

# Assessment Committee Minutes

August 10, 2012

## I. Convocation Schedule

- 9:00 - 10:00 President Rice ("State of the University")
- 10:15 - 11:30 Breakout Sessions
- 11:45 - 1:00 Lunch (Dr. Beck - "Accreditation")
- 1:15 - 2:30 Breakout Sessions

## II. Breakout Sessions

- ETS Test Results and Implications for General Education at RSU (Mary Millikin)
- Civic Engagement: Best Practices at RSU (Monica Varner)
- Creative Uses of Angel (Myra Haulmark)
- Classroom Assessment: Little Things that Make a Difference (Steve Housel)
- Program Assessment: What Works and Why (Evalon St. John)

## III. Draft of Communication to Faculty

The University Assessment Committee believes additional steps in the assessment process need to be taken in order to: (1) refine our evolving assessment and feedback system related to student learning outcomes; and (2) meet the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission, the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, and the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education. The following recommendations are not requirements, but are strongly encouraged. Please consider making them standard operating procedures beginning in the fall semester. Compliance, although voluntary, will become part of the public record, will be included in the Student Learning Report forms, and will be subject to inquiry in the peer review sessions.

- Any measure that is part of an assessment report should include data from all delivery formats (online, on-ground, blended) and from all instructors (permanent and adjunct faculty). This is already being done in some cases, but not in others.
- Departments are encouraged to hold occasional faculty assessment meetings. These are defined as any formal faculty meeting or part of a meeting in which issues related to the assessment process (improving classroom instruction and student learning) are discussed. In support of the Higher Learning Commission site visit, representatives on the University Assessment Committee will report the dates and attendance of the meetings.

## IV. Recommend strategies to "close the loop" of the assessment cycle.

- Student Learning Reports and Peer Review Reports
  - More user-friendly forms
  - Consistent formats and rubrics
  - Reporting of informal changes
  - More inclusive reporting requirements (all formats, all instructors)
  - More in-depth reporting of data
  - More accountability in analysis
- Annual Student Assessment Report (Office of Accountability & Academics)
- Peer review sessions
  - Sending questions in advance
  - Target dates for completing reports
  - Tracking and reporting attendance
- Identifying and communicating best practices
- Reporting dates and attendance of department assessment meetings
- Assessment-oriented professional development workshops
- Appointment of facilitator
- Assessment of embedded
- ETS tests

## **RSU Faculty Assessment Coordinator**

The Faculty Assessment Coordinator at Rogers State University seeks to support quality student learning and to foster excellence in educational practices by establishing and maintaining a [culture of assessment](#) and continual improvement at the course, program, and institutional levels. The ultimate goal of the Faculty Assessment Coordinator is to improve student learning.

*Primary responsibilities are to:*

1. Work with the faculty and the University Assessment Committee to develop and implement a broad plan for assessing student learning outcomes in RSU degree programs and courses.
2. Work with academic units to develop, implement, and revise plans as needed for student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessment to improve student learning.
3. Serve as an assessment resource to the university community and work with the Office of Accountability and Academics to provide professional development opportunities related to the understanding and use of contemporary theory and practice of assessment in higher education.
4. Improve communication about assessment of student learning outcomes across the institution through a variety of information sources, including both internal and external reports, workshops and presentations, university webpages, and individual consultations with faculty members and Department Heads. The Faculty Assessment Coordinator will also establish a dialogue with assessment constituents from outside the institution.

## Qualifications

- Full-time tenured or tenure track faculty member
- Evidence of leadership and administrative abilities
- Ability to work cooperatively to achieve position responsibilities
- Working knowledge of assessment implementation and procedures, and the ability to disseminate that knowledge to others in the university
- Outstanding oral and written communication skills

## Compensation Terms

- Three credit hours of reassigned time in fall and spring

## Selection Process

- Position announcement distributed to College Deans.
- Vice President of Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Assistant Vice President of Accountability and Academics, will determine selection.

# Assessment Committee Minutes

## September 7, 2012

Call to order: Dr. Steve Housel- chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 2:04 pm. on September 7, 2012 in Baird Hall Room 127.

Present: Bryce Brimer, Teri Bycroft, Jalal Jaenbai, Steve Housel, Mary Millikin, Thomas Luscomb, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Joel White, Craig Zimmerman, Frank Grabowski (proxy for Jim Ford). Absent: Sarah Clark, Juliet Evusa, Jim Ford.

Approval of minutes from last meeting. There were no corrections to the minutes.

---

### Reports and Announcements

- 1) New Members: a) Sarah Clark - Stratton Taylor Library, b) Teri Bycroft - Health Sciences
- 2) New Committee Scribe - Susan Wong,
- 3) Meeting with Senate
- 4) Meeting with Academic Council: Dr. Housel will attend even though they do not have concrete results from the two years of General Education pretest and posttest results at this time.
- 5) Best Practices 'Newsletter': David Tait, Jamie Graham, David Ruskoski, Don Glass are contributors. Discussion: Dr. Housel discussed how the best practices newsletter will help to improve general education.

---

### Old Business

#### 1) Institutionalization of the Student Learning Reports

Discussion: The general consensus of the committee was that the Student Learning Reports (SLR) is quite well done and is comprehensive, and consistency in reporting is necessary. Further, the importance of the SLR was emphasized.

Action: The faculty had no comments in adding the adjuncts/courses to the SLR.

#### 2) New Requirements for the Departments

Discussion: Dr. Housel announced that if the departments have meetings devoted to assessment, they need to report these meetings to the UAC meetings.

#### 3) General Education Forum- Results of ETS Proficiency Profile

Discussion: Dr. Grabowski, speaking for Dr. Ford, felt the sample size of the Spring 2012 sophomore cohort, using the ETS Proficiency Profile, is insufficient. Dr. Varner reminded the committee that GE testing at RSU is still in the pilot stage of development. She reiterated that a great many hours have been devoted to the issues of concern (e.g., sample size, test instrument, normative/comparative data, etc.). She also noted that GE testing design and implementation is still in its infancy, and these issues will be resolved. Two types of research were discussed: Theoretical and Practical. Dr. Zimmerman led a discussion on the merits of statistical rigor in research. Dr. Millikin concurred and noted that statistical robustness is our collective goal, mitigated by the realities of non-laboratory research designs and the constraints of actionable research.

Action: There was objection from Dr. Grabowski as to the use of ETS, in light of the fact that the majority of Oklahoma regional universities' use the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP).

Dr. Varner made the recommendation to continue the discussion when Dr. Ford was present so his concerns could be addressed. It was recommended by the committee to appoint statisticians such as Dr. Jaenbai to offer suggestions for long-term research design and instrumentation.

