

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate December 2023

This report is being submitted on behalf of the charge of the joint Provost Office and Faculty Senate Committee: Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee (LOOC), in partial fulfillment of the responsibilities outlined for the committee which included a commitment to promoting, supporting, and ensuring effective assessment as an integral part of the student learning experience at the University of Rhode Island. Until the newly approved committee convenes (Faculty Senate meeting, 10/4), this report satisfies previously described expectations and affirms program assessment as a University-wide responsibility with a commitment to curricular and student learning improvement. Data and results from outcomes assessment are examined in the aggregate only and are not used to evaluate individual faculty or students. (The charges to the committee were contained within sections 5.84.10-5.84.12 of the University Manual.)

The following summary of the biennial assessment reporting represents activity for cohort II, programs who last reported in 2021, with the next biennial reports due spring 2023¹. Reporting results were compiled by the ATL Office of Student Learning, Outcomes Assessment, and Accreditation.

SUMMARY OF INSTITUTION WIDE ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES - AY 2022-2023

This report provides an opportunity to share an annual institution-level assessment update, acknowledge faculty and programs identified through peer review for their excellence in assessment reporting, and summarize support for new programs.

Update: During the 10/19/23 Faculty Senate meeting, the CBUM committee approved the recommended merger of the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) with the Learning Outcomes and Oversight Committee (LOOC). The new committee will be known as the Joint Committee on Academic Program Review and Outcomes Assessment (JAPORA) and "...will share the common goal of ensuring processes and practices that are in place to support institutional effectiveness through evaluation and assessment." Additional details are available in the minutes found [here](#).

Item #1:

NEW PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLANS

Fall 2022 to present, the Assessment Office provided guidance, support and feedback to provisionally approve the following assessment plans for new program proposal packages in support of strategic goals and curricular innovation: (NOTE: this is one part of the [new program approval process](#).)

Academic Programs

Environmental Education BA

Education PhD

World Languages MA

Accelerated Online:

Environmental Management MA

Healthcare Outcomes and Data Analytics MS

¹Includes all programs assigned to Cohort II and any reports from Cohort I programs who may have had delayed reporting during their reporting year in 2022. Biennial assessment reports are due each May, at graduation, in compliance with the faculty contract, however, programs can opt into an extended due date in June.

Accelerated Online (cont.)

International Transitional tDPT
 Masters in Professional Studies MPS
 Professional Science Masters PSM
 User Experience/User Interface (UXUI) MA

Certificates

Jewish Studies UG
 Coastal Resilience Grad
 Early Intervention Grad
Accelerated Online:
 Cannabis Sciences Grad
 Pharmaceutical Development Grad
 Econometrics and Data Analysis Grad
 Wearables and Neurotechnologies Grad
 Future Autonomous Systems Grad
 User Experience (UX) Grad
 User Interface (UI) Grad

Item #2:**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROCESS REVIEW AND UPDATE**

Program-level assessment is the process used to document and demonstrate a commitment to understanding student learning and uncovering ways to improve the educational experience for students in an academic program at URI. The cohort based biennial reports use two of the NECHE reporting templates as the University's tool to capture faculty effort to check on learning within a curriculum and across a program. A third type of report template, the Interim Planning report, was developed internally as an assessment planning tool option arranged between a program and the Assessment Office typically to allow a program extra time to develop a meaningful assessment project or to follow up on results from a prior report. Interim reports are always requested if a program does not submit a report as expected nor communicate an issue in doing so. The interim plan is due mid-cycle, between reporting years, to ensure programs are on track for a successful assessment project.

Success in reporting is defined by two metrics: 1) **compliance** with reporting expectations for all accredited and non-accredited programs who are expected to engage in outcomes assessment; currently certificates do not participate, and 2) **report quality**, which provides information on faculty use of best practices in outcomes assessment to examine student learning (non-accredited programs only²). Both metrics are evaluated by peer reviewers using published rubrics to score the reports during a summer retreat.

Peer review of all reports occurs in June/July. Programs received feedback in August/September 2022, followed by the Deans Offices receiving institution-level and customized college-level summaries.

²As noted in prior reports, beginning with the 2016 Cohort I reporting cycle, accredited programs use a streamlined report template in recognition of additional reporting demands from external accrediting agencies.

