

# Assessment Committee Minutes

## August 11, 2009

Members Present: LeeAnn Sipes/Health Science, Jerry Bowen/Biology, Massood Saffarian/Business, Frank Grabowski/ E&H, Joel White/Sports Management, Denny Schmickle/Fine Arts, Richard Boyd/Communications, Monica Varner/PS&CJ, Steve Housel/History & POLS, Vadym Kyrylov/Applied Technology, Linda Andrews/Ex-officio/Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment.

Meeting was called to order by Linda Andrews at 2:00pm.

Selection of chair and Secretary:

- LeeAnn Sipes nominated Steve Housel as chair, seconded by Monica Varner, unanimous vote.
- Monica Varner volunteered to be secretary.

Discussion:

Meeting Schedule: Third Friday of each month at 1:00pm in Prep 315.

Idea Center-Student Evaluation of Instruction: Reviewed by Linda Andrews, discussed benefits, strengths, and weaknesses.

Review of General Education Assessment of Student Learning, faculty will submit suggestions and changes to Steve Housel.

RSU Assessment Plan Executive Summary will need to be reviewed by all committee members.

Review of Assessment Evaluation form, tab led for next week.

Next Meeting: 8/21/2009, 1:00pm, 315 Prep Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm. Submitted by, Monica Varner.

# Assessment Committee Minutes

August 21, 2009

Members Present: LeeAnn Sipes/Health Science, Jerry Bowen/Biology, Massood Saffarian/Business, Frank Grabowski/ E&H, Joel White/Sports Management, Denny Schmickle/Fine Arts, Richard Boyd/Communications, Monica Varner/PS&CJ, Steve Housel/History & POLS, Vadym Kyrylov/Applied Technology, Brenda Tuberville, Developmental Studies, Linda Andrews/Ex-officio/Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment.

Meeting was called to order by Steve Housel at 1:00pm.

Approval of Minutes for 8/11/09.

---

## Old Business

If your department has general education changes (measures and standards) send them to Steve and he will forward them to the office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA).

Idea Center: 300 educational institutions using Idea Center, Idea Center's survey instrument will accommodate written comments. All faculty and adjuncts will be evaluated. If a course was evaluated in the fall, it will not be evaluated again in the spring. Only evaluating fall and courses in the spring that were not evaluated in the fall will decrease cost. Individual faculty requests for comprehensive evaluations will be granted.

---

## New Business

Discussion:

Online classes will be the only ones to use electronic version of Idea Center's instructor evaluations. The committee addressed this issue at length. It was motioned that all web-ct courses blended and shelled use the electronic version. The motion was not seconded.

The committee agreed to visit this issue in the spring.

The committee decided by consensus to not calculate a total score for the Assessment Committee Analysis of Departmental General Education Report/Plan. It was noted that the total score did not provide a benefit for the stake holders. Each category will be rated using the present scale.

A discussion of program reviews by the committee led to a suggestion that a later completion date for the evaluations would give departments a chance to use the UAC reviews for midyear adjustments to their assessment measures, performance standards, and sampling methods. The committee agreed by consensus to complete its review of departments' report/plan documents by November 15.

Committee decided by consensus that beginning in Fall 2010 program performance measures will exclude non-majors and minors. Current and past data gathering practices have not differentiated among the groups.

Next Meeting: 9/18/2009, 1:00pm, 203 Prep Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Submitted by, Monica Varner.

# Assessment Committee Minutes

September 18, 2009

Present: Frank Grabowski, Jan Ferris, Brenda Tuberville, Linda Andrews, Joel White, Evalon St. John, Monica Varner, Craig Zimmerman, and Vadym Kyrylow. Absent: Massood Saffarian, Craig Zimmerman, Lee Ann Sipes, Denny Schmickle, Richard Boyd,

Topic	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	General Education Assessment Form and Program Form. Assessment Assignments Idea Center Student Evaluations	Do not complete part one and two. Assignments were made for faculty review of program assessment reports/plans. Will evaluate new evaluation program Spring 2010.
Approval of Minutes	August 21, 2009 Minutes reviewed and discussed.	Motion to approve, Frank Grabowski, seconded Craig Zimmerman. All approved.
Reports & Announcements	Developmental Studies Subcommittee Meeting. Assessment Review with Faculty Senate. Online Instructor Evaluation	Effectiveness of Raw Data will be reviewed. Steve Housel will present next faculty senate meeting. Effectiveness will be reviewed Spring 2010.
Old Business	Due Date Reminders: Oct 1: R/P for all program Oct. 5: Ged Ed R/P Nov. 15 UAC Review of Program R/P	
New Business	Richard Boyd offered to provide training with assessment evaluation.	Richard Boyd will send an email of day and time for training session for all who would like to attend.
Next Meeting	Nov 20, 2009, 1:00pm 203 Prep Hall	
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned 2:30pm	Minutes Submitted by Monica Varner