#### **4) Assessment of Online Delivered Courses**

Discussion: Dr. Grabowski and Dr. Varner discussed keeping the online data and forms. All data to be reported will not be separate this academic year. Dr. Varner recommended that English and Humanities should gather the data and be the pilot for the rest of the departments. Dr. Grabowski discussed how difficult that is to separate them out. He said that they are already separating the data with the Capstone and Comparative Religion courses due to the fact that they have to justify their program.

Should the online degree program have its own SLR? When measuring the outcome, the standard, the sample and analysis, one hopes that the results are comparable between online and on-ground sections.

Action: Dr. Zimmerman recommended a comparative analysis of online versus on-ground courses if it's already embedded in a program. Dr. Grabowski stated that there is a need to make certain measures to make sure the online courses are as rigorous as the on-ground courses. The learning outcome in Capstone for instance, shows a big difference when students link the compartments together on-ground versus when they don't link the compartments online. The English and Humanities Department is already conscious of the disconnect between the two modalities and is working to remedy it. Dr. Housel reported that we are collecting data separately for online and on-ground classes beginning August 2013.

Next Step: Send a memo to the Chairs and strongly encourage them to report the measured data in the segregated reports on the online/on ground courses.

Motion: by Jalal Jaenbai to make a recommend to the Faculty Senate based upon the feedback, and go through the Academic Council so that by next year, we start separating out the SLO outcomes and have them compared.

Second: Dr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Discussion: Dr. Zimmerman recommended that assessment forms be sent to Susan Wong to be included on the UAC Website. Have the departments met and collaborated over assessment issues?

Next Step: Submit assessment forms to Susan Wong [swong@rsu.edu](mailto:swong@rsu.edu) to be uploaded on to the UAC Website.

#### **5) Electronic Forms**

Discussion: Dr. Zimmerman recommended that a web-based version of the SLR be created for online sections to match the on-ground web-based forms that Dr. Peter MacPherson is designing. He stated that the UAC should encourage the online/ on-ground disaggregation. He would like to get a few members to put data on this form to brainstorm ideas. He suggested creating a dropdown box or boxes to check and that the user cannot advance to the end until all boxes have been selected.

Action: Dr. Zimmerman recommends creating this mock up form to be due by October 1, 2012.

#### **6) Convocation Day Sessions Summary**

Discussion: Dr. Jaenbai presented handouts and a slideshow giving statistical evidence of the results of successful 2012 Convocation Breakout Sessions. Ford and Hallmark's presentation were well attended and well received. The statistics show very advanced experts in RSU that will influence their colleagues. He further remarked that it was most advantageous to host this event in conjunction with Convocation as the turnout was high. Dr. Bycroft suggested that it would be helpful to give a continuing education credit for professional development.

Action: It would be a good idea to schedule this next year at Convocation. Dr. Housel will present this recommendation to the Academic Council to request the institutionalization of the sessions.

Next Step: Dr. Bycroft will look into Health Science using these breakout sessions for continuing education credits.

## **7) UAC Repository**

Discussion: Professor Luscomb recommended having 2 separate Websites: one for internally-accessed documents through the Hillcat Hub that are of a more sensitive nature, such as Peer Review reports for faculty and administrators only. This one would be read only. It would be accessed by a password. The second site would be for the general public providing minutes, information on assessment, scholarship, best practices, OSHRE, and anything tutorial pertaining to assessment of student learning outcomes. This would have selected items that would be found on the Hillcat Hub but in public forum format.

Action: Cathy Burns will begin working on the Internally-accessed Website using Image Now. Kelly Fields will work on the general public after the UAC provides her with documents.

## **8) ETS testing**

Discussion: Dr. Millikin stated that 30 fall freshman have completed the ETS testing thus far. Minimum sample size to run an ETS report is N=50. An email has been sent out to the remainder of the 70 students to take the test by the deadline September 21, 2012 or they will not be allowed to enroll in spring classes. Once they take the test, they will receive \$10 on their Hillcat card as an incentive. There has been an issue in the Testing Center due to the fact its staff have resigned. However, there is a sign posted on the Testing Center door that directs students to the Admissions Office where a staff member will set up the ETS for them.

Action: Notify Dr. Beck that mid-terms are taken at the same time that this testing is being implemented and there is no staff member in the testing center at this time. There must be a proctor at the testing center for these students to take the test.

## **9) Facilitator**

Discussion: Dr. Housel elected to skip this topic until after his meeting with Academic Council on Sep 14 at 1:30 pm.

## **10) Peer Review Survey**

Discussion: The proposal was accepted. A "posttest" survey is being implemented in September for comparison with the pretest results. This is a survey that all faculty members will take. Results will be presented at a future UAC meeting.

Action: Dr. Zimmerman will send an email draft to current UAC members with Peer Review program. It was noted that the UAC voted in May 2012 to add a new policy that any program missing its Peer Review meeting must make a conscientious effort to reschedule it. If all else fails, the department must submit to the UAC its Peer Review results in writing using the university-wide format. The UAC needs to implement the policy to make the accommodations and then answer the questions in writing.

Next Step: Composition of peer review teams can be discussed next time.

---

## **New business**

### **1) Peer Review**

Discussion:

Scheduling: It is time to create the schedule for Peer Reviews for Spring 2013. Dr. Zimmerman has agreed to create this schedule again this year, and will bring a draft to the next UAC meeting. Suggestions for Improvements:

Suggestions for improvement of peer review process: learning outcomes, use the peer report to have a face-to-face session, and write the report, then write your questions, then peer review.

Action: Why have a review when a program or department already has its report? Best reviews have shed light on significant reports. Questions need to be substantive, rather than department specific. It's important not to be critical of the program and/or the department that the peers need to refrain from critical reviews. Do not add something that was not discussed prior to the report. Discussion was tabled by Dr. Housel.

Next Step: Need to cc this to all UAC members. Add this item to the Agenda for Old Business. As UAC members go through the student learning and the peer review form, send Dr. Housel an email. Add to the Agenda for next UAC meeting for discussion: Sending Proxy.

## **2) General Education Forum:**

Discussion: There is a problem regarding student learning outcomes when they address only each individual class rather than approaching General Education as a program. There is a need for closing the loop of General Education as a program to assessment student learning outcomes. Global learning and social abilities/skills are essential in any program. The only way to create this program is to collaborate with the departments. It's important to address Reading/Writing/Science/Math/Critical Thinking for this program if implemented. The forum should include Deans, Faculty, Dr. Beck and Dr. Millikin. RSU was advised at the last accreditation that it doesn't have a comprehensive General Education program and this was recommended for the next review.

Action: Need to construct professional learning communities to discuss service learning, risk management, and student outcomes. Must think of General Education as a global centrality. In directly assessing this construct, the ETS provides concrete targets, showing proficiency levels. There may be a possibility that it could present a problem for other programs if they do not have the same standards.