From fall 2012 to spring 2023, the University of Rhode Island has followed a two cohort system for biennial reporting for all accredited and non-accredited academic programs with a mix of graduate and undergraduate programs expected to report every other year. Since 2020, however, two reporting deadlines are now offered to all reporting programs: *Option 1*: Submit the report on or before graduation, per the faculty contract and Faculty Senate policy; *Option 2*: Extended submission date 2-weeks following graduation.

Beginning summer 2023, the Graduate School will begin coordinating learning outcomes assessment for all graduate programs within a comprehensive student success framework, shifting to a 3-year cycle and a unique report form.

Item #3:

ANNUAL RESULTS ON BIENNIAL COHORT-BASED ASSESSMENT REPORTING (Cohort II, May 2023)

The 2023 reporting year included 42 Cohort II non-accredited programs, 25 accredited programs. Compliance scores represent the success of programs to engage in reporting within the 2-year cohort calendar. The scores for the quality of reports represents the degree to which programs used best practices in outcomes assessment, and met or exceeded expectations. Reports scoring below the expected level of achievement are not included.

Cohort II, Spring 2023 Institution-level Assessment Report Results:

SUBMITTED A TRADITIONAL, FULL REPORT

(NOTE: 12 graduate programs were exempt from reporting this round; reference EXEMPT section below)

Non-Accredited Programs: Report template has two sections. All programs are expected to complete Section I each round; expectations for completing Section II are guided by the programs' decisions regarding learning improvement recommendations based on results from the prior round of reporting:

Sec I. New assessment activity – a new outcome to be examined each cycle, or an outcome is re-examined in a new way (required by all programs each round unless expectations are made):

26 Undergraduate programs: 21 submitted (**81%**); 19 met or exceeded expectations (**90%**)

15 Graduate programs: 11 submitted (**73%**); 9 met or exceeded expectations (**82%**)

Sec II. Follow-up on prior assessment activity - follow-up on recommendations from the prior round of reporting, 2021 (expected when a program makes a recommendation for change and improvement):

4 Undergraduate programs expected: 2 submitted (**50%**); 2 met or exceeded expectations (**100%**)

5 Graduate programs: 3 submitted (**60%**); 2 met or exceeded expectations (**67%**)

Accredited Programs: Report template has two sections to capture topline summary information and metrics:

10 Undergraduate programs: 9 submitted (**90%**); 9 met or exceeded expectations (**100%**)

15 Graduate programs: 14 submitted (**93%**); 11 met or exceeded expectations (**78%***)

*Usually missing information

SUBMITTED AN INTERIM PLANNING REPORT (Non-accredited programs only; option available through the Assessment Office; used as a unique planning option):

Sec I. New Assessment Activity:

4 Undergraduate programs: 3 submitted (75%); 3 satisfactory (100%)
1 Graduate programs: 0 submitted (0%); 0 satisfactory (0%)

EXEMPT FROM REPORTING THIS ROUND (This option is used to indicate program engagement and ensures that preliminary planning for future rounds of assessment is in place. Exempted programs have an interim report due mid-cycle, spring 2024.)

3 Undergraduate programs requested this option
12 Graduate programs: these programs were offered the option to opt out of reporting last spring in anticipation of the Graduate School initiative

BIENNIAL INSTITUTION LEVEL, COMBINED COHORT RESULTS ON ASSESSMENT REPORTING: 2022 and 2023

Due to the current 2-cohort biennial reporting cycle, assessment results can be aggregated every two years to provide a complete picture, all academic programs, of the institution-level assessment effort at URI. The combined results yield the picture of University engagement with learning outcomes assessment:

SUBMITTED A TRADITIONAL, FULL REPORT

Non-Accredited Programs: Report template has two sections. All programs are expected to complete Section I each round; expectations for completing Section II are guided by the programs' decisions regarding learning improvement recommendations based on results from the prior round of reporting:

Sec I. New assessment activity – a new outcome to be examined each cycle, or an outcome is re-examined in a new way (required by all programs each round unless expectations are made):

50 Undergraduate programs: 44 submitted (**88%**); 37 met/exceeded expectations (**84%**)
33 Graduate programs: 22 submitted (**66%**); 15 met/ exceeded expectations (**68%**)

Sec II. Follow-up on prior assessment activity - follow-up on recommendations from the prior round of reporting, either 2020/2021, depending on the cohort; expected when a program makes a recommendation for change and improvement:

