Outcomes Assessment Coordinating Council
Meeting Minutes 11/14/2022

In Attendance: Mark Stewart; Kane Gillespie; Ellen Watson; Allen Lewis; Charis Ng; Bonnie Granat; Wolf Lacossiere; Marie Claire Roberts; Lori Escallier; Lori Bruno; Richard Kollmar; Tina Adjei-Bosompem

Today's Discussion:

TOPIC	NOTES
Assessment planning and SWOT Analysis Project: Phase 1 preliminary results- *Presented by Kane Gillespie*	• The goal of the Assessment planning and SWOT Analysis project is to take a pulse on assessment activities across the institution and to use the results of the project to inform the development of an institutional assessment plan. For further details on the project, see the proposal "OACC Assessment Planning and SWOT Analysis," endorsed by the OACC on Oct 17, 2022. • Since our last meeting on Oct 17, Mark, Lori B., and Kane have shared rubrics as planned with the Deans, who have provided thoughtful and quick responses. Kane has conducted a preliminary descriptive analysis of the responses and presented the analysis to the OACC. • The preliminary results of phase 1 are as follows: o Results returned with a 91% response rate. By design, the sample size is sufficiently small, so the analysis is based on averages of responses to the rubrics. Each rubric employs a 4-point response scale from 0 (not evident) to 3 (mature / excelling). Kane compiled the responses from deans and organized them by College/ School and program. o The analysis suggests that a number of elements deserve some attention in each aspect of institutional effectiveness (Design, Implementation, and Impact). Overall, the Deans responded similarly with respect to the maturity of institutional effectiveness practices at the university. o Analysis suggests that individual program assessment practices varied among the academic programs. However, despite the variation, the average response for individual program assessment maturity was higher than the average response for institutional effectiveness. o The four free-response questions are still under review. Some initial strengths and weaknesses of assessment are emerging but with a spectrum of responses. o Results thus far align with the anecdotal observations expressed by individuals on institutional effectiveness and program assessment: Programs assess themselves on average as "proficient" (1.8 on a 0 to 3 point scale) in program assessment practices, they assess the institution as as "emergent" (1.3) in institutional effectiveness practices. o The analysis suggests a few strengths and weaknesses among aspects of program assessment practices. Strengths include maturity of program learning outcomes (PLO), assessment of PLO's, and dissemination/ consideration of assessment results. Weaknesses include alignment of PLO's with Institutional Learning Outcomes; Curriculum Mapping, Assessment planning and Program review. o The analysis suggests a few strengths and weaknesses among aspects of Institutional Effectiveness practices. Strengths include use of data from multiple sources and budgetary support for assessment. Weaknesses include a lack of an institution-wide assessment plan, alignment among institutional objectives with program and course objectives, use of

TOPIC	NOTES
	assessment results for institutional improvement, communication of institutional assessment results, inclusion of faculty and staff in institutional effectiveness activities, articulation of measurable outcomes for the institution, and ongoing, consistent and sustainable assessment practices at the institutional level. o The analysis will be useful in fostering discussion in phase 2 (focus groups) of the project, scheduled to commence after Thanksgiving. Campus wide discussions will continue in January 2023 with a town hall in February 2023 to present findings and solicit additional feedback from the campus community. *Observations/suggestions:* • Cross-reference the status of assessment in each program from the perspective of program accreditors. Are any programs responding to requests from their accreditors for program assessment activities? Doing so could provide and additional perspective of our assessment practices that can be compared to our own self-assessment. • Discover what the external site visit team identified as specific concern as a result of the 2016 Middle States evaluation. The visiting team's remarks could provide an additional perspective for developing an assessment plan for the university. • The analysis of responses from Deans should neither be viewed as an evaluation nor promoting competition. Instead, the anlysis is intended to foster ongoing discussion and collaboration for continuous improvement. As Dean Lewis pointed out, it's less important where we start and more important that we make continuous progress. *Next steps:* • *Start Phase 2 of Assessment Pulse analysis which will include 2 focus groups and a town hall*
Middle States Updates:	• Downstate is in the early stages of the Self-Study Process. • A small group of Downstate members will have completed the Self-Study Institute in October and November 2022, which indicates the official start of self-study process. • We are in the final stage for identifying members of the steering committee. • The tentative date for the site visit is early 2025 (Jan-April 2025). Although the tentative site visit date seems in the distant future, in reality, we only have a few short semesters to conduct a self-study and prepare for the site visit when taking into account summer and winter intersessions. • A detailed production calendar is being developed for transparency and to track our progress. • Middle States expectations include for us to demonstrate compliance and continuous improvement on each of their Standards by providing evidence of 4 P's -- policy, process, people, and proof -- for each criterion. Working groups will be assigned a standard of accreditation to work on. • Tentative launch date for the Middle States Website will be Nov 30, 2022. The site will include resources for the campus, members of the middle states committees, and (where appropriate) the public.

TOPIC	NOTES
College updates:	- COM, CON, SPH, and SOHP are currently working on accreditation for at least one of their programs - COM has a report due December 2nd that will hopefully tie up any final loose ends for LCME on 12 areas identified in their most recent evaluation. CoM must address a few non-compliance issues as well as some monitoring. CoM has action plans in place for all 12, but the general issue at the last evaluation was that the plans were not in place for long enough to demonstrate compliance. CoM expects to be in full compliance following acceptance and review of the Dec 2 report. - SoHP: Dean Lewis reports that accreditation activities are in full swing and well-managed in SoHP. - Midwifery: a self-study report is due in February 2023 for a site visit in April 2023. - Physical Therapy has a self study report due in April 2023 for a site visit in July 2023. - Physician's Assistant program is preparing a "modified self-study," due in July, 2023 as a follow up to their prior evaluation. - CON has no updates to report. - Kane offered support from the Office of Evaluation, Outcomes Assessment, and Accreditation Services for any ongoing accreditation activities.

Respectfully Submitted, Nov 15, 2022, Kane Gillespie and Tina Adjei-Bosompem, Office of Evaluation, Outcomes Assessment, and Accreditation Services