Motion: There was a motion to move in the direction of the General Education Forum.

Next Step: Have someone take notes and transcribe the meeting from the entire peer review panel. Dr. Millikin will provide the framework and the Forum could look at it and discuss it to enhance and develop the global centrality of the program. UAC members voted, and a quorum agreed to establish a General Education Forum.

## **3) Add a Behavioral Science to the Super Nine?**

- a) BIOL 1114- General Biology
- b) ENGL1213- Composition II
- c) GEOL 1014- Earth Science
- d) HUM 2113- Humanities I
- e) HIST 2493- American History Since 1877
- f) MATH 1513- College Algebra
- g) POLS 1113- Political Science
- h) SPAN 1113- Beginning Spanish I
- i) SPCH 1113- Speech Communication

Discussion: It was determined by looking at enrollment statistics that there is a high rate of enrollment in Intro to Psychology as opposed to low enrollment in Spanish I. Discussion was geared toward how important it is to learn about different cultures as a part of the bigger picture, hence the need for Spanish.

Motion: It was motioned to remove Spanish from the Super Nine. The motion was amended by Dr. Housel to add Intro to Psychology to the Super Nine and leave Spanish I intact. A quorum vote was achieved.

**Adjournment:** Dr. Housel adjourned the meeting at 4:22 pm. Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong

# Assessment Committee Minutes

## September 26, 2012

Dr. Steve Housel- chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 1:32 pm. on September 26, 2012 in Baird Hall Room 127.

Present: Teri Bycroft, Sarah Clark, Juliet Evusa, Jim Ford, Jalal Jaenbai, Steve Housel, Thomas Luscomb, Mary Millikin, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Joel White, Craig Zimmerman.

Approval of minutes from last meeting. The minutes from the June 21, 2012 and the July 12, 2012 meetings were approved. There was discussion about corrections to the minutes for September 26, 2012. It was agreed that there need not be separate SLR forms for online/on- ground classes. The minutes were approved.

---

## Reports and Announcements

### 1) Meeting with Faculty Senate

Dr. Housel spoke with the Faculty Senate about having an UAC representative, a Senate Faculty representative, the Deans and Department heads to meet during the upcoming academic year to discuss items such as General Education, Best Practices, Online/On-ground/Hybrid classes, and an Assessment Facilitator during their upcoming department assessment of student learning outcomes meetings. No concerns were expressed at the meeting.

### 2) Meeting with Academic Council

Meeting to take place October 12, 2012

---

## Old Business

### 1) Assessment Facilitator

Discussion: Steve Housel distributed handouts on Ideas for Facilitator. The general consensus was that the chair should get release time to implement the position. Steve Housel has been and is willing to accept this position as the Assessment Facilitator if all are in favor. Massood Saffarian asked that the facilitator provide the consistency and instant memory all the while tracking meetings with whom, when, and why. Dr. Housel is thinking he will have a full final report of his first year of duties as Assessment Facilitator by April 2013. Teri Bycroft commented on the effectiveness of her assessment training with Dr. Varner and how this method could be implemented with other faculty. She found it very helpful and useful in her assessment approach. Jim Ford relayed that the Faculty Senate discussed the option of the Assessment Facilitator having a 3 hour release from classes. The Faculty Senate believes the position should be implemented, should see how it works, and move from there. Craig Zimmerman felt that the job description was not comprehensive enough for a faculty member to have this position. He also commented on if it should be an administrator or a faculty member to chair this post? All discussed the implications of having a faculty member released from time as it causes problems for scheduling. Because of the history of success for these positions regionally and nationally using faculty (and a history of non-success for staff), Mary Millikin gave her support to Steve Housel for the position as well as her support for 3 hours of release time for the Assessment Facilitator.

Action: Jim Ford moved that they amend the original Assessment Facilitator job description to include 3 hour release time for this position. Monica Varner seconded. All approved.

## **2) New SLR Forms**

Discussion: Dr. Housel distributed handouts outlining the new SLR forms. Examples were referred to throughout the form showing the many different changes proposed for the new form. Steve Housel thought that a conclusion in the Conclusion section can be substantive yet brief. This won't be necessary in the future as this will be inter-departmental. Also noteworthy was the fact that for all degree program outcomes the results needs to include more than a single year's results. Are the departments doing this? We need a bigger picture of what is going on instead of a small sample. Jim Ford concluded that we should take in previous year's results to give a better indication of how well the program is doing against the student results. Are we asking too much in the conclusion section? Are the performance standards being met? Should we beef up the results by including a table for different grades? Should there be an amendment for next year 2013-2014? Juliet Evusa thought this was part of the discussion to all the faculty members and has been presented. There is a need to be more specific and detailed in the results section. For the Peer Review Reports, this is the first time hearing about a clear and specific analysis of the Students' results. For the distribution portion, there are multiple measures for outcomes in the learning outcome section. If some departments would like to add their multiple measures there are multiple ways of showing results. It needs to be consistent among the reviewers. It is something that looks like it has promise but should not issue a demerit to someone for not including it. As a group, we will see how the department will use distribution forms.

## **3) New Approaches to Peer Review Sessions**

Discussion: There was discussion on the new approaches to peer review sessions. The suggestion was to ask departments to self-rate their department performance in meeting each of the criteria normally evaluated by members of the UAC. Jim Ford said it adds too many layers and that there are enough already. Is it legitimate to give yourself a self-score as an informal way of meeting with the Peer Review? The group said no. The evaluation by the UAC is binding. If there is a concern, it needs to be documented even if the concern is rectified. Using the proposed Peer Review process will make it more meaningful. An analysis of the individual SLR will encourage the use of the rubrics for assessment of student learning. Everyone that was involved in the report should be at the review so that the faculty can interact with the reviewers. The general consensus was that the departments and department heads should encourage self-evaluation, not the UAC. This should generate awareness, should help in moving forward faculty awareness of the process, and should generate the student outcomes the rubric is outlining.

## **For the Next Meeting and Issues**

- Peer Review Scheduling
- General Education Forum
- Status of Assessment Facilitator
- ETS Testing
- Peer Review Survey
- Electronic Forms
- Best Practices Newsletter

**Adjournment:** Dr. Housel adjourned the meeting at 2:40 pm. Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong

# Assessment Committee Minutes

October 26, 2012

Dr. Housel, chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 2:09 pm. on October 26, 2012 in Baird Hall Room 124.

Present: Sarah Clark, Juliet Evusa, Jalal Jaenbai, Steve Housel, Thomas Luscomb, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Joel White, Craig Zimmerman. Absent: Bryce Brimer, Teri Bycroft, Jim Ford, Mary Millikin.

Approval of minutes from last meeting. The minutes from the September 26, 2012 meeting were approved.