# Assessment Committee Minutes

November 2, 2009

## I. New Business

- a. Ask that assessment data be turned in with grades.
- b. Review Gen Ed form
- c. online classes assessed?
- d. Review method for updating forms and keeping track of them
- e. The SLR column labeled "Analysis and Conclusion" should be changed to "Results and Analysis"
- f. Social Security numbers on some data sheets.
- g. Have assessment data turned in each semester rather than at the end of the academic term.
- h. Make sure professors (including adjuncts) are aware at the beginning of each semester the assessment data they will be expected to turn in at semester's end.
- i. Use common terms:

<b>Level</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Content</b>
Program/Major	Program Student Learning Report	
General Education	General Education Student Learning Report	
Developmental Studies	Developmental Studies Student Learning Report	

- j. review SLR language below
  - i. Part II: Discussion of Assessment of Student Learning Plans for this Academic Year
    1. Your departmental Assessment of Student Learning Plan for 2008-2009 included specific instructional changes that would occur during the year that just ended. Which of those changes occurred and which did not? If no changes were planned, simply state, "No instructional changes were planned." Describe the impact of planned instructional changes, if any, to the departmental Academic Plan or Budget.

## I. Reports

## II. Old Business

# Assessment Committee Minutes

January 15, 2010

Members Present: Steve Housel, Monica Varner, Phillip Payne, Richard Boyd, Massood Saffarian, Brenda Tuberville, Frank Grabowski, Craig Zimmerman, Joel White, LeeAnn Sipes, Brenda Tuberville, Linda Andrews

Members Absent: Vadym Kyrylow, Evelyn St. John, Jan Ferris

Topic	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Steve Housel called meeting to order.	
Approval of Minutes	Motion to approve minutes, 9/18/2009.  Correction made: Craig Zimmerman attended 9/18/2009 meeting.	Motioned was seconded and minutes were approved.
Reports & Announcements		
Old Business	Update on assessment and peer review development studies courses by Brenda Tuberville	Tabled and Moved for further discussion in next meeting 2/19,2010.
2	Faculty Assessment Report, by Linda Andrews. RSU had a very good first semester of Idea evaluation process. Some problems but will be addressed Spring 2010.	Reports will be delivered to departments for distribution to faculty.
New Business	Annual RSU assessment to Regents.	Tabled, moved to 2/19/2010 meeting.
1	Reviews of UAC 2009/2010	Tabled, moved to 2/19/2010 meeting.
Adjournment	Steve Housel adjourned the meeting.	

# Assessment Committee Minutes

Feb. 19, 2010

1. Present: Boyd, Grabowski, Housel, Kyrylov, Payne, White, Saffarian, Sipes, St. John, Zimmerman. Absent: Tuberville, Varner.
2. Approval of minutes. Postponed because minutes from previous 2 meetings (Jan 2010/Nov 2009) not approved.
3. Old Business
  - a. Entry-level assessment and placement success rate. The absence of Brenda Tuberville necessitated the postponement of further discussion about assessing developmental studies. Linda Andrews reminded committee members that entry-level assessment and placement success rate is reported in Student Assessment Reports for 2007/2008 and 2008/2009, which are available on the RSU webpage. These reports are submitted to the State Regents.
  - b. New faculty evaluations. Discussion about how committee members viewed the first use (Fall 2009) of the Idea Center's instructor evaluations. Evalon St. John and Rick Boyd remarked that fewer online evaluations were completed than in the past. Housel noted that his written comments were reduced by 70-80 percent. Boyd stated the main value of switching to the Idea Center's program is the ability to compare results with other institutions.
4. New Business
  - a. Names for student learning reports and peer reviews. Housel said there are various names used to identify what is officially titled the Student Learning Report. They include assessment report, student evaluation, department evaluation, assessment plan, etc. Housel said a similar assortment of referents applies to what is officially titled the Assessment Plan Analysis. He recommended that Student Learning Report and Peer Review be adopted. No vote was taken.
  - b. Peer review of general education assessment. The committee agreed to divide its members into three groups, each group will work as a team to review the general education assessments. The teams will use a rubric and template provided by Linda Andrews. Each team will review approximately one-third of the assessments. The teams will complete their work by the next UAC meeting on Friday, April 2nd. They will also report on the usefulness of the rubric and template. The teams, team leaders, and standards assigned each team are:
    - TEAM ONE: Standards -- 8, 4 & 1: Frank, Evalon, Steve (team leader), Monica
    - TEAM TWO: Standards -- 2, 3 & 5: Massood, Rick (team leader), Joel, Phillip
    - TEAM THREE: Standards -- 6 & 7: Craig (team leader), Vadym, Brenda, LeeAnn
  - c. Peer review of developmental studies assessment. The committee decided to postpone reviewing developmental studies assessments until after completing the general education assessments.
  - d. Adoption of external test for general education outcomes. Consideration of the tests was also postponed till the next meeting.
  - e. Other new business. Linda Andrews reported that the obvious trend in the higher education community nationally and in Oklahoma is toward increased accountability. Specifically, this means institutions are increasingly being tasked with providing direct evidence of student learning. She said the assessment process exists for the purpose of (1) providing data to faculty for use for instructional improvement and (2) demonstrating to stakeholders and overseers RSU's commitment to high instructional standards. Andrews said RSU may join the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) in 2010/2011. According to the VSA website, its purpose is to supply basic, comparable information on the undergraduate student experience to important constituencies. Seven Oklahoma universities currently belong to VSA: Cameron University, East Central University, Northeastern State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma State University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, and University of Central Oklahoma.
5. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20 pm.

