UGS and the Utah Pledge Assessment Plan
2016-2017

Student Success Portfolio
Amy Bergerson, Kathryn Coquemont, Beth Howard,
Mike Martineau, Mark Mattheson, Amanda May

Student Success Definition:
Student success at the University of Utah manifests in students who emerge from the institution with a demonstrated capacity for:
- Developing a sense of purpose that empowers and nurtures their capacity to live productively.
- Committing to the human and global community and the creation of a better world.
- Achieving personal growth in many areas, including intellectual advancement, practical skills for living, and emotional development.
- Developing academic and personal goals that may include accomplishing a degree in a timely manner.
- Demonstrating empathy and respect towards others.
- Valuing tangible and intangible elements of life.
- Increasing their access to opportunities.

These outcomes are nurtured though students' engagement in meaningful learning experiences with educators and organizations in the Division of Undergraduate Studies.

Goal 1: Establish a regular session where students can talk directly to a small group of University faculty and professionals about whatever is on their minds.

Action Steps
1. MUSE Casual Friday Spring 2016
2. Consider other offices that should be involved in these sessions: create a campus culture in which these gatherings take place across campus
3. Take to different locations on campus: day care centers
4. Provide different formats (i.e., faculty-led discussion, topical discussion, informal time to get to know invited faculty/staff)
5. Target types of students who are typically less engaged or report feeling marginalized on campus

Assessment Steps
1. Measure the extent to which we actually establish these sessions
2. Collect information on the number of students attending sessions and who they are
3. Have students complete simple survey at the end of sessions to measure their impact (use iPods from Assessment or UGS to administer the survey): expanding their network or connection, likelihood of talking with a professor, sense of belonging, type of donuts they like
4. Ask offices related to particular topics to track where students are coming from to see if students in our sessions are accessing other resources
5. Add to GSS? (Engagement—consider NSSE measures)

Goal 2: Every student will annually discuss with an academic advisor, student success advocate, or other University agent how they are engaging in academics, campus life, community and self-development.

Action Steps

1. Build on foundations of campus card swipe system and ensure all data goes to one place to facilitate understanding of what services/programs/departments students are accessing
2. Create new and formalize existing faculty mentor programs; assign students based on interests outside of academic field. Focus on career-line and tenured faculty. Possible groups: 1) first year students to establish connections quickly, 2) transfer students to help establish connections and differentiate the U from their transfer institution, 3) students with low student success indices.
3. Expand first- and second-year mandatory academic advising for all students annually—start with students with indicators of lack of progress

Assessment Steps

1. Tap into data from offices already tracking student use (i.e., UC, SSEI, WRC, Campus Life Mentors, CESA, WEI mentors, AIRC, Veteran's Center, CDS, ISSS, Business Scholars, TRIO, Capstone Initiatives, UROP, LEAP
2. Survey students about their interactions with faculty in the faculty mentor program
3. Qualitative data: students' experiences with faculty and faculty experiences with students in the program
4. Utilize predictive data analytics to compare similar students who are/are not engaged
5. Create or refine GSS and stop-out survey to focus on students" relationships with faculty and other mentors
6. Measure number of students meeting with Academic Advisors annually, reductions students with lack of progress indicators

Goal 3: Undergraduate Studies will identify key campus partners to co-develop new initiatives or reinvent or modify current programs, processes, or policies to remove barriers for students.

Action Steps

1. Create sessions at Orientation, Welcome Week, etc…that help students understand how to, and the importance of, interacting with faculty (partner with MUSE for this)
    a. See goal #1 for opportunities for students and faculty to interact
2. Have a UGS intern comb through UGS and SA annual reports to create an inventory of potential partnerships across areas; identify how these partnerships can reduce barriers for students
3. Utilize knowledge in identity centers to identify barriers for specific populations of students (WRC, LGBT, CESA, Veterans, DSS, Transfer Center, TRiO, AIRC). Identify faculty and other campus members who can serve as liaisons to those centers.

Assessment Steps

1. Number of students who attend these sessions, NSSE, faculty surveys
2. See goal #1 for assessment opportunities for student-faculty interaction
3. Changes in numbers of students utilizing identity centers; acknowledge the impact that interactions with faculty and staff have on students' progression; 360 evaluations of these centers and other spaces on campus

Goal 4: Increase involvement in our academic community by providing opportunities to engage for students at U of U off-site locations and online.

Action Steps
1. Conduct needs assessment to determine what students need/want to see at off-site locations
2. Utilize Bringing the U to You locations/spaces to connect with online and off-site students who live in those areas
3. Increase capacity for providing virtual student services to off-site and online students; utilize student services to off-site and online students; utilize live-streaming of events to off-site locations
4. Develop communication plan for informing students about services and events specific to their location as well as general advice

Assessment Steps
1. CE develop and conduct the assessment—see what data is already there
1. Look at goals of students attending in these locations and whether we meet those
2. 3. Track Attendance at BtUtY events; survey online and off-site faculty and staff about increases in contacts
3. Track number of courses attempted vs. completed increase. Retention rates.
4. Assess communication plan through open and click rates

Assessing Engagement Portfolio Team
AY 2015-2016 Report, May 2016

I. Team members
Ann Darling and Rachel Hayes-Harb, Co-chairs; Dean McGovern; Mark Matheson; Merilee Anderson; Patricia Rohrer; Stephen Goldsmith; and Trever Bruhn

II. Our charge
Develop a systematic approach to assessing the student learning that occurs in the context of deeply engaged learning experiences.
• Look at the assessment we are already doing and what we are not
• Develop a set of goals about what we hope to achieve through deeply engaged learning experiences
• Combine qualitative and quantitative measures to assess the numbers of students participating, what we hope they will learn, what they think they are learning, and how this represents an undergraduate education at the U

III. What is an engaged learning opportunity?
The team agreed that we would adopt the definition of an engaged learning opportunity that had been previously developed by the Deeply Engaged Learning Portfolio Team. Our definition is thus as follows:

A well-defined and purposeful educational experience, of significant duration or intensity, that offers sustained mentoring, deep inquiry into a specific field or practice, and a concentration of learning modes that enable students to develop their capacities for analysis, creativity, and constructive action.

IV. Programs that focus on deeply engaged learning
We identified several programs and units on the University of Utah campus who focus on deeply engaged learning; each program/unit had at least one representative on the team.
• Beacon Scholars
• Bennion Center
• Capstone Initiative
• Continuing Education and Community Outreach (CECE)
• Honors College
• MUSE
• Undergraduate Research

V. Categories of outcomes for deeply engaged learning
Given the definition above, we identified three categories for learning outcomes. Learning outcomes should focus on the ways in which the opportunity enables students to develop their capacities for:
- Analysis
  - Processes of inquiry
  - Use of appropriate methods to answer questions
  - Examining the parts of a whole to understand them separately
  - Creativity
  - Problem-solving
- Navigating complexities
  - Flexibility
  - Comfortable with uncertainty
  - Managing change effectively
- Constructive action
  - Projects, products
  - Taking what you have learned and effecting change
  - Reflection
  - Collaboration

VI. Where are we now?
Each of the identified programs was invited to share their current learning outcomes assessment plan and/or develop one by answering the following questions: (1) What are your learning outcomes, and how are they aligned with the categories of analysis, creativity, and constructive action)?; (2) What are your procedures for data collection, analysis, and reporting?; and (3) How does the data inform change?

Bennion Center
1. List of learning outcomes
• Identify and utilize relevant previous work that supports community engagement and civic competencies (analysis)
• Develop a collaborative community engagement project (creativity/ constructive action)
• Identify and defend civic competencies (analysis)
• Work collaboratively with other students, faculty, and community partners demonstrating effective communication and problem-solving skills (creativity)

• Present/defend the community engagement project effectively in a and a written publication (constructive action)
• Reflect constructively on the CE experience, identify what happened, why its important, what comes next (What? So What? Now What?) (analysis/ constructive action)

2. Data collection, analysis, and reporting
Portfolio, defense, reflective narrative/video
3. How does the data inform change?
Data is continuously evaluated to make adjustments to Bennion Center programming including work with community partners. Also the BC reports community impacts.