---

## Reports and Announcements

### **A. Meetings with Faculty Senate (10/5) and Academic Council (10/12)**

Discussion: Dr. Housel met with Faculty Senate and Academic Council twice. The first meetings were Q&A sessions and the second meetings were formal voting sessions. The main discussion was centered on release time. The Assessment Facilitator is an experimental position, and can be recommended for termination by the UAC as well as the Academic Council and VP for Academic Affairs. RSU's President makes the final determination. Both committees, Faculty Senate and Academic Council, voted for approval of release time for Dr. Housel in this capacity. Release time has been approved for spring 2012 through the end of spring 2013, after which time this will be re-evaluated.

### **B. UAC Repositories- Thomas Luscomb- with handout**

Discussion: There will be two separate Repositories- one accessible only for RSU Faculty and Administrators and one accessible for general public. The RSU faculty and administrator website will be accessed through the HillCat Hub. It was suggested that a brief paragraph could be written by Mary Millikin on the purpose of the Repository and what will be found on each site.

These are the components of the internal Faculty and Administrator Website:

- Cathy Burns will create the site- utilizing ImageNow
- It will be read only
- It will be media file formatted only
- It will be password protected (RSU faculty and other employees need to know it is password protected)
- All files will be in PDF file format to block any changes.

Hierarchy will be based on degree programs and will consist of the following:

- Peer Review Reports
- Peer Review and Student Learning Report forms
- Reports will be ordered by academic year and an example of hierarchy follows:

Peer Review Reports:

- Applied Technology
- Biology
- Business
- Communications
- All remaining programs in alphabetical order

Student Learning Reports

- Degree Programs
- Developmental Studies
- General Education

Other information on Assessment. These are the components for the General Public Website:

- Kelli Fields will create this site.
- Assessment meeting minutes and agendas
- Best practices
- Information on Assessment
- Scholarship and best practices
- Annual reports to the Oklahoma State Regents (OSHRE)

Discussion: A subcommittee of the UAC will be formed to determine the framework of the documents for submission to Cathy Burns and Kelly Fields. The collection of the documents may be more efficient using a subcommittee rather than the task being defaulted to all members of the UAC. Thomas Luscomb will be the subcommittee chair and will report back in the spring.

Joel White is willing to take a position on this subcommittee. It was discussed that Mary Millikin should have a role in this platform as she is the key source for the student learning report. It was discussed whether the purpose of the two websites are for public relations, peer review, or to show transparency. It was determined that this is a way to make the documentation available to two different audiences: [1] RSU faculty who use the information to improve student learning and [2] other institutions who seek ideas and examples. The public accessed site includes a public relations component. The internal website is more comprehensive and will house more sensitive documents (e.g., peer review reports which evaluate departments' sophistication in assessing student learning). Both sites will require UAC monitoring for completeness.

### **C. Electronic Forms- Craig Zimmerman**

Regarding innovation in SLR and PR templates, Craig Zimmerman has suggested using an Excel spreadsheet template that could be uploaded into HillCat Hub. Faculty could upload their student assessment data into the Excel spreadsheet rather than a subcommittee or IT members having to do this work. There could be a tab for each instructor and could have own output to compare with other instructors. Questions to be discussed include:

- Would instructors be able to access off campus?
- Can it be password protected?
- Would be difficult to do this with name-specific data?

Using ZAP numbers may be a solution to this dilemma. Possible to have Peter Macpherson create this template as he has expertise with applets. Craig Zimmerman feels very confident that these will be available in the fall of 2013.

### **D. Best Practices Newsletter- Steve Housel**

Discussion: Dr. Housel will feature Don Glass, the fourth faculty member to make a contribution in the first newsletter. He has all the copy and photos. It will go out to all faculty through campus mail distribution and will be posted on the external assessment website. There is a great deal of information available that is not getting out to the faculty and staff. One example is of Peter Macpherson's applet tools on his website for faculty and staff that have proven extremely useful for enrollment purposes. There is also information on the N drive for service learning.

### **E. Peer Review Survey- Monica Varner**

Discussion: The post survey is complete. There was a good response rate with 62 respondents out of 104 fulltime faculty. Breakdown between faculty and administrator status paralleled that of the University population and was similar to that of the pretest. A 44% response rate was garnered for the pretest in fall 2011.

Pre- and posttest analysis revealed some significant differences. Significantly more faculty reported that they were not familiar with the degree program assessment process in 2012 than in 2011. This could be due to more faculty being involved in writing assessment reports in 2010 than in 2011. However, results suggested that those faculty who are engaged in the full assessment process are satisfied with what the UAC is doing. Those that are not engaged may not be as aware.

Further, results indicated that faculty were less satisfied with general education assessment (most recently using ETS testing), and use of general education assessment outcomes leaves room for improvement. Discussion revealed that most faculty are not aware of the results of the ETS testing. Although there was a professional development session offered at Convocation 2012, only approximately 10 faculty attended. There was discussion about who should be involved. All felt that faculty should be leading the university in assessment of general education, followed by department heads. Mary Millikin wants University Assessment Committee representation at the Academic Council meetings to keep department heads and deans updated and to facilitate greater support.

#### **F. ETS Testing- Mary Millikin**

Mary was attending the Oklahoma Institutional Research conference in Oklahoma City at the time of this meeting, and she will report out on the ETS testing results next meeting.

---

## **Old Business**

### **1) Status of Assessment Facilitator**

Discussion: The position is instituted beginning January 2013. Steve Housel will be the Assessment Facilitator. He will get together with the departments and get a model idea of how to move forward with this program. He will summarize feedback for the UAC, which will add to the agenda.

### **2) Standards and Criteria for Peer Review Sessions**

Discussion: These were shared with UAC members, who were asked to review and comment.

### **3) SLR and PRR form improvements**

Discussion: UAC members were asked to discuss possible improvements to the form. Those improvements already brought forward are being added to the electronic form. The UAC will review the electronic version when available.

---

## **New Business**

### **1) Peer Review Scheduling- Craig Zimmerman**

Action: Craig will send out an email to UAC members as to what dates they can commit to for peer reviews. All felt that teams of three could take turns leading in the peer review sessions. Several Fridays will be needed to complete these sessions.

### **2) General Education Forum**

Discussion: It was discussed that Mary Millikin and Richard Beck, VP of Academic Affairs, are very supportive of the generic idea of the General Education Forum.

### **3) Distance Education Committee**

Discussion: It was discussed that the committee has experienced some difficulties in moving forward. However, the committee has been re-membered and is now active and in motion to meet the goals of the committee.

Action: The Distance Education committee will report to the University Assessment Committee once a semester and the UAC will report to the Distance Education Committee. The goal is for strong collaboration to meet HLC standards.

