**Senate Committee Annual Report**

Senate Committee: Assessment Committee Year: 2017-2018

Committee Members: : Jim Hatton, Kristin Nagy Catz, Craig Stillwell, Lee Ayers, Dorothy Ormes, Hart Wilson, Jody Waters, Dylann Loverro, Christina Richardson, Shanell Sanchez, Erin Wilder, Michael Stanfill, Rene Ordonez **.**

**1. What are the primary duties of this committee?**

From the Senate constitution:

* Review and recommend university-wide assessment tools.
* Advise and assist academic programs in developing and monitoring student learning.
* Collaborate with the University Studies Committee on university-wide assessment of University Studies goal strands and proficiencies.
* Collaborate with the Accreditation Steering Committee to report on accreditation standards that include academic assessment.
* Report information on university-wide assessments to the Institutional Assessment and Accreditation Committee. – Abolished spring 2016.

**2. What did you plan to accomplish this year?**

From the Minutes of the September 29, 2017 Meeting

1. Perform the fourth year of institutional senior writing assessment including a Quantitative Reasoning (QR) component. Also improve the rubric and archive exemplars.
2. Close the loop on writing by training writing tutors on our rubric, publicizing professional development opportunities, encouraging faculty participation in the MultiState Collaborative, and supporting the library in its endeavors.
3. Resume academic program review process.
4. Carry out an institutional oral communication assessment based on what we learned from the pilot study last year.
5. Organize three Assessment Workshops.
6. Work with the university studies people as they design assessments for the integration strands.
7. Communicate to our students the work of the assessment committee.
8. Standardize the statistical analysis of rubric sampling data.

**3. What did the committee accomplish during this academic year?**

 A response to the goals listed above.

1. The committee evaluated fifty-six senior writing samples from all programs and 40 FUSE papers from USem students. The detailed report including QR results is attached.
2. Summaries of each program’s writing assessments were given to each program as part of the Director of Assessment academic program review meetings.
3. Teams from the committee evaluated twenty-one academic program reviews.
4. The committee evaluated thirty-eight student oral presentations. A report will be prepared for the committee to review this fall.
5. A spring workshops were held. Academic program reviews were discussed along with senior writing.
6. Jim Hatton met with members of the General Studies Committee this year.
7. It was unclear if the committee had an official student representative. In any event, two students participated fully. Otherwise no direct communication with student governance was made.

**4. What issues and/or additional responsibilities arose this year that influenced the work of the committee?**

 We feel our evaluation process for student writing is stable and reproducible. We struggled with finding ways to encourage and/or help programs improve their students’ writing and critical thinking. We expect some kind of role as the new core themes are implemented. That will be a topic for next year.

**5. Given what you have learned this year, what goals do you recommend this senate committee focus upon in the upcoming year?**

The committee has generated useful data in several areas: student writing, student presentations, and program learning outcomes. The frustration is closing the loop. How do we use this data to help improve student learning? We will look over the process next fall. We expect to be part of the strategic planning implementation process if it hopefully emphasizes student learning.
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