

1. Creation of the Data-Driven Decision Making Task Force (DDDMTF)

On March 13, 2018, Senator Fadayomi made a motion to establish an academic senate process to guide faculty use of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data. The motion was to address the issue of not effectively using the data collected. The motion was seconded by Senator Thomson. Senator Thomson provided a friendly amendment to expand the existing motion to include other assessment data which was accepted by Senator Fadayomi. Motion passed 88% to 12% with no abstentions.

2. Charge of the Task Force and the Timeline set by the Senate

Charge of the Task Force:

1. To identify all available processes, databases, and resources at the university that can be used for continuous improvement of academic programs and student learning.
2. To make recommendations to the Senate on how the information can inform curricula and program improvement.

Timeline:

1. Establish an agenda for the 2018-2019 academic year and report that agenda at the 2018 Academic Senate Retreat.
2. Make progress reports to the Academic Senate at monthly meetings.
3. Make recommendation(s) to the Senate by the first Senate meeting in April 2019.

3. Task Force Report

May 4, 2018

Six faculty members representing four academic colleges who had volunteered to serve on the task force met to discuss the task force charge and devise a plan to execute the charge. It was decided that each of the academic college should be represented on the task force.

June 4, 2018

With representation from all academic units, members agreed that their first task was to document the assessment practices at the University and then compare them to similar institutions. Consequently, the committee summarized the Task Force charge as follows:

1. What data exists at the University?
2. Where are the data stored?
3. How do faculty use data to make continuous improvement?
4. Explore best Assessment practices from other institutions of higher learning.

July 13, 2018

Committee compiled a list of existing assessment data, categorizing how data is being used and the gaps that exist in the data collection at the University.

The gaps include:

1. Lack of effective communication between faculty and Academic Affairs on assessment matters.
2. Lack of a mechanism to connect people who want to use data with people who have access to data.
3. Inadequate resources for faculty to assess and use data effectively.
4. Faculty concerns about the potential misuse of collected teaching and learning data to negatively impact:
 - a. Promotion
 - b. Tenure
 - c. Merit
 - d. Contract renewal
 - e. Post-tenure Review.

The report was presented at the Academic Senate Retreat on August 21, 2018.

August 6, 2018

Members proposed the following potential solutions to the previously identified gaps:

1. Better communication between faculty and Academic Affairs on assessment matters. Perhaps, an invitation to Associate Vice President for Assessment and Accreditation for a conversation on the state of assessment at the University might be a starting point.
2. Set up focus groups in each college to find out what resources faculty might find helpful in their efforts to use assessment for teaching and learning efficiently.
3. Develop and adopt an Academic Dashboard to empower faculty to make their classroom better.
4. Have a designated person at the University to coordinate assessment efforts at the university level.

September 12, 2018

The committee had a brainstorming session with the Dr. Todd Stanislav, Director of the Faculty Center for Faculty Teaching and Learning, on how best to address the previously identified gaps on assessment practices at the University.

The conclusions from the discussion were the following:

1. Nuventive Improve is the key source of evidence data about student learning at the university.
2. Primary use of Nuventive Improve data, curriculum maintenance and improvement by faculty.
3. The data can also be used for program accreditation and university accreditation,

October 23, 2018

Committee invited the Director of Assessment in the College of Pharmacy, Mandy Seiferlein to discuss the Assessment Practices in the College. College of Pharmacy Assessment Plan was described as comprehensive and successful.

Summary of the discussion:

1. The process in the College of Pharmacy is designed to honor shared governance.
2. Assessment in the College is "faculty-centric," the faculty are in charge of learning outcomes. The College Curriculum Committee took responsibility for learning outcomes, but the Director of Assessment (who is not faculty) facilitates discussions with and among the faculty.
3. The College of Pharmacy is an accredited program.
4. Some assessment measures are classroom-based while others are not.
5. The value of Examsoft software was discussed.

November 27, 2018

Committee met with the outgoing Associate Vice President, Robbie Teahan and the Interim Associate Vice President, Mandy Seiferlein to discuss the current state of and future plans for Assessment at the University.

Dr. Teahan provided updates on curriculum and program assessment including a variety of factors that she believed contributed to systematic failures for many of the assessment goals.

These factors include:

1. Lack of knowledge regarding learning assessment.
2. Lack of leadership continuity which would be beneficial for stakeholder buy in.
3. Lack of shared governance where - Associate Deans have been mostly tasked with managing assessment for each college.
4. Unsatisfactory documentation of our curriculum - Form E is not readily accessed by faculty.

Ms. Seiferlein shared a Draft Charter Revision for the AAAS Committee and expressed a need to integrate the charter with recommendations that come out of the DDDMTF.

Conclusion:

- There should be better collaboration between AAAS and DDDMTF
- Need for better documentation of assessment processes, since some of these processes exist, but are not documented.
- Resources are needed, so faculty are able to make use of it.