### **Next Meeting**

A. Issues

B. Time and Place: November 30, 2012 2:00 pm. in Baird Hall in Room 124

**Adjournment:** Dr. Housel adjourned the meeting at 3:50 pm. Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong

# Assessment Committee Minutes

## December 12, 2012

Dr. Steve Housel- chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 1:00 pm. on December 12, 2012 in Baird Hall Room 124.

Present: Bryce Brimer, Juliet Evusa, Jim Ford, Jalal Jaenbai, Steve Housel, Thomas Luscomb, Mary Millikin, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Joel White, Craig Zimmermann. Absent: Sarah Clark.

Approval of minutes from last meeting. The minutes from the Oct 26, 2012 meeting were amended and approved.

---

### Reports and Announcements

#### **A. Best Practices Newsletter- Steve Housel**

Discussion: The newsletter is finished and will go out late January 2013. It will be sent to the UAC members for review before it goes out University-wide.

#### **B. ETS Testing- Mary Millikin**

Discussion: RSU Bachelor degree-seeking sophomores with 45 to 60 credit hours as of the end of the fall 2012 semester have been selected for General Education testing during the spring 2013 semester. To align the sample with RSU needs, only students who took general education courses at RSU are included. Transfer students and students who took general education courses concurrently were omitted, as were students who are primarily enrolled in online courses. The final sample of students will be mailed a letter of notification before the winter break. Students will be sent periodic email reminders, and testing will be available at all three RSU campuses beginning January 7, 2013. Results will be available in time for the April 12 General Education Forum.

#### **C. HLC Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement (Accreditation Self-Study) Mary Millikin/Jim Ford**

Discussion: HLC evaluators will be on campus between the Fall of 2014 or April 2015. Jim Ford, Ken Hicks and Mary Millikin will be the overall co-chairs for the self-study. Steve Housel and Monica Varner will co-chair the Criterion 4 committee. Criterion 4 committee members include will be announced in the next week. UAC members will be important resources for this analysis. Self-study drafts will be submitted May 1, 2013 (first draft), October 1, 2013 (second draft), and December 1, 2013 (third draft).

---

### Old Business

#### **A. Peer Review Schedule- Zimmermann- handouts**

Discussion: The UAC Assessment Review Session Schedule was produced and distributed to the attending meeting members by Craig Zimmermann. The schedule represents the Sessions, Departments, Date, Time, and the UAC committee members on each individual Peer Review Team. Craig Zimmermann discussed the types of Reports.

Jan 18, 2013	2:00-4:00pm	Communications	Zimmermann, Saffarian, Brimer
	4:00-5:00pm	Fine Arts	
Jan 25, 2013	1:30-3:30pm	Health Science	Varner, Saffarian, Brimer
	3:30-4:15pm	Sports Management	
	4:15-5:00pm	Developmental Studies	
Feb 1, 2013	2:00-4:00pm	Biology	Housel, Evusa, Clark
	4:00-5:00pm	Math & Physical Science	
Feb 15, 2013	2:00-5:00pm	English & Humanities	Varner, Jaenbai, White
Feb 22, 2013	2:00-4:00pm	Psychology, Sociology, & Criminal Justice	Ford, Luscomb, Clark
Mar 1, 2013	2:00-5:00pm	History & Political Science	Zimmermann, Luscomb, White
Mar 29, 2013	2:00-5:00pm	Applied Technology	Housel, Jaenbai, Bycroft
Apr 19, 2013	2:00-5:00pm	Business	Ford, Evusa, Bycroft

#### **B. Assessment Websites- Luscomb**

Discussion: Assessment internal and external websites should be updated by February 1, 2013. UAC Meeting minutes are to be emailed to Kelly Fields, the website manager, for posting. Any items pertaining to best practices and annual reports will also be sent to Kelly Fields. Peer Reviews and SLRs will be located at the internal assessment website, as this will take the place of the N: drive.

#### **C. General Education Forum – Varner- handout**

Discussion: Monica Varner discussed the purpose for having the General Education Forum at RSU. The forum should address and evaluate fixed valued goals/learning outcomes. It should maintain an integrated and coherent focus. It should develop understanding about expected student learning and level of learning. It should also address and evaluate the peer review student learning and the general education program assessment processes. It should enhance student learning by exposing students to human cultures, the physical and natural world, and should cultivate intellectual and practical skills, and personal and social responsibility. Monica Varner also distributed to the attending members copies of the General Education Forum Student Learning Knowledge Network Model Professional Learning Communities (PLC). The information included: general education assessment master SLR for the Academic Cycle 2011-2012, giving details about the description of measure, the performance standard, the objective, essay, or unknown, the sample size, and if the standard was met for each course type in a sample of Humanities, English, and PSCJ courses. A student learning value/outcome rubric was attached. Also included was information on “learning to think, thinking to learn”, Bloom’s revised Taxonomy, Bloom’s original taxonomy, and higher/lower thinking skills. The group discussed the process of filtering results between the on-ground/online classes to assess them separately for General Education.

Monica has asked that General Education Forum (GEF) taskforce members complete the following by the next GEF January 7, 2013 meeting:

1. Describe in detail expectations of the General Education Forum Format. Design a script for the 120 minute session.
2. Define the four learning outcomes. Utilize the following documents to develop a clear and concise definition for each learning outcome; the documents include Our Students Best Work: A Framework for Accountability Worthy of Our Mission and Student Learning Value/Outcome Rubrics.
3. Develop questions from the General Education Master SLR (GEMSLR). The questions will be shared with faculty, department heads, and deans, they will be used in the forum to generate discussion and develop an integrated and global view of general education learning. The questions should address the emerging patterns identified from the GEMSLR.
4. Future Strategies: Peer Review Report by University Assessment Committee and format for distributing peer review information to faculty, department heads, deans, and stake holders.

---

## **New Business**

### **A. Convocation Day 2013- Steve Housel**

Discussion: Steve Housel reported that Faculty Senate has requested time at Convocation 2013 for faculty committee meetings. Some committees wait until October to meet which is too late in the year and Convocation would be timely. Because of this schedule, faculty professional development will need to take place in the afternoon or on another day.

Because no monies have yet been identified to pay for a faculty lunch at Convocation, the suggestion was made to use Commencement lunch funds for Convocation, foregoing the Commencement lunch.

### **B. Distance Education Forum Committee- Myra Haulmark- handout**

Discussion: Myra Haulmark, co-chair of the Distance Learning Education (DLE) Committee, reported that Dr. Beck approached the DLE Committee to review the HLC's recommendations for monitoring distance education at RSU. The committee decided to focus on best practices for teaching online. The committee has drafted a document of best practices to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and ultimately approved by the Academic Council on February 8, 2013. Objectives developed by the DLE include the development of distance education course policies, including the specification of frequency of correspondence with online students and details regarding posting student grades.

