## UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT

*Committee Name:* *Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee* 2017-2018

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1 plus time on ad-hoc committees for Rowan Core

Committee Chair: Carla Lewandowski

Committee Members: (list here)

| Adrian Barnes | Daniel McArdle | Hajime Mitani |
|---|---|---|
| Alison Novak | Sangita Phadtare | June Rangone |
| Seran Schug | Jennifer Nicholson | Austin O'Neill |
| Michael Viola | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

### Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Engages in the ongoing review of the University's assessment principles and observes the application of the principles in practice; reviews and recommends assessment plans from academic programs, general education, and student development; assists in the establishment of a process for the systematic review of assessment information collected each year. Eligibility: (Committee Chair is not calculated in the committee total) 6 Faculty (one from each College), 1 Curriculum Committee Rep, 1 Institutional Research Rep (non-voting), 1 AFT rep, 1 Professional Staff, 1 Academic Policies/Procedures Rep, 2 SGA Reps

### Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee met one time as a committee, but helped the Rowan Core Committee review proposals for courses that wish to be added to the Rowan Core. Departments developed assessment methods (typically objective questions or essay questions with grading rubrics). The assessment methods for the course are aligned to specific Rowan Core outcomes within one literacy. The LOAC participated on the committee to make sure that the assessment methods did in fact align to the outcomes. This was a useful exercise for our committee because we were able to learn more about the assessment, outcomes and the literacies. Members of the committee participated in up to 3 ad hoc meetings for the Rowan Core proposals.

The chair of the LOAC, Carla Lewandowski, met with Jeff Bonfield, the Director of Assessment and Nathan Bauer, the chair of the Rowan Core, to discuss the role of the LOAC in the future with the adoption of the Rowan Core in the 2018-2019 school year. It was decided at the meeting that the LOAC could take on a greater role. The range of possible student scores on the assessment methods are translated to a standardized scale that represents the students' level of attainment of the Rowan Core outcomes(s) that are aligned to the assessment method. While there is a standardized scale for Rowan Outcome ratings, the *translations* of the course scores to the standardized ratings are not *themselves* standardized.   It is possible that for the same Rowan Core outcome, students would have to perform significantly better in one course than they would in another course to earn the same rating on the Rowan Core outcome.  The LOAC could eliminate this shortcoming in the assessment process.

Therefore, moving forward, the LOAC will evaluate representative samples of student work from Rowan Core assessment methods that are aligned to a common Rowan Core outcome. The Committee will rate the students' performance using the standardized scale for the Rowan Core outcome.  Reviewing a range of student work from various courses will make it possible for the LOAC to apply the standardized scale evenly both within and across disciplines. In instances when objective questions are the course assessment method, the Committee will determine what number correct correlates with what rating on the standardized scale.

## <u>SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

### 2017-2018

The workload for this committee will most definitely become greater as a result of the new responsibilities of the committee. While it may not be necessary in the 2018-2019 year, it may become helpful for the chair of the committee to receive a course reduction for the school year as the committee takes on more courses to evaluate. The chair will need to set up and facilitate standardization meetings in addition to asking subject matter experts to join ad hoc meetings.

Moreover, the committee makes a recommendation that students should not be on the committee as the work will now include evaluating student work. The committee feels it is not appropriate for students to be evaluating other students' work, even if it is anonymized.