12 Undergraduate programs expected: 8 submitted (**66%**); 7 met/exceeded expectations (**87%**)
12 Graduate programs: 6 submitted (**50%**); 3 met/exceeded expectations (**50%**)

Accredited Programs: Report template has two sections to capture topline summary information and metrics:

21 Undergraduate programs: 20 submitted (**95%**); 19 met/exceeded expectations (**95%**)
19 Graduate programs: 18 submitted (**94%**); 14 met/exceeded expectations (**77%***)

*Usually missing information

SUBMITTED AN INTERIM PLANNING REPORT (Non-accredited programs only; option available through the Assessment Office; used as a unique planning option.)

Sec I. New Assessment Activity:

5 Undergraduate programs: 4 submitted (**80%**); 4 satisfactory (**100%**)
3 Graduate programs: 1 submitted (**33%**); 1 satisfactory (**100%**)

EXEMPT FROM REPORTING (This option is used to indicate program engagement and ensures that preliminary planning for future rounds of assessment is in place. These programs had interim reports due mid-cycle, either spring 2023, or reports will be due in spring 2024)

4 Undergraduate programs requested this option

12 Graduate programs were offered an option to be exempt from reporting in anticipation of the Graduate School initiative

Item #4:

RECOGNITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN ASSESSMENT REPORTING

Assessment reports are evaluated during an intensive 3-day summer retreat, following a 3-day training and norming session for faculty peer reviewers using faculty teams and a third level of oversight to review reports. Ten faculty served on peer review teams (2023) for the first round of review (Level 1); each reviewer then served as an independent reviewer (Level 2) for all reports providing oversight to ensure consistency in the review and scoring process. Scoring rubrics guide report review of assessment report templates (accredited, non-accredited, interim). To meet expectations in reporting, all non-accredited and accredited program reports are expected to achieve a score of “Satisfactory”.

Programs exceeding expectations are recognized for their excellence in assessment practice. It is important to note that rubric scores assigned by peer reviewers reflect neither a judgment of instructors nor the student learning results revealed during the assessment process, but rather, all scores reflect the level of achievement of programs in their effort to use best practices and processes to conduct assessment in order to yield valuable results. The results of outcomes assessment are intended strictly for use by academic programs for curricular or assessment process improvement.

The use of a peer review process and a rubric scoring tool provides the opportunity to identify faculty and programs undertaking best practices in learning outcomes assessment. The recognition of excellence in reporting is currently available for non-accredited undergraduate and graduate programs. This does not diminish the content nor effort of accredited programs to report, but reflects the streamlined accredited report template which requires summary content and metrics that are typically readily available, rather than the reporting on a program of the authentic assessment of student learning.

Recognition is determined by the aggregate of item and domain level rubric scores which define criteria related to the strength of the assessment process used to investigate issues around student learning, engagement of faculty, and plans for responding to findings and proposing/implementing interventions for improvement as needed. The legend for scores for non-accredited programs scores are:

Advanced: Criteria met for exceeding expectations.

Satisfactory: Criteria met for expectations.

Developing: Criteria not meeting expectations; room for improvement identified.

Missing: Items within the report or a section(s) of the report were not provided.

N/A: Report results were not yet available (due to timing, resources, etc.), or a Section of the report was not expected (no prior recommendations were made, or there was no prior report)

REPORT RECOGNITION

Six programs received top recognition for excellence in assessment reporting with nearly perfect scores of Advanced indicating a consistently strong assessment process was used, with documentation of additional efforts which strengthened the process and enhanced the report:

Program	Department	College	Faculty Member(s) Submitting Report
Undergraduate			
Aquaculture and Fisheries Technology, BS	Fisheries, Animal, and Veterinary Sciences	College of the Environment and Life Sciences	Marta Gomez-Chiarri
Biotechnology, BS	Cell and Molecular Biology	College of the Environment and Life Sciences	Brian Plouffe
Chinese, BA	Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures	College of Arts and Sciences	Xiaoyan Hu
French, BA	Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures	College of Arts and Sciences	Leslie Kealhofer-Kemp, LeAnee Spino-Seijas, Bing Mu
Italian, BA	Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures	College of Arts and Sciences	Michelangelo La Luna, LeAnee Spino-Seijas
Professional and Public Writing, BA	Professional and Public Writing	College of Arts and Sciences	Stephanie West-Puckett & Genoa Shepley