Based on these best practices, the committee has devised a professional development series consisting of four course modules for online and blended instructors. They wish to work collaboratively with the UAC to effectively assess all online and blended courses.

### **Next Meeting**

A. Time and Place: January 10, 2013 3:00 pm. in Baird Hall in Room 124

**Adjournment:** Dr. Housel adjourned the meeting at 3:20 pm. Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong

# Assessment Committee Minutes

## January 10, 2013

Dr. Steve Housel- chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 1:09 pm. on January 10, 2013 in Baird Hall Room 124.

Present: Bryce Brimer, Sarah Clark, Jim Ford, Steve Housel, Mary Millikin, Thomas Luscomb, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Craig Zimmerman. Absent: Juliet Evusa, Teri Bycroft, Jalal Jaenbai, Joel White.

Approval of minutes from December 12, 2012 meeting. Meeting minutes were amended and approved.

---

## Reports and Announcements

### A. HLC Self-study Team (Criterion 4) – presented by Housel, Varner

1. David Barron, Teri Bycroft, Jamie Graham,
2. Steve Housel, Monica Varner, Craig Zimmermann
3. Marisa Littlefield, Massood Saffarian, Brenda Tuberville

Discussion: The Self-Study kickoff was held on Jan 8, 2013. This was the launch for the 18-month long process to conduct the Self-Study for HLC accreditation. Several UAC members are assigned to various teams and all faculty are encouraged to be involved and provide feedback. At this time, the subcommittee members have been identified. See page 11. An outline has been developed as a reference from Teri Bycroft for Section C. See page 8. Monica Varner has shared the University of New Mexico's self-study report for guidance in developing the outline for RSU's self-study report. The University of New Mexico is going through its site visit Nov 2013. Monica emailed the descriptions to all the members of UAC. See page 11 for exact page numbers.

First draft of Criterion 4 Self-Study section is due May 1, 2013 with plans for Self-Study Coordinators to review over summer. Page limit for the entire report will be approximately 200 pages, limit for each chapter is approximately 35 pages. New Mexico University has a 36-page document for Criterion 4 section with hyperlinks to its resources. RSU's Self-Study will be hyperlinked to the Xitracs Website for resources.

Please see the link to the Criterion: [Higher Learning Commission Criteria](#)

### B. Assessment Website- Thomas Luscomb

a) Internal:

- 1) UAC-related forms including Student Learning Reports and Peer Review Reports
- 2) Regents Assessment Report

b) External:

- 1) UAC agendas and minutes
- 2) Faculty Insights newsletter
- 3) Regents Assessment Report

Discussion: External information is partly there. Thomas sent the remaining minutes and agenda to Kelli Fields. It should be completed by Feb 1, 2013. Mary Millikin will work to create the internal website using the framework Cathy Burns has set up. It will be completed in February.

### **C. General Education Forum- Varner**

Discussion: It would be beneficial to identify a member to represent each department in the 11 areas. The faculty currently communicates with the department heads regarding assessment, but the global General Education assessment will be through UAC due to the fact that Gen Ed is taught across the curriculum. This is a professional learning community not an administrative group. The committee discussed having a panel to meet with the Department Heads to explain the General Forum parameters.

### **D. Peer Review Reports- Housel**

Discussion: It's important that Peer Review reports and sessions be a collaborative process. One person should not be responsible for a program. Spring 2013 Peer Review reports will be developed in a similarly effective process as they were in Spring 2012.

### **E. Distance Education- Housel**

Discussion: Steve announced that Dr. Myra Haulmark has accepted a position at another university in Arkansas. She will be difficult to replace at RSU and will be missed.

---

## **Old Business**

### **A. Faculty Insight Newsletter- Housel**

Discussion: Is available for review and input. This publication will be distributed in February and will likely be published once a semester.

### **B. Peer Review Schedule- Zimmermann- \* see page 10**

Discussion: Craig reviewed the Peer Review Schedule and asked for feedback. UAC members noted that it was clearly communicated, and they thanked him for his efforts.

### **C. Convocation Day- Housel and Ford**

Discussion: Jim has requested the hour following President Rice's address to the University at Convocation 2013 be set aside for faculty to convene in standing committees. This has been requested because in the past committees sometimes don't meet until October, which is problematic for the Curriculum Committee. If approved, this will require that the UAC amend its plan to hold professional development sessions immediately following the president's address. Instead, it was suggested that after the proposed standing committee meeting(s), faculty would be provided a box lunch from the University and attend professional development breakout sessions. Mary has issued a request to the RSU Foundation to fund the lunch, which would cost approximately \$1,300. Maynard Phillips has added this request to his list, and will let Mary know if he receives additional funds to support this request.

---

## **New Business**

### **A. Peer Review Forms- Housel \*See Addendum on University Assessment Committee pg. 5.**

Discussion: The UAC members discussed whether the Peer Review Form should be amended to include separate reporting columns for online course results versus on-ground course results. It was determined to allow the departments to decide about separating the on-ground/online courses. HLC assumes that the departments meet formally/informally to discuss assessment issues. The UAC is asking its members to report dates and attendance of their formal assessment meetings and to provide meeting minutes if available. These recommendations were made to the Deans and the Department Heads. What is the best way for the UAC to follow up on this procedure? Should the questions be added to the Peer Review Forms? In regards to Self-Study Criterion 2C., the following questions are to be discussed. Was online data included or reported? How strongly do you encourage the faculty to collect online data? The questions will identify when we are doing this and how. It was decided that discussion among deans, department heads, and faculty will occur in order to determine if a change is made next year separating the on-ground/online courses for data conclusions. The course comparison is more valuable than what the numbers of

students are in each category as there are many students that take both on-ground/online courses. The overall objective is to determine if the online course is as rigorous as the on-ground course. This is information that HLC will need in the future. HLC leaves it up to the institution as to how to monitor the two categories. Steve plans to share user friendly SLRs for clear and concise reporting from the departments. All feel that blended courses should be in their own category for results. HLC is non-prescriptive as to how to implement this.

Action: It was determined that there is a need to have someone on the Peer Review committee report on the questions that were asked in the Peer Review session to track the efficacy of faculty in reporting on these issues. UAC will need to gather the information and synthesize it, review in the late spring, and create a strategy.

**B. Adding Macroeconomics- Saffarian- Handout \* see page 9**

Discussion: Massood brought up the need to consider adding Macroeconomics to the General Education course requirements. He felt that because more students enroll in Macroeconomics than Microeconomics, this change to the General Education assessment plan is necessitated. The General Education committee still has an arbitrary list of courses that are being considered to get the most accurate picture of student learning. Adding this course would also address the problem that the School of Business and Technology currently has that there is currently no course for inclusion in the General Education Forum. The interest lies in developing a comprehensive Gen Ed program for global outcomes of the student. It was discussed that UAC should write a Gen Ed master SLR that covers all of the schools. Dr. Beck counsels that Gen Ed should be reviewed as a program rather than individual courses. We will discuss rotating courses as a possibility. At this point we need a framework and not sure if it's going to be productive, positive, or worthwhile. How are we doing and how do we know?