Honors Praxis Labs
1. List of learning outcomes
   • Identify and utilize previous research on a complex social issue (analysis)
   • Develop multiple disciplinary approaches to analyze the issue (analysis)
   • Collaboratively identify and review relevant actionable local issues (creativity/constructive action)
   • Collaboratively design and implement a project that addresses a need in the community (creativity/constructive action)
   • Present the research in a written publication and in multiple presentations on campus and
   in the community (creativity/constructive action)
   2. Data collection, analysis, and reporting
   Student and faculty assessment/self reports
3. How does the data inform change?
We continuously (annually?) review the Praxis Lab program.
Office of Undergraduate Research

1. List of learning outcomes
   • Identify and utilize relevant previous work that supports their research (analysis)
   • Articulate a timely and important research question or creative objective (analysis)
   • Identify and utilize appropriate methodologies to address the research question or creative objective (analysis)
   • Meet the relevant field's standards for the responsible conduct of research, and effectively navigate challenges that arise in the research process (analysis)
   • Work collaboratively with other researchers, demonstrating effective communication and
   problem-solving skills (creativity)
   • Present the research effectively in a conference setting and a written publication (constructive action)
   • Reflect constructively on their research experience, identifying what was learned, personal strengths and opportunities for growth, and how the experience informs their future educational and career goals (constructive action)

2. Data collection, analysis, and reporting
Student Self-Report - As a condition of acceptance of the Undergraduate Research

Opportunities program (UROP) award, a small grant, or a travel grant, students agree to complete an online 'final report' of the experience. They are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that their undergraduate research experience has helped them to meet each of the learning outcomes. Response options are: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree. In addition, students who apply for the Undergraduate Research Scholar Designation (usually in their final semester before graduation) are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that their undergraduate research experience has helped them to meet each of the learning outcomes. Faculty Mentor Report - Faculty mentors are also asked to complete a final report; they are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that "through participation in UROP this semester under your mentorship", the student has met each of the learning outcomes. We calculate proportion 'agree' scores for each of our learning outcomes. These are available on our web site: http://our.utah.edu/aboutour/learning-outcomes/.

3. How does the data inform change?
We use the data in our annual program review process to determine the extent to which students involved in these programs achieve our learning outcomes. To the extent that students do not meet the learning outcomes, we adjust our programs accordingly. By virtue of asking students and their faculty mentors to interact with our learning outcomes via the final reports detailed above, we enjoy the additional benefit of communicating our values and goals as an office to our stakeholders. Thus, the learning outcomes assessment process in and of itself has the ability to effect positive change.

MUSE
1. List of learning outcomes
  • Students improve their skills at critical analysis of texts, lectures, and performances. Students encounter these forms of discourse through our annual MUSE Theme Year text, for which we hold student book-group discussions; our MUSE Lunchtime Lectures and other sponsored presentations; and attendance at performances and exhibits offered through our MUSE Nights Out program.
  • Students increase their capacity for self-reflection, for attention to their inner life, and for
  analysis of their unique experience.
  • Students create new social skills and develop their capacities for community building and for establishing personal networks. These opportunities are available through a variety of MUSE events that connect students with individual members of our faculty, community leaders, and distinguished national guests. Video and design contests have also provided a stimulus to artistic creativity.
  • Students participate in engaged ways in the life of the campus and the broader community. MUSE opportunities encourage constructive action in the intellectual life of the University, such as facilitating student book discussion groups, participating in Q and A conversations with distinguished lecturers, and presenting papers at conferences. MUSE Internships also engage students in constructive action in professional offices across campus. Our MUSE Theme Year events have proven to be a rich opportunity for students to engage with younger students in the local community.
2. Data collection, analysis, and reporting

• MUSE keeps accurate records of the number of students who participate in each of our events. We have also conducted, in each of the last two years, an inventory of student involvement in engaged learning opportunities offered by all campus offices.

• We learn through ongoing conversations with students about their experience of MUSE events and through asking them to reflect on these opportunities in writing.

• We ask for mentor and intern evaluations for all MUSE Internships.

3. How does the data inform change?

As an office, MUSE is engaged in a sustained way in evaluating our programming based student responses. This is an active and ongoing effort.

