

Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Committee (UOAC) Meeting Minutes
Date: Friday, November 1, 2021
Location: ZOOM meeting

Present: Kate McIntyre (Chair, H&A), John Bergendahl (CEE), Chrys Demetry (Morgan Center), Jennifer deWinter (CAP), Shivaani Gopal (student representative), Art Heinricher (Provost's Office), Doug Petkie (PH), Melissa Leahy (Office of Strategic Initiatives)

1. Chair K. McIntyre called the meeting to order at 11:01 am.
2. The minutes from the October 8th meeting were approved with minor edits.
3. Discussions continued from previous meetings around the assessment of Undergraduate Learning Outcome 8 that relates to the global and intercultural competency. In particular, what data (statistical summaries and raw data) are currently available to inform some assessment strategies? The discussion focused on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that could inform the learning outcomes and shape future measures. Raw data exists, but based on Learning Outcome 8, a subset of NSSE survey questions should first be selected. Currently it seems that about six to eight questions may be relevant, but these should be examined more closely before gathering the raw data.

The fit of NSSE survey questions was discussed in the context of WPI's curriculum. The NSSE survey goes to first year and senior students and identifies practices that would happen in individual courses, rather than in projects (GPS/HUA/IQP/MQP), that would meet these outcomes. Hence these survey questions should be examined carefully to see if they fit our curricular (PBL) model.

WPI Learning Outcomes have changed and the NSSE survey has changed and we would use the latest outcomes as a frame of reference to identify relevant survey data whose questions have evolved. There should be a careful mapping of questions to outcomes.

4. There was also a set of questions added to NSSE by the Association of Independent Technological Universities (AITU), but that comparison has not been completed for many years as the contact person has moved on. President Leshin is the past president of the AITU and a member of the Executive Committee and this could be an opportunity to revive this survey.
5. Overall, NSSE, AITU, and IQP/MQP survey questions could provide an assessment measure of Learning Outcome 8. However, the outcomes of the IQPs/MQPs do not explicitly have a global component and the previous Learning Outcome 8 was difficult to understand, making mapping difficult. While many IQPs are global (not all), most MQPs are not. If there is not enough overlap, we may need to pursue an overall change in the assessment strategy. Could Faculty Reports be used as a measure?
6. Parallel efforts in the Global School (Mimi Sheller and Kent Rissmiller in a previous meeting) and Esther Boucher-Yip's group funded by an Educational Development Council (EDC) grant and upcoming report at the end of the academic year (previous meeting) will intersect this effort

and the efforts should inform each other through collaboration. Jennifer deWinter will be the liaison/interface with DIGS regarding outcomes in DIGS specific courses and projects (ID2050, PQP, GPS, IQP).

7. As students may not recognize these outcomes, they should be explicitly listed in course and project syllabi. Faculty also may not recognize these outcomes, even though the Faculty Handbook identifies the outcomes and connects grading guidelines with student achievement of the learning outcomes. Some programs may have outcomes that are in alignment (ABET Outcome 2 is an example), however, this committee looks at university wide assessment rather than programs/departments and this program data could be difficult to incorporate to university outcomes. However, HUA assessment may provide an opportunity, but a general assessment would still have to be developed for a broad range of courses that exist in HUA. The capstone component can be examined. A link to Global Competent Matrices was shared: <https://www.teaching.unsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/upload-files/Global%20Competence%20Matrices.pdf>
8. Melissa will review the new and previous NSSE questions and start to place the survey questions into an assessment matrix and the committee will review this progress. There is the 2020 and 2016 data for NSSE, but there is no AITU cohort comparison, so we can examine our own trends and see about including data from previous years.
9. During the next meeting, we will host Kristin McAdams, who will show us the new Advisor Survey mechanism for IQPs and MQPs, and see if Jennifer deWinter has any feedback from DIGS.
10. The meeting was adjourned at 11:59.

Respectively submitted,

Doug Petkie, B term Secretary