Motion: A motion was made by Craig Zimmermann to include Macroeconomics to the General Education course list. The motion was seconded by Monica Varner.

**Adjournment:** 2:41 pm.

Next Meeting: January 31, 2013 1:15 pm. Baird Hall Room 124.

Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong Minutes approved by: Mary Millikin, Steve Housel.

---

## Addendum

### 1. Excerpt from August 23, 2012, Memo to deans and department heads:

In meetings held this summer the University Assessment Committee made two important decisions that it believes will (1) refine our evolving assessment and feedback system to inform ourselves of progress in student learning outcomes, and (2) help meet the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission, the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, and the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education.

The decisions listed below are recommendations that the UAC strongly encourages departments to follow. Please consider making them standard operating procedures. Although this SOP is voluntary, in order to be in compliance with the Open Records Act, the Student Learning Reports will be posted on the UAC website and results will be subject to inquiry in peer review sessions.

- 1) Any course that is part of an assessment report should include data from all delivery formats and from all instructors. This means that in addition to on-ground courses, data from online and blended courses should be collected, assessed and reported. It also means that data from courses taught by adjunct faculty should be included. Whether online data are reported separately from on-ground data is left to departments.
- 2) We believe that the Higher Learning Commission assumes that departments meet formally and informally to discuss assessment issues. The University Assessment Committee is asking its members to report the dates and attendance of their department's formal assessment meetings, which are defined as any faculty meeting or part of a meeting in which issues related to the assessment process are discussed.

The University Assessment Committee also recommends that more detail be provided in the Results and Conclusions sections of Part 4 ("Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning") of the assessment report. This is a request for a modest amount of additional information. This year's assessment forms will include examples, which should provide guidance in this area.

### 2. Questions

- Did the instructors responsible for each measure collaborate on the conclusion? Is at least one here to discuss each measure's conclusion? Will they in the future?
- Do all measures include data from all delivery formats (on ground, online and blended) and all instructors (adjunct and faculty)? Will they this spring? Next academic year (2013-2014)?
- Was online data included and discussed? Will they be this spring? Next academic year (2013-2014)?
- Were dates and attendance of formal assessment meetings recorded? Were minutes taken? Will they be this spring? Next academic year (2013-2014)?

### 3. Form for each session to include:

- Date of session
- Peer review team
- Degree programs being reviewed
- Attendance of faculty, chairs, deans
- Answers to the questions above
- Recommendations for improving form
- Recommendations for improving peer review sessions
- Note good examples of data display or conclusions.

## **Rogers State University General Education Forum Introductory Overview Spring 2013**

Purpose: The General Education Forum is designed to develop Clear and Complementary Responsibilities for General Education Outcomes. The Forum should:

- Address and evaluate fixed valued goals/learning outcomes.
- Maintain an integrated and coherent focus.
- Develop understanding about expected student learning and level of learning.
- Peer review student learning and the general education program assessment process.
- Discuss and review learning goals and outcomes and assessment results with all stakeholders.

(AACU, 2008, Our Students' Best Work: A Framework for Accountability Worthy of Our Mission, see handout provided in packet).

Enhance Student Learning:

- Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
  - Students will acquire and evaluate information.
  - Students will analyze and integrate knowledge.
  - Students will develop perspectives and an understanding of the human experience.
- Intellectual and Practical Skills
  - Students will acquire and evaluate information.
  - Students will analyze and integrate knowledge.
  - Students will develop perspectives and an understanding of the human experience.
  - Students will communicate effectively.
- Personal and Social Responsibility
  - Students will develop perspectives and an understanding of the human experience.

(Categories were described in AACU, Peter D. Hart Associates, November and December 2006, Outcomes 1-4 are described in RSU General Education Student Learning Report).

HLC site visit team's remarks, 2004: *"Appropriate program-level objectives have been established for general education. However, the institution has not developed an effective method for measuring student attainment of goals. The team urges RSU to make this a high priority."*

Strategies: Introductory Proposal

- 1) General Education Student Learning is peer reviewed as a program not individual course embedded assessment strategies.
- 2) Group Forum format which includes faculty, DHs, Deans, Assistant Vice President of Accountability and Academics, and Vice President of Academic Affairs.
- 3) Four UAC members will lead the peer review and address each learning outcome. Relevant faculty discusses assessment outcome, methods, performance standards, and results. Forum members will address the outcome in an integrated, clear, complementary, and coherent focus. The General Education Student Learning report will be merged and sent to the faculty and Department Heads with questions and suggestions before the forum. All Forum members develop an understanding about expected student learning and level of learning. Faculty and reviewers make recommendations to increase the quality of student learning and the general education program assessment process. The Office of Accountability and Academics will communicate learning outcomes and results with all stakeholders.

Strategies: General Education Forum Committee Activities (January 7, 2012)

- 1) Describe in detail your expectations of the General Education Forum Format. Design a script for the 120 minute session.
- 2) Define the four learning outcomes. Utilize the following documents to develop a clear and concise definition for each learning outcome; the documents include Our Students Best Work: A Framework for Accountability Worthy of Our Mission and Student Learning Value/Outcome Rubrics.
- 3) Develop questions from the General Education Master SLR (GEMSLR). The questions will be shared with faculty, department heads, and deans, they will be used in the forum to generate discussion and develop an integrated and global view of general education learning. The questions should address the emerging patterns identified from the GEMSLR.
- 4) Future Strategies: Peer Review Report by University Assessment Committee and format for distributing peer review information to faculty, department heads, deans, and stake holders.

Criterion Four: Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching and Learning

Criterion Four: Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching and Learning

Demonstration of Rogers State University's (RSU) Responsibility for Quality of Educational Programs

4A.  
here

RSUs practice of regular program reviews  
RSUs evaluation of all credits that are transcribed  
RSUs policies assuring quality of credit accepted in transfer.  
etc

4B.  
here

RSUs commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning  
RSUs stated goals for student learning and processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.  
etc

4C.  
here

RSUs Commitment to Educational Improvement: Retention, Persistence, and Completion Rates in Degree and Certificate Programs (do we have any certificate programs?)  
RSUs defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion.  
Attainability  
Agreement with RSUs mission  
Student population  
Educational offerings  
RSUs analyses on student retention, persistence, and completion.  
RSUs responses to data of student retention, persistence, and completion.  
completion.  
RSUs processes and methodologies for data collection and analysis on student retention, persistence, and completion.

