<b>Graduate Exit Survey</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at new exit survey based on what is already provided for the undergraduate survey</li> <li>• Question blocks have already been received from units that wanted unit specific input</li> <li>• Next phase is to take the survey to senior administrations and possible be ready for December grads</li> </ul>	Dr. Andy Pagel
<b>Questions/ Discussion</b>	Assessment Input Group will meet again during the fall semester.	

<b>Adjourn</b>	Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
----------------	--------------------------------