



Rogers State University University Assessment Meeting Minutes

MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting:	10/10/2008	Time:	12:00PM
Minutes Prepared By:	Denny Schmickle	Location:	Harrington Hall 235

1. Meeting Objective

Discussion of the report review process and how we might improve the process, especially the inter-rater reliability.

2. Attendance at Meeting

Name	Department/Division		
Joy Hadwiger	Psychology, Sociology and Criminal Justice		
Massood Saffarian	Business		
Frank Grabowski	English & Humanities		
Joel White	Sports Management		
Vadym Kyrylov	Applied Technology		
Sue Katz	Biology		
Denny Schmickle	Fine Arts		
Rick Boyd	Communications		
Roya Namavar	Mathematics and Physical Sciences		
Steve Housel	History and Political Science		
LeeAnn Sipes	Health Sciences		



Rogers State University University Assessment Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting:	10/10/2008	Time:	12:00PM
Minutes Prepared By:	Denny Schmickle	Location:	Harrington Hall 235

3. Agenda and Notes, Decisions, Issues

Topic	Notes	Contributors
Review and discussion of plan review forms and process	<p>Rick Boyd raised questions of specificity in ratings in the reports (the use of decimal points). It was determined that specificity in the comments is more effective than in the numerical scoring, and would be the best course of action.</p> <p>The availability of Assessment Committee documents (including reviews and scores) to committee members and departments via the campus intranet was discussed. Debate revolved around the benefit of the ability for one department to potentially better their assessment process by reviewing the work submitted by other departments. In the end it was decided that it would be good to upload reports (as long as they've been reviewed by committee), and to exclude the reviews.</p> <p>Vadym suggested we color-code the various documents used in the assessment process, to which there was much agreement.</p> <p>The need for elaboration in place of abbreviations and course numbers was expressed by Massood, and seconded by Sue. Rick explained that the nature of writing for one's own department (rather than the assessment committee) was a likely reason for this phenomenon.</p> <p>We also discussed the need for consistency across reviewers, and possible implementations of policies that would achieve such.</p>	All present
Discussion of Submission and Review Schedule	<p>Joy and Steve initiated a discussion regarding the current scheduling of assessment submission and review. An "ideal" schedule was started, in the interest of finding out when things <i>should</i> be done, versus when they are currently done.</p> <p>Adjacent to this topic, were discussions of making assessment useful to departments, and convincing them of such; writing for multiple audiences; who collects the data and who writes the plans; and ideal dates and cycles.</p> <p>Vadym also suggested an itemized "To Do" list complete with bullet points to be emailed to committee members before any up-coming meetings.</p> <p>Frank suggested we consult with various local and regional universities to get an idea of how assessment works in other locations, in an effort to make our own process more efficient.</p>	All present
New Forms	<p>Everyone felt the new forms were an improvement but asked that Joy explore the possibility of a landscape format rather than the way they were provided.</p>	

4. Action Items

Action	Due Date
Review Department Assessment Plans	10/23/2008

5. Next Meeting (if applicable)

Date:	11/21/2008	Time:		Location:	
Objective:					