Macroeconomics ECON 2113: Course Description: A study of economy wide resource allocation choices and macroeconomic policies that effect unemployment, inflation, national income, and economic growth.

Text: Economics Today: The Macro View by Roger LeRoy Miller, 15th edition. ISBN#978:0-321-57131-1

**D. Course Objectives**

After successfully completing this course

1. You will have acquired a basic content knowledge in economics that includes an understanding of price theory, the resource allocation decisions that are made by individuals and firms, supply, demand, market structures, and cost.
2. Be able to analyze and synthesize economic theory and derive predictions from those theories.
3. Have significant knowledge of the economic forces shaping and altering society.

Student progress toward these goals will be periodically assessed through quizzes, midterm exams, and written assignments.

**UAC 2013 Assessment Review Session Schedule**

Session	Department	Date	Time	Peer Review Team
1	Communications Fine Arts	Jan 18	2:00 - 4:00 4:00 - 5:00	Zimmermann, Safarian, Brimer
2	Health Science Sports Management Developmental Studies	Jan 25	1:30 - 3:30 3:30 - 4:15 4:15 - 5:00	Varner, Safarian, Brimer
3	Biology Math & Physical Sciences	Feb 1	2:00 - 4:00 4:00 - 5:00	Housel, Evusa, Clark
4	English & Humanities	Feb 15	2:00 - 5:00	Varner, Djayanbaev, White
5	Psychology, Sociology, and Criminal Justice	Feb 22	2:00 - 4:00	Ford, Luscomb, Clark
6	History & Political Science	Mar 1	2:00 - 5:00	Zimmermann, Luscomb, White
7	Applied Technology	Mar 29	2:00 - 5:00	Housel, Djayanbaev, Bycroft
8	General Education Forum	Apr 12	2:30 - 4:30	All UAC Members
9	Business	Apr 19	2:00 - 5:00	Ford, Evusa, Bycroft

**University of New Mexico**  
**Example of Criterion Four Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Information**

Contents:

Criterion Four Introduction	108
4A	108
4A1	109-112
4A211	112-113
4A3	113-114
4A4	114-116
4A5	116-117
4A6	117-119
4B	119-120
4B1	120-123
4B2	123-124
4B3	124-130
4B4	130-133
4C	133-134
4C1	134-136
4C2	137-138
4C3	138-141
4C4	141-142
Criterion 4 CH Summary	142-144

**Rogers State University Self Study**

**Criterion Four Teaching and Learning Evaluation and Information**

Example: Provided by New Mexico State University Alamogordo

Chapter Five Criterion Four Committee: Co-Chairs: Steve Housel and Monica Varner

4A: Marisa Littlefield sub-committee chair, Massood Saffarian, Brenda Tuberville

Committee advisor: Monica Varner

4B: Craig Zimmermann sub-committee chair, Steve Housel and Monica Varner

4C: David Barron sub-committee chair, Teri Bycroft, and Jamie Graham

Committee advisor: Steve Housel

# Assessment Committee Minutes

February 21, 2013

Dr. Housel, chairperson called to order the regular meeting of the University Assessment Committee at 2:05 pm. on February 21, 2013 in Baird Hall Room 124.

Present: Teri Bycroft, Sarah Clark, Juliet Evusa, Jim Ford, Steve Housel, Jalal Jaenbai, Thomas Luscomb, Mary Millikin, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, Joel White, Craig Zimmerman. Absent: Bryce Brimer, Jim Ford.

Approval of minutes from Jan 10, 2013 with changes to New Business, Peer Review Forms, second sentence to read: It was determined to provide a separate column for the on ground courses and the online courses, with the blended courses to be included with the on ground courses. Minutes were amended and approved.

---

## Reports and Announcements

### A. ORU visitor- Mary Millikin

Discussion: Dr. Easterling is a consultant evaluator for the HLC often assigned to the assessment portion of accreditation site visits. Dr. Millikin discussed need to address faculty and staff budget meetings before initiating visit from Dr. Easterling. She felt this would be the best time to approach the subject about requesting funds for a scheduled visit in July 2013. She believes it would be prudent to provide SLR, Peer Reviews, GE Forum Reports, and Strategic Plans for him to view in June. Strategic Plans offer reports from academic and non-academic departments of the institution. HLC looks favorably on institutions that have robust reporting from both. Over the summer, he would process these reports provided, and give feedback.

### B. Distance Education Report

Discussion: David Tait, chair felt the committee would have their recommendations of Best Practices for distance education within 2 weeks and would pass them along to Faculty Senate, Academic Council, and UAC. The committee is will maintain their oversight of the standards setting; follow through with standards will be left to departments. It was discussed to provide an online SLR to create formal criteria with a guiding rubric but should fall on the distance learning committee to implement.

### C. Websites

The committee viewed the links provided on the RSU website: [www.rsu.edu](http://www.rsu.edu) > Faculty & Staff > Committees > Assessment. Committee agreed to change title page from Public Assessment Information to Assessment of Student Learning. The verbiage was enhanced and shortened for readability.

### D. Faculty Insights Newsletter

Discussion: Newsletter emailed to all faculty members. It was not determined if President Rice, Dr. Beck and Dr. Millikin fall into this emailing, but should be included for future editions.

---

## Old Business

**A) Assessment Website**-Thomas Luscomb-Steve Housel-Handouts RSU Website> Committees> Public Assessment Information

a) Internal:

- 1) UAC-related forms including Student Learning Reports and Peer Review Reports
- 2) Regents Assessment Report

Discussion: Mary Millikin is in the process of compiling the information for internal site before it can be launched. Launch date has not been determined as there are 4 years of reports and the documents require uploading one at a time. The N: Drive is limited to only UAC committee members and is limited as a repository to make it feasible as a way for all faculty members, full time and adjunct faculty to access. It was determined that all full time faculty members will have access to this Internal site. The site needs a link for the GE outcomes and forum. It was suggested to create an entire page for GE to be included on this webpage.

b) External:

- 1) UAC agendas and meeting minutes
- 2) Faculty Insights newsletter
- 3) Regents Assessment Report
- 4) Resources that are available nationally (AIR for example)

Discussion: Thomas Luscomb and Kelli Fields will upload meeting minutes and agendas to external site by Spring Break March 2013. The gateway to access this site will be through Mary Millikin's office. Steve Housel would like access to monitor the site and provide oversight. When viewing Public Assessment Information webpage, members felt the title should read: Student Learning as this is the sole purpose of the committee is to promote student learning and outcomes.

### **B. General Education Forum- Monica Varner- handout \*see page 5 and 6\***

1. Update- The first committee meeting was well attended on December 7, 2012.
2. Comp I Addition- the GE Forum Committee members agreed to increase General Education from the Super 11 to Super 12 courses, including Comp I which has the largest enrollment on campus. All student learning outcomes are addressