

COLLEGE & UNIT SUMMARIES

College of Business and Economics (CBE)

We had a closing-the-loop meeting for social justice (CBE does not have diversity). We shared the a

2. The S

College of Science (CSCI)
TheS

Uni

as well as representatives from Graduate Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, University Extension, and other university offices.

Annual reports to CAPR showed a strong commitment from programs to actively teach and assess diversity and social justice skills. The methods used were strongly discipline-specific and tied to per-program coursework and program learning outcomes. This is in contrast to more general methods which had been proposed to teach and assess the written communication or information literacy ILOs. It would be advantageous to consider if there is the opportunity to provide university-wide learning opportunities to support the per-program activities. For instance, in addition to assessing their students' coursework, the Department of Educational Leadership conducted a survey and focus groups to gather feedback about student experiences regarding five social justice principles, student support in their program, and other issues. The Speech Language and Hearing Science program maintains an Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Access (IDEA) Committee which proposed a mentoring program for new students and also proposed partial funding of graduate school applications for undergraduates from historically under-represented groups. As has been suggested in previous reports, wider dissemination of effective closing the loop strategies to all programs and departments could lead to less duplication of effort. Where possible, university sponsored initiatives could lead to greater improvements in student learning than activities limited to a single department or college.

An additional on-going topic of discussion concerned the logistics of the ILO assessment process. Reporting was simplified in the last year as ILO assessment data need be reported only to CAPR, and not separately to the Office of Graduate Studies. CAPR also clarified its policy on assessment data to be reported by programs undergoing a five-year review. There are still a number of concerns however that specifically affect graduate programs. This is due to the different assessment strategies used for undergraduate and graduate programs. Undergraduate programs are assessed uniformly using the same assignment guide and rubric for all collected work, regardless of college or program. Graduate programs are assessed individually by the program itself. The type of assignment and rubric are specified by the individual program. The concerns raised included:

- It is not possible to produce results that can be compared with undergraduate assessment results or between graduate programs due to the wide variety of rubrics and criteria used.

- Some programs are forced to do double assessment, assessing student work once with a PLO rubric and once with the associated ILO rubric in the same year.

- The assessment schedule of some programs does not align with the university ILO schedule, specifically for programs with discipline-specific accreditations. For example, a program may be required to assess a PLO on written communication one year for its discipline-specific accreditation, and then assess the ILO on written communication another year according to the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#).

The issues regarding ILO assessment logistics were brought to university assessment leadership, and the following solutions were proposed:

- University results will be qualitative in nature rather than quantitative for example, recurring challenges among programs, improvement in similar criteria, or common closing the loop suggestions.

- Quantitative assessment results will be specific to a discipline with a PLO rubric which will be consistent across all programs.

When reporting ILO assessment results, programs may report the results of the PLO assessment for the PLO which aligns with the required ILO. Hence, collected work may be assessed using just one rubric, the PLO rubric.

A program must report ILO assessment data according to the university ILO long term assessment schedule. If a program has already assessed the aligned PLO earlier in the 5-year cycle, however, they may report those results rather than collecting and assessing new data for the current year.

These changes to ILO assessment policy are in keeping with the observation that graduate programs differ greatly in their goals and expectations. The GAC has reaffirmed the desire of individual programs to assess ILOs using the method most fitting to their program on multiple occasions. The above changes will help to streamline the process, both reducing the effort required, and providing data that might not have been available otherwise due to ILO assessment scheduling.

Academic Programs and Services (APS): Office of Educational Effectiveness & General Education

The [University Summary Report](#) assessment results for Diversity and Social Justice were posted in August 2022, and distributed to the Educational Effectiveness Council which includes college assessment leadership for campus-wide discussions and decision making in the fall term. The report was also presented at the ILO Subcommittee and CAPR in fall, 2022. The summary of the recommendations and actions taken is being presented and discussed during the — e ssion — taken i quhi luct

Student Affairs is utilizing a new "assessment report template" that asks each functional area that is scheduled ([on a 5-year rotating basis](#)) to undergo a comprehensive assessment to inventory the activities and correspondQ