

Agenda

ULM SOP Assessment Committee		Date: 2.21.2017	
MEMBERS: Gina Craft (liaison), Jennifer Smith (chair), Amal Kaddoumi, Seetharama Jois, Michelle Zagar, Scott Baggarly, Amanda Storer, Hilary Tice		MEMBERS ABSENT: Adam Pate (excused)	TIME CALLED TO ORDER: 12:05 pm TIME ADJOURNED: 12:50pm
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSIONS/CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS WHAT/WHEN/WHO	PRESENTER
1. Committee updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	Jennifer
2. Meeting minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of meeting minutes from 1.17.17 	Motion to approve-Hilary Tice 2 nd : Michelle Zagar Vote to approve: Unanimous	Jennifer
4. Internal faculty survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus group planning: approval of top 5 questions revised from last meeting • Finalize details for holding focus groups • Consider some examples for the questions to help stimulate discussion if needed; also have the survey question they're based on (since goal is to find out why those questions had low scores and try to improve them) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions finalized • Jennifer will do random selection of 15 faculty (split by ratio of faculty in dept: 4:2:1 Clin:BPS:Tox) and send Doodle to find time to hold group; Michelle to help facilitate and both will take notes (no recording) 	Jennifer
5. Admissions data analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and discussion of information from analysis of 2009-2015 admission data that tested effects of gender, ethnicity, prior degrees, GPA categories, and PCAT upon delayed graduation • Having BS degree was only significant indicator of on-time graduation (people with degrees less likely to have modified progression) • This was first time we had access to PCAT subscores; PCAT chem subscore related to on-time graduation • Can't explain why this data makes it seem that math science GPA seems to be predictor of delayed progression (further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify any questions/follow-up needed from this committee 	Scott

	<p>review needed; may be missing factor that wasn't measured)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Info we have only explains approx. 17% of variation (target with this type of model usually around 35%) 		
6. Naplex pass rates/ranking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If time allows, review and discuss Naplex summary data (ranking) • Reviewed; per Gina, task force is looking at this data too and if we have comments, can forward to them • One suggestion was to look at high-performing schools and see if we could reach out to them to see what their curriculum looks like to compare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer will forward comment to task force 	Jennifer/Gina
7. Open discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other comments/questions? 		Committee