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Summary: Assessment reporting processes can become stagnant and reduce rather than enhance faculty interest. This session will describe the rebooting of existing program assessment reporting and review procedures facilitated by faculty engagement. Key insights from the use of a taskforce to identify problems with current practice and development of a new campus wide review structure, assessment conference, and grants will be shared.

Origins of the Issues: Provost desired review of existing process to understand needs and make improvements to program assessment work after her first review of our standard reports. Chartered an ad-hoc taskforce to investigate some key issues.

▶ Does the timing of review and feedback of assessment within the academic programs meet the needs of all parties involved?
▶ Does the current structure of review and feedback of assessment within the academic programs meet the needs of all parties involved?
▶ If these conditions (both or just one) are not met, what substantive changes could be taken to improve the process

Taskforce Outcomes: Taskforce surveyed department chairs, review documents and existing process, and returned 3 areas of concern: Defining Assessment and Expectations, Faculty Buy-in/Ownership, and Failure to Use Results for Improvement.

Four areas of recommendations from the Taskforce:
• Improve Consistency of Feedback Regarding Program Assessment
• Encourage Increased Communication and Knowledge of Program Assessment at all Levels
• Establish a Reward and Accountability Structure
• Identify Strategies to Increase Buy-in

Follow-up from Provost/Administrative/Faculty:
Provost’s Office Staff, with the Deans, and Faculty Senate Leaders collaborated along several issues to develop actions steps including:
1. Creation of Improved Review Structure and University Program Assessment Committee (UPAC),
2. Creation of Annual Assessment Meeting to share knowledge of best practices,
3. Awarding Program Assessment Grants ($500-$1000 to spur targeted assessment improvements),
4. Recognizing Assessment Work in Faculty Promotion (created categories in system to denote participation).

Creation of new committee and review process aligned with newly purchased Taskstream software to facilitate process. Goal was to support better ongoing use of assessment process to improve student learning, provide better and more timely feedback to programs, allow for campus level picture of assessment work. We have completed first year of the new process with the first round of end of cycle reports in Fall 2016, first set of initial plans in Spring 2017.

Lessons Learned from Process:
• Need for Administrative and Faculty Senate Support
  o Strong Administrative Support- Provost and Deans
  o Prominent and Key Role of Faculty in Taskforce, soliciting feedback on needs, Faculty senate leadership in creation of committee
Focus on timely and constructive feedback (6 week turn around on reviews)
Support for training on new systems for the programs and review committee is critical
Unique needs remain across programs and were addressed
  - College of Business maintained Internal Review, School of Education needed Annual Cycles, Externally Accredited Program Exemption process was needed

Next Steps: 2017-18 will provide for second cohort for review, allow us to seek user feedback on changes to process and system, and seek permanent status for UPAC as faculty committee.

New Review Process

Focus of the Review:

Initial Plans: Review of Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Maps, Assessment Measures
End of Cycle Reports: Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Maps, Assessment Plan (Measures), Assessment Results, Action Plan (Based on Results), Action Status Report

Other Aspects of Review:
Review Committee Codes Types of Improvement Actions (12 types):
Examples include: Revise Program Learning Outcomes, Change Student Experiences/Activities in Specific Courses, Change Student Experiences/Activities in Courses (non-specific), Change in Assessment Methods, Make Major Changes to Textbooks/Learning Resources Used Throughout the Program, Modify, Add, or Delete Course(s) in the Curriculum, Modify Sequence of Courses in a Program, Refine, Change, Enforce Prerequisites for Courses/Major/Program, Change in Course Delivery/Pedagogy


More information on process elements and Taskstream structures available at:
https://www.uwlax.edu/taskstream/program-assessment/process-timeline/
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