LOOC Meeting Minutes  
Galanti Lounge  
March 10, 2010  
3:00-4:30 p.m.

In Attendance:
Marilyn Barbour   Karen McCurdy  
Gary Boden    Libby Miles  
Joanna Burkhardt   Mercedes Rivero-Hudec  
Lori Ciccomascolo   Robert Shea  
Elaine Finan    David Smith  
Carolyn Hames    John Stevenson  
Anne Hubbard    Kathleen Torrens  
Mary MacDonald   Chip Yensan

I. Welcome and approval of February 19, 2010 minutes, with three corrections. (Barbour)

II. **SLOAA update on programmatic student learning outcomes assessment (Shea/Finan)**
- Program reports continue to come in. SLOAA is reviewing them and will be up to date with reviews by the end of the week: reports to be sent on to Peggy Maki for final evaluation. Some reports will be presented at the ASAC meeting this Friday.
- There was a Graduate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment workshop on Friday, March 5th.
- John Stevenson was congratulated on the assessment presentation he did for the psychology department.

III. **SAGE Update and graduate student outcomes assessment (Stevenson)**
- SAGE has submitted their assessment report to SLOAA/OHE and is awaiting feedback.
- Grand Challenge (GEN ED) courses and instructors (Grand Challenge Fellows) participated in the 2nd required workshop on assessment. SLOAA was commended for their presentation at the workshop.

IV. **Graduate program assessment update Ciccomascolo**
- Ciccomascolo – Noted 3rd assessment meeting coming up in April to include programs in pilot and minigrant recipients.
- Barbour – reminded LOOC will need to come up with recommendations and work with graduate program and SLOAA to come up with a report for June OHE. Feedback on policy thoughts requested for the April LOOC meeting.

V. **Miscellaneous (Barbour)**
- LOOC report is due to the Faculty Senate before their April 29th meeting.
- LOOC membership on task force committees:
  - All have representation, and Joanna Burkhardt has volunteered as a faculty member for Global Education Task Force.
  --Barbour – gave reminder that each task force has specific items to accomplish; they are not long-lived groups and that participation in a task force is another way to call attention to LOOC. LOOC members responsibilities as representatives on various task forces: 1) Keep a focus on the importance of student learning outcomes; 2) be
sure assessment and alignment are considered to ensure groups are not working at cross-purposes.

In discussion it was mentioned that it should be considered where these task forces contribute to the overall strategic plan, and there was a concern that none of the six recommended CCE students were included in any of the task forces.

VI. LOOC Policies (Barbour) – (handout) – Page 1

It is important to remember what our accrediting body requires. As we create policy we should be re-creating the essence of the NEASC standards as a broad-based systematic process. NEASC said we had some things in place, but we were not doing much yet, as LOOC had just been started and had not put together any policies.

-There was limited member feedback when asked for policy contributions which is concerning because LOOC has only one meeting monthly. The Chair requested commitment from members to respond to e-mails in order to accomplish what we need to do.

-Communication is needed at all levels - we all need to be moving in the same directions. It is essential that LOOC be identified as the voice of assessment so we can get a sense of alignment – what are programs doing? Are courses linking to outcomes linking to the University’s overall goals/mission? Are student learning outcomes connected to University? outcomes? Does LOOC have a philosophy? What does LOOC want to accomplish as a unit?

Three policies for discussion: (Handout)

- Policy 1 – Giving guidance to programs. Agreed.
  - Discussion: each program needs to have student learning outcomes. It should be published on the Program’s website as well as the SLOAA website.
    - First asterisk of draft policy #1 should remain as written (see handout).
    - Second asterisk of draft policy #1:
      - Discussion –gap between sentences one and two: Agreed to separate the assessment plan from the assessment report. Suggestions: brief annual reports that are part of larger cycle of plan? 6-year plan cycle with 3-year report cycle? Many possibilities, but we must define what is required in a plan and in a report and determine what cycles make sense for undergraduate/graduate/accredited and non-accredited programs. Be sure to be clear in procedures for how to accomplish these tasks down the road. Insert “faculty approved” to ensure participation and awareness in departments. Include wording that plans should be continuously reevaluated to support plans are being used and are active.
      - Need timeframe for cycle and reports, and can build in some flexibility to ensure programs have opportunity to report when it’s best for them within our guidelines.
      - Implication for LOOC and SLOA in terms of handling reports to ensure appropriate feedback.
      - Recommend this section be rewritten to include such considerations and provide for acceptable timeframes which shows OHE/NEASC that we are assessing on an ongoing basis.
Accredited programs asked to take a snapshot of work they are preparing to report out on as required by accrediting bodies, not extra work, just a snapshot of work being done (new form is much simplified).

Outstanding questions: Who will develop and apply rubrics to judge whether reports are submitted or adequate. What is the consequence or procedure if reports are not reported or are not adequate?

Overall, important to support the authority of SLOAA in the process in reviewing reports and processes. LOOC should be listening to SLOAA because the review work will be coming to them. SLOAA (or a university designee) will present these policies to OHE for their endorsement and support because we are showing that we are embracing program assessment and that a university designee will report annually to OHE.

The Chair will email LOOC members asking for comments on the rest of the draft policy items and will then send it out incorporating recommendations made during this meeting for interactive email conversation. Asked to consider scheduling another meeting before the April 23rd meeting to better prepare for the Faculty Senate presentation 4/29.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 23, 2010
2:00 -3:30 p.m.

Note Location
Change!!!

Green Hall, 2nd Floor Conference Room

LOOC Meeting 3/10/2010-- Policies for Discussion
DRAFT LOOC Policies for consideration by Provost DeHayes and the Faculty Senate

1. All undergraduate, professional, and graduate academic degree programs at URI shall be actively engaged in student learning outcomes assessment as evidenced by, but not limited to:

* Published student learning outcomes that are clear statements of what students are expected to gain, achieve, demonstrate or know at the completion of the academic program. These student learning outcomes shall be published on the program's website as well as on the website for SLOAA. These student learning outcomes shall be periodically reviewed by the academic program for ongoing relevance.

*Initial and biennially updated reports to LOOC/SLOAA describing plan of student learning outcomes assessment. On a triennial basis, a formal report of student learning outcomes will be provided to LOOC/SLOAA. Review and feedback on reports shall be provided by SLOAA with assistance of LOOC members. Reports shall be published on the SLOAA website.

2. All rubrics and guidelines for preparation and evaluation of academic program plans and reports shall be created by SLOAA with the assistance and approval of LOOC. These rubrics shall be posted on the SLOAA website. Consultative services will be provided to support academic programs.

3. With the approval of LOOC, SLOAA, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, will work with other university offices to collect, maintain, analyze, and distribute assessment findings.

Recommend that we do not put forth previously worded policy for SLOAA:

The Office of Student Learning, Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation (SLOAA), in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, will work with other university offices to provide coherent frameworks for collecting, maintaining, analyzing, and distributing information related to student learning assessment. This function does not preclude assessments that colleges, departments, or offices may wish to conduct for their own purposes, nor does it require SLOAA to approve, conduct, or provide data for such assessments. (passed by LOOC 12/7/09)

Draft Recommendations for LOOC members on Academic Plan Task Forces:

1) Put Student Learning Assessment on the Table
   To the extent that the initiatives of a specific task force impact on student learning, ensure that the effects are measured.

2) Communication, Interconnection and Alignment
   It is important that task forces do not work at cross-purposes when it comes to the element of student learning assessment. There needs to be interconnection between the task forces, communication of processes (undergraduate, graduate, professional) and a framework for alignment.