FLEXU Intensive Courses

Status: In progress. Working with associated academic departments concerning the classification of FLEXU intensive courses as deeply engaged learning experiences.

Beacon Scholars

Status: In progress. Draft learning outcomes are in progress and will be completed during the summer 2016 semester. Over the course of the 2016-17 academic year we will work on data measures for these outcomes. Learning outcome data will be used to drive program decisions. Results will help us know where to focus or rework curriculum. Individual student data will help drive staff coaching and more intentional interventions to ensure student progress and success.

Capstone

Status: In progress. During the AACU conference on assessment held in New Orleans in February, examples of assessment criteria and processes were presented from a broad range of institutions and programs. These ranged from collaborative, interdisciplinary capstone courses to capstones for language majors and chemistry. In June, the Director of Capstone Programs at Portland State along with some of her colleagues is hosting Stephen during their capstone fair. The goal is to bring back wisdom from their 20-years of experience in assessing capstones and adapt the knowledge from both of these experiences to our program.

Learning Communities Assessment Committee
Summary
Background
In November, 2015, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Martha Bradley charged Sylvia Torti, Dean of the Honors College, and Carolyn Bliss, Director of LEAP, with chairing the committee. Table 1 lists committee members and their departments.

Learning Committee Members:
Sylvia Torti Dean Honors College
Carolyn Bliss Director UGS; LEAP
Ann Darling Assistant Vice President of UGS; Block U
Undergraduate Studies
Taun_ya Dressler Assistant Dean College of Humanities
Steve Maisch Assistant Professor UGS; LEAP
Rudy Madina, Student Equity and Diversity
Erica Rojas Associate Director Honors College

Tricia Sugiyama Director Student Equity and Diversity

The committee's charge had two specific components. First, the committee was asked to "develop a systematic approach to assessing the student learning that occurs in the context of learning communities." The second was to look into qualitative and qualitative tools to assess these communities. The overarching goal was then to develop learning outcomes and recommend assessment tools that may be applicable to various LCs. The committee met every other week January through April, 2016.

Learning Community Definition

Based on Association of American Colleges and Universities (AA&U) Integrative Learning Value Rubric, the committee defined Learning Community as:

"A community where integration oflearning involves students with 'big questions' that --~-· matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another etnd with their professors."

From this definition, each committee member evaluated its own learning communities to identify the purpose of the program and desirable outcomes. The committee reviewed the following first-year learning communities:

- Honors (various versions)
- LEAP (various versions)
- Block U
- Diversity Scholars
- Humanities Scholars

Its members considered other existing communities such as Business Scholars and potential new learning communities.

Learning Outcomes for First Time Freshmen Learning Communities

As a result of the program evaluation each committee member conducted, three integrative learning outcomes emerged. These dimensions include: making intellectual, reflective/self-assessment, and community connections.

Intellectual Connections: Measures student capacity for making connections among disciplines, experiences, perspectives, etc.

Reflection/Self-Assessment Connections: Develops ability to self-assess (e.g., introspection, directional learning, self authorship).

Community Connections: anchoring students to campus and community, e.g., feeling they belong, knowledge of where to find resources, etc.

It is important to note that current learning communities had already been engaging their students in making connections in all three dimensions. These dimensions, however, create a framework that current learning communities can use to evaluate their programs. In addition, these dimensions give direction to future LCs and the ability to easily integrate in their curriculum.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes
The committee looked at qualitative and quantitative tools to assess the three dimensions of the learning outcome.

• Qualitative: Since the theme for each learning community differs, the committee recommends that each program integrates assignments into their syllabi that demonstrate each dimension. Committee members mapped their syllabi to show how faculty could incorporate and evaluate the dimensions (see appendix I).

• Quantitative: The committee looked into Skyfactor, a survey tool LEAP has utilized in the past to assess classroom experience and curriculum outcomes. Questions already included in the survey aim to evaluate a student's sense of belonging in the classroom and on campus, as well as connections to other disciplines and intellectual growth. The approximate cost to distribute this course to 102 course sections is $4, 738 for the 2016-2017 academic year (see appendix II). In addition, the committee recommends that each program develops its own assessment tools to track student retention and degree completion.