# Assessment Committee Minutes

April 2, 2010

Present: Boyd, Grabowski, Housel, Kyrylov, Payne, White, Saffarian, Sipes, St. John, Zimmerman. Absent: Varner.

1. The approval of minutes. Housel reported that the minutes for Nov. 2, 2009, could not be found, so the agenda for the Nov. 2 meeting will be circulated instead. Members will be asked via email to approve the minutes for Nov. 2, 2009; Jan. 15, 2010; and Feb. 19, 2010.
2. Old Business
  - a. Committee Action on IDEA Center Evaluations.

S. Housel asked if the committee wished to take any action on the new evaluation process. V. Kyrylov said the response rate for his online classes was at an all time low with the new method. F. Grabowski and L. Andrews expressed the view that this was the first time the IDEA Center method had been used, thus some problems were to be expected. L. Andrews said she expected response rate for online courses to improve and meet or exceed the current proportion of 35 percent.

V. Kyrylov questioned whether some kind of incentive could be used to improve proportion of responses. M. Saffarian remarked that some higher education institutions hold university-wide evaluation days with both students and faculty participating. The relevant issues are timelines, use of resources, and student assistants typing faculty evaluations. Further discussion was tabled till next semester. Action Item: L. Andrews will find out if it can be determined within the IDEA Center system which students complete evaluations.
  - b. Committee Action on Adopting Terms for Student Learning Reports and Peer Reviews.

S. Housel proposed that for the sake of clarity the committee adopt common terminology for the reports and reviews that constitute the evaluations for which the UAC is responsible. The committee accepted Student Learning Report (SLR) and Peer Review as the generic terms.
  - c. Peer Review of General Education Student Learning Reports
    - i. Critique Forms and Templates.

Several members noted corrections that needed to be in order for there to be consistency across Student Learning Reports, Peer Reviews, and Peer Review Rubrics. Cited most often were:

      1. The confusing use of the terms findings, conclusions, and analyses. The committee determined that findings will be used to refer to collected data and the results, e.g., eighty-seven percent of the students passed the exam; and analyses will be used to refer to the interpretation of the findings.
      2. The template used for Peer Review of the General Education SLRs should include separate columns for Measure, Standard, and Sampling/Data Collection. The Student Learning Report should have separate columns for Findings and Conclusions.
      3. The departments did not use the same General Education Student Learning Report; some used the most recent version and some used an older version.

Action item: F. Grabowski volunteered to review the forms and edited them for consistency and currency

- ii. Critique Review Process  
The committee did not review the process of dividing the SLRs into four equal groups for team reviews. However, it was noted that the SLRs varied in how departments treated the goals and objectives. For example, some departments obviously considered the objectives and aligned measures and standards accordingly; whereas others apparently took a one-size-fits-all approach and ignored the objectives. S. Housel volunteered to send all department heads a memo reminding them

that now is the time to make any changes in the alignment of general education courses with university goals, and to emphasize the need to incorporate objectives.

d. Entry Level Assessment and Placement Success Rate.

L. Andrews reviewed data that have been accumulated and published for entry-level assessment through Fall 2008.

3. New Business

a. Peer Review of Developmental Studies Student Learning Reports

P. Payne and J. White volunteered to complete the Peer Review of the Developmental Studies Student Learning Reports.

b. Adoption of External Test for General Education Outcomes.

Discussion centered on whether there was a need for external assessment of general education courses and, if so, which test would be most appropriate for RSU. Comparability and rigor were cited as reasons supporting external evaluation. Tailoring and inclusion were cited as reasons for maintaining in-house assessment. S. Housel and L. Andrews emphasized the need to improve the precision and professionalism of the in-house effort in order pass scrutiny by regional accreditation reviewers.

The consensus of the committee supported the following proposal, which was largely based on suggestions brought forth by F. Grabowski, to wit: (a) the UAC will withhold its recommendation until next semester; (b) the UAC representatives will confer with their departments and bring to the committee feedback about whether an external assessment is advisable and, if so, which instrument might best suit the university, its faculty and stakeholders; and (c) the UAC chair will communicate the committee's position to the vice president for academic affairs.

4. Other New Business

a. Next Committee Meeting

The committee felt that another meeting this semester was not necessary; therefore, the it will next meet in Fall 2010 at a date and time to be determined.

b. Chair for 2010/2011.

S. Housel said since there would not be another meeting this semester, the UAC needed to elect a chair. He volunteered to continue as chair. There were no other volunteers and there were no objections.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:50 p.m.