Assessment Committee Minutes

August 29, 2008

Members Attending: Renee Cox, Roya Namavar, Massood Saffarian, Joel White, Rick Boyd, Denny Schmickle, Steve Housel, Vadim Kyrylov, Leeann Sipes, Joy Hadwiger

Members were provided updated Assessment Manuals. Asst. VP Andrews explained the assessment process and the role of the university administration, the assessment committee and the department's relative to assessment. Asst. VP Andrews explained that forms had been revised to comply with the modifications made by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) and the changes recommended by the assessment committee in AY 2007-2008.

Members were provided a list of the of assessment reviews to be completed. Members were paired, a new member with a veteran member, to facilitate the completion of assessment reviews. Reviews must be completed by September 12, 2008 so that the feedback can be available to departments for their use in the development of 2008-2009 plans.

A schedule of meetings for the upcoming academic year was established by the members (attached).

Member, Joy Hadwiger, invited members to introduce themselves to the membership. Following introductions the membership was informed that a committee chair and a secretary should be elected. Nominations for committee chair were opened; Richard Boyd nominated Joy Hadwiger, nomination seconded by Steve Housel. There being no other nominations, Richard Boyd moved that Hadwiger be elected by acclimation. Nominations for committee secretary were opened with the nomination of Denny Schmickle by Joy Hadwiger, seconded by Richard Boyd. There being no other nominees Denny Schmickle was elected by secretary by acclimation.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Assessment Committee Minutes

October 10, 2008

Present: Joy Hadwiger, Massood Saffarian, Frank Grabowski, Joel White, Vadym Kyrylov, Sue Katz, Denny Schmickle, Rick Boyd, Roya Namavar, Steve Housel, LeeAnn Sipes

Review and Discussion of Plan Review Forms and Process

Boyd raised questions of specificity in ratings in the reports (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.

Discussed the availability of Assessment Committee documents (including reviews/scores) to committee members and departments via intranet. Debate about the benefit of the ability for one department to potentially better their assessment process by reviewing the work submitted by other departments. 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.

Vadym suggested we color-code the various documents used in the assessment process, to which there was much agreement.

The need for elaboration in place of abbreviations and course numbers was expressed by Massood, and seconded by Sue. Rick explained the nature of writing for one's own department rather than the assessment committee was a likely reason for this phenomenon.

Discussed need for consistency across reviewers and possible implementations of policies that would achieve such.

Discussion of Submission and Review Schedule

Joy and Steve initiated discussion regarding the current scheduling of assessment submission and review. An "ideal" schedule was started, in the interest of finding out when things should be done, versus when they are currently done.

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.

Vadym also suggested an itemized "To Do" list complete with bullet points to be emailed to committee members before any up-coming meetings.

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.

New Forms

Everyone felt the new forms were an improvement but asked Joy explore the possibility of landscape format.

Action Items

Review Department Assessment Plans: Due 10/23/08

Assessment Committee Minutes

April 3, 2009

Present: Joy Hadwiger, Massood Saffarian, Frank Grabowski, Joel White, Rick Boyd, Steve Housel, Sue Katz, Denny Schmickle, Vadym Kyrylov, Roya Namavar. Absent: LeeAnn Sipes. Guests: Linda Andrews.

Topic	Discussion	Action
Approval of Minutes	Minutes were reviewed by the members present.	On motion by Kyrylov, seconded by Grabowski, minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved.
Reports & Announcements		
1 Gen Ed	We will look at Gen Ed plans in the Fall of 09. A date will be determined to review Gen Eds; the other report/plans are still due Sept 8. Andrews distributed a revised Gen Ed form, which removed unnecessary redundancy and should be reviewed by departments to evaluate whether or not courses match Gen Ed outcomes. #5: Demonstrate Computer Proficiency. Do we keep this as an outcome when there is no Gen Ed course in place to ensure it? How can we ensure students meet an objective if its possible to take none of the supporting courses?	Review/discuss new format with Departments, provide feedback regarding how well courses fit with outcomes, return by MAY 1. No decisions made. We will find out soon, as a study is in progress.

Topic		Discussion	Action
2	Voluntary System of Accountability	According to the Spellings Commission's Report there is a growing consumer demand for accountability and transparency. The Voluntary System of Accountability is a voluntary initiative for 4-year public colleges and universities. Developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the VSA is designed to help institutions meet the following objectives: * Demonstrate accountability and stewardship to public * Measure educational outcomes to identify effective educational practices * Assemble information that is accessible, understandable, and comparable	
3	The Idea Center	Prof Andrews introduced the concept of using The Idea Center for a web-based system for student evaluations. Topics discussed: • the cost of $6k/year • the likelihood/enforcement of student participation • the faculty can "weight" certain parts of the survey • the univ. would receive a report, not raw data • Dr. Kyrylov brought up the feasibility of switching to a different system	Prof. Andrews will submit the idea to the faculty at large for further feedback.

Topic	Discussion	Action
Old Business		
1	NSSE presentation in the Fall.	
New Business		
1	Rick Boyd suggested that perhaps sometime over the summer "the Assessment Packet" could be sent out so that committee members could get a head start on things.	It was agreed that this was a good idea.
2	Good job everyone!	
Next Meeting		
Adjournment	Move to Adjourn by Rick Boyd. Seconded by Denny Schmickle	