Two programs received an overall score of Advanced for either report section with all item level scores of Satisfactory or Advanced:

Program	Department	College	Faculty Member(s) Submitting Report
Undergraduate			
Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems, BS	Fisheries, Animal, and Veterinary Sciences	College of Arts and Sciences	John Taylor
Graduate			
Public Administration, MPA	Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures	College of Arts and Sciences	Aaron Ley

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

Undergraduate Programs:

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Chinese, BA

Lead Writer: Xiaoyan Hu

The program demonstrated a clear commitment to rigorous research practices, engaging in a continuous cycle of effort toward improving student learning. Faculty conducted a systematic examination of shared learning expectations for the ability of students (at the 200 and 400 level across two tracks of learners: regular and intensive tracks) to speak effectively in various social contexts, in linguistically and culturally appropriate ways, as well as to speak about complicated tasks in the upper division. The program administers nationally accepted standardized tests using both telephone and computer based oral questions scored by certified examiners. The program intentionally aligns the curriculum with the specific components of the national exams to ensure the teaching and learning are aligned to the strong national standards for language learning to best equip their students to be proficient. Program engages in ongoing review of results to ensure that they are evolving to meet the needs of its students. The program provided a very thoughtful examination of student performance across both regular and intensive language tracks. At both levels, students met goals, and the program considered ways to help students achieve at higher levels. The findings are the result of a deeply reflective and intentional

process, with a plan for curriculum map revisions, simplifying student learning outcomes, and the use of additional assessment tools. The program supports a strong commitment to improving learning through both curricular and pedagogical methods, and finding the best ways to use assessment as a way to check on students across the program.

French, BA

Lead Writers: Leslie Kealhofer-Kemp, LeAnee Spino-Seijas, Bing Mu

This program provides detailed the evidence, collection methods and interpretation of student learning at the midpoint and endpoint of students' academic performance. The program looked at oral proficiency and cultural competence of their students. Both outcomes had well-designed research plans. For oral skill, the program administers nationally accepted standardized tests. The oral testing is done regularly and provides longitudinal assessment data for individual students which allows the program to implement curricular changes as learning trends appear. Formal proficiency testing allows students to track themselves and their proficiency scores. Students' intercultural competence was measured via the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), a thorough student proficiency assessment tool supported by the hiring of an Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) Specialist. Future plans included curriculum changes, implementing more DIE (Describe; Interpret; Evaluate) classroom activities, developing cultural awareness via activities, and changing testing protocol of the ICC. This report provided assessment evidence that will be connected to a larger, research trajectory of future assessment reports.

Italian, BA

Lead Writer: Michelangelo La Luna, LeAnee Spino-Seijas

The program assessed students' language proficiency in narrating and describing the past, present, and future. Through a thoughtful and cohesive assessment review which included the use of tools like the Oral Proficiency Interview and looking at student learning at the midpoint and endpoint of students' academic performance. The program administers nationally accepted standardized tests. The program also assessed students' awareness of cultural practices related to Italian and American cultures at the midpoint and endpoint groups of students' academics using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), a thorough student proficiency assessment tool supported by the hiring of an Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) Specialist. Recommendations include implementing activities at different course levels to enhance intercultural communicative competence. Changes in the testing protocol will assess incoming majors and graduating seniors, with a plan for biennial assessments.

Professional and Public Writing BA (formerly Writing and Rhetoric)

Lead Writers: Stephanie West-Puckett, Genoa Shepley

Based on the 2019 report, and also in service to the JEDI commitment, and the program's overall continued focus on a vibrant, relevant, engaging and research based program, the report noted major program revisions to courses, pedagogy, mandatory training in critical courses to ensure consistency of course delivery, revision of learning outcomes (implemented fall 2023) and several other course-specific updates in addition to the continued consideration of how the program and specific courses service all students. The current report sought to check on the impact of pedagogical changes (2018-2019) in a critical course looking for learning trends by demographic factors across a)grades as a predictor of success (2014/2022) b) authentic assessment of a writing prompt via General Education assessment and use of IDEA student response data. The program's use of external data would help them to better understand student success (beyond assessment) as they prepare to launch a participatory student

oriented research project to probe learning and student populations. The program awaits additional evidence before making more changes. It should be noted that the program's extensive documentation around goal-setting, processes for examining learning, measuring, evaluating, responding to results, and their presentation of findings, reflections and recommendations is exemplary.

COLLEGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LIFE SCIENCES

Aquaculture and Fisheries Technology, BS

Lead Writer: Marta Gomez-Chiarri

The report focused on evaluating students' ability to generate solutions to complex challenges in the field. The program examined artifacts from a broad mix of courses and individual and group work to gauge the student's integration and application of knowledge. The assessment process included an evaluation team of 8 faculty participants, and the use of a "Problem-Solving" rubric adapted from the AAC&U VALUE Rubric to assess student performance. Faculty were pleased that overall, throughout the curriculum where this outcome is supported, students generally achieve expectations, with specific results for each type of assignment and each criteria. Faculty identified some flaws in the assignments, as well as growth in learning from courses that introduced the outcome to the upper level, as expected. Faculty noted weakness and lower proficiency for students implementing solutions, however, the program had specific recommendations including attention to the internship courses and the enhancement of problem-based courses or shifting courses to be more problem-based, as well as improvement on some of the mentor/supervisor evaluation forms to align with the outcome/rubric and enhance the learning information available.

Biotechnology, BS

Lead Writer: Brian Plouffe

The report was detailed, comprehensive and thorough in describing the program's recent focus on the communication skills of biotechnology students using oral and written strategies. Three required, sequenced courses, which allow for assessment of the building of communication skills, were examined using multiple sources of evidence including lab reports, supervisor evaluations, and course-specific rubrics within a robust student sample. The objective is for students to graduate with skills to present scientific or technical information orally and in writing to a variety of audiences. Tools for assessing proficiency in the learning outcome were designed uniquely and specifically for each course and the process appeared collaborative and was well documented. The program expanded their use of the assessment project to look at metrics outside program level including overall program assessment across both outcome areas, individual performance areas, course-level assessment, overall and individual performance areas, individual areas on each evaluation tool, semester/yearly changes, and the effectiveness of scaffolding in the assignments. The program supports more scaffolding and repetition of content and practice as needed and helpful to students, but noted that students need support to improve in the area of the "Results" section of their lab reports where growth and improvement was lowest (with some explanation).. Additionally, some faculty were challenged to assess writing and some students need more support in general with information literacy/citations, and it was found that group work scores did not necessarily represent individual student skills and learning. Both curriculum and individual course changes are planned because of this analysis, and due to observations in individual courses and assignments: two of the recommendations address writing skills, and the third is curricular change to support opportunities for reinforcement of skills.

Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems BS

Lead Writer: John Taylor

The program conducted a comprehensive examination of students' knowledge and skills in evaluating the complex and integrated nature of food systems as *systems thinkers* looking at several levels of students from introductory, to capstone and general education with a mix of group and individual work examined. Faculty added in-class assignments, and repeated feedback, and improvement was noted in students' information literacy skills, however, the assessment project using a standard rubric across the varied courses/assignment types was invaluable for discovering specific weaknesses aligned with rubric criteria. Several clear and actionable recommendations for course-level changes were provided to enhance the students' opportunity to develop deeper systems thinking processes, for example, by expanding skills in the areas of marketing and distribution, the incorporation of more social and economic factors, as well as continuing to develop student's knowledge and understanding of factors that contribute to equitable, sustainable and resilient food systems.

Graduate Programs:**Masters in Public Administration****Lead Writer: Aaron Ley**

Comprehensive assessment practice was used in this report which was also used to support the program's application for accreditation. The program used surveys of recent grads, and results of direct evidence to explore the student's ability to [shape policy outcomes and management practices and their feelings of competence in the field](#). Faculty engaged in a strong, validated scoring practice and enhanced the shared rubric with additional criteria which found students were achieving program expectations. Additionally, the examination of students ability to when selecting appropriate methodological, analytical tools or frameworks noted areas for improvement with recommendations to emphasize the selection of research methodology from the appropriate literature in the pre-capstone and capstone courses, which will be redesigned to integrate an exercise to help students develop a robust methodological section to meets expectations.