December 6, 2018

Review of other institutions of higher learning

Members reviewed how the following institutions gather and utilize data for assessment and quality improvement:

1. Southern Illinois University
2. Mississippi State
3. Western Michigan University
4. The College at Brockport, State University of New York

Committee also discussed pros/cons and similarities/differences of the various structures and processes, and which elements are most appropriate for Ferris.

Brainstorm Potential Structure

Using a draft diagram for the ownership and flow of University assessment data, members brainstormed a potential structure that could work with existing University groups to create an effective system for maintaining and utilizing assessment data. Consequently, a theoretical "Senate Assessment Committee (SAC)" was proposed. Creation of a Senate Assessment Committee will enhance the opportunity for faculty buy-in and engagement.

SAC could work with:

1. University Curriculum Committee (UCC) – currently requires outcomes and means of assessment
2. Academic Program Review (APR) – currently requires curriculum map and outcomes data
3. Academic Affairs/Academic Affairs Assessment Committee (AA/AAAC)

Established timeline for the Spring 2019:

- January – Preliminary recommendations drafted by Committee
- February – Discussion with key stakeholders (AA/AAAC, UCC, APR)
- February – Finalize recommendations with input from stakeholders
- March – Make recommendations to Senate in March

January 30, 2019

Members reviewed and revised the role and make-up of Senate Assessment Committee, SAC and its interaction with APR, UCC, AAAC and faculty in collecting, maintaining and utilizing assessment data.

Draft flow charts were created for further revision.

February 27, 2019

The focus of this meeting was to share the draft recommendations with representative members of assessment related committees/groups—and to critique draft recommendations. These groups included the following:

1. Academic Affairs/Academic Affairs Assessment Committee
2. Academic Program Review
3. General Education
4. University Strategic Planning
5. HLC Steering Committee

Changes recommended by the group:

- Replace Senate Assessment Committee with University Assessment Committee (UAC).
- Expand committee membership to include 1 member from each of the senate representative units, 2 members from AAAC and 2 members from Student Affairs/Institutional Research.
- All members of UAC should have a voting right.

Task force Recommendations

The Task Force recommends to the Academic Senate, the development of a systematic approach to collecting, analyzing, using and protecting data for continuous curriculum maintenance and improvement.

A flow chart of the systemic approach is attached to this document. The systemic approach includes:

A. Creation of a University Assessment Committee (UAC)

Committee Membership should include:

1. One faculty member from each Senate Representative Unit.
2. One representative from the Academic Senate.
3. Two representatives from the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee (appointed by Academic Affairs).
4. Two representatives from the Student Affairs Assessment Committee (appointed by Student Affairs).

Committee Charges:

- Collaborate with the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee and Student Affairs Assessment Committee to establish the development, exchange, and the advancement of best practices and excellence in assessment.
- Collect annual reports from each College/Unit to monitor processes and methodologies to assess student learning.
- Provide feedback, guidance and resources to each College/Unit to support curricular assessment practices and help achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency as a result.
- Evaluate the progress and outcomes of these charges on an annual basis and use data to inform the work of the committee.

Additional charges

- UAC Chair reports monthly at the Senate meeting.
- UAC chair presents an annual report on curriculum/course data and program assessment to the Senate.

B. Systemic Review of Learning Outcomes

Each time a program is up for APR, all of the learning outcomes are evaluated by the Assessment team (UAC) or APR. If any outcomes are determined to need revision, the program must submit new outcomes to UCC within one year of the APR recommendation. This will help to establish a new culture which places a priority on assessment and outcome development.

Task Force Members

Katie L Axford College of Pharmacy

Felix A Bollou – College of Business

Christopher L Cospers - College of Engineering Technology

Emmanuel D Jadhav – College of Health Professions

Olukemi Fadayomi – Chair, College of Arts and Sciences

David A McCall – Retention and Student Success

Joe J Pole – College of Optometry

Vanessa L Wyss – College of Education and Human Services

Paul Zube – Ferris Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Organization

Proposed Ferris State University Assessment Process:
A Recommendation from the Data-Driven Decision Making Task Force

Course Creation and Program Review

UCC
Review original course SLOs

Gen Ed
Review SLOs in relation to Gen Ed requirements

APRC
Review PLOs as part of APR process

College-level assessment activities

Faculty Members
Enter assessment data in Nuventive Improve

Start here

Dept. Chair
Review UAC report and dean's recommendations with faculty



Department Assessment Committee (DAC)
Review all departmental course SLOs and PLOs



College Assessment Committee (CAC)
Review all college course SLOs and submit report to dean and UAC



Dean
Receive report from CAC
Receive final report from UAC
Send report to faculty



Senate / Academic Affairs

University Assessment Committee (UAC)
One faculty member from each Senate Representative Unit
One representative from the Academic Senate
Two representatives from the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee (appointed by Academic Affairs)
Two representatives from the Student Affairs Assessment Committee (appointed by Student Affairs)



Notes

Not every college has a department and chair structure; the flowchart should be modified for each college's unique structure.