Item #5**RECOGNITION OF FACULTY ASSESSMENT FELLOWS: Faculty Peer Reviewers**

Faculty engagement in the assessment process is a critical part of meaningful and manageable assessment which enhances the overall climate and supportive culture as faculty work collegially to examine the curricular experience and expected knowledge and skills of their graduates. Each spring, full-time faculty and lecturers have the opportunity to further develop their assessment knowledge and skills by applying to become an [Assessment Fellow](#). Selected faculty participate in training to become peer reviewers of undergraduate and graduate program assessment reports and develop feedback for programs during the Assessment Retreat. The [2023 Assessment Fellows](#) (also listed below) earned a *Assessment Participant Badge*:

Jessica Alba, Assistant Professor, Biomedical & Pharmaceutical Sciences
 Izabela Ciesielksa-Wrobel, Assistant Professor, Textiles, Fashion Merchandising & Design
 Emily Clapham, Associate Professor, School of Education, Health and Physical Education
 Michelle Flippin, Assistant Professor, Communicative Disorders
 Leah Heilig, Assistant Professor, Professional and Public Writing
 William Krieger, Associate Professor, Philosophy

Brian Plouffe, Clinical Assistant Professor, Cell and Molecular Biology
 Brett Still, Clinical Assistant Professor, Natural Resource Sciences

In spring 2023, Julianna Golas, Associate Teaching Professor, Human Development and Family Studies (CHS), co-facilitated the design and delivery of the peer reviewer training and retreat sessions, earning the *Assessment Leader Badge*. Julianna had successfully completed the Assessment Fellows program in 2022.

As of May 2023, more than 60 faculty have earned the designation of Assessment Fellow and are recognized below for their commitment to supporting learning outcomes assessment through active participation in a faculty community. In 2023 the call for applicants was limited to returning reviewers in order to capitalize on both their experience as prior reviewers and to refresh and renew their skills.

Participated 1 Year:

Brad Weatherbee, Marine Biology
 Clarisa Carubin, Art and Art History
 Crystal Green, Communication Studies
 Jennifer Gill, Cellular and Molecular Biology
 Madison Jones, Professional and Public Writing
 Roberta King, Biomedical & Pharmaceutical Sciences
 Ryan Chapman, Kinesiology
 Yang Lin, Mechanical, Industrial and Electrical Engineering
 Ali Akanda, Civil and Environmental Engineering
 Christy Ashley, Business
 Michael Barrus, Mathematics
 Barbara Costello, Sociology
 Douglas Gobeille, Physics
 Sandy Hicks, Education
 Rabia Hos, Education
 I-Ling Hsu, Chinese
 Anne Hubbard, Interdisciplinary Studies
 Steven Irvine, Biology
 Heather Johnson, Professional and Public Writing
 Musa Jouaneh, Mechanical and Industrial and Systems Engineering
 Diane Kern, Education
 Sarah Larson, Nutrition
 Mary MacDonald, Library Science
 Lauren Mandel, Library Science
 Kathleen Melanson, Nutrition
 Libby Miles, English
 Bethany Milner, Communicative Disorders
 Mary Moen, Library Science
 Roberta Newell, Accounting
 Brietta Oaks, Nutrition
 LuAnne Roth, Professional and Public Writing
 LeAnne Spino-Seijas, Spanish
 Theodore Walls, Psychology
 Ping Xu, Political Science

Participated 2 Years:

Jessica Alba, Psychology, Interdisciplinary Neuroscience
Alana Bibeau, Sociology
Kris Bovy, Anthropology
Izabela Ciesielksa-Wrobel, Textiles, Fashion Merchandising & Design
Julianna Golas, Human Development and Family Studies
Leah Heilig, Professional and Public Writing
Gerard Jalette, Communication Studies
William Krieger, Philosophy
Aaron Ley, Political Science
Christine McGrane, Nursing
Samantha Meenach, Chemical Engineering, Pharmacy
Brian Plouffe, Cell and Molecular Biology
Ann-Marie Sacco, Business
Cathy Semnoski, Education
Brett Still, Natural Resource Sciences
Simona Trandafir, Environmental and Natural Resource Economics

Participated 3 years:

Melissa Boyd-Colvin, Leadership Minor
Michelle Flippin, Communicative Disorders
Norma Owens, Pharmacy

Participated 4 Years:

Emily Clapham, Kinesiology
Miriam Reumann, History

Participated 5 years:

Susan Brand, Education
Kristin Johnson, Political Science
Ingrid Lofgren, Nutrition and Food Science
Martha Waitkun, Communication Studies

Faculty Senate Office: [2023 LOOC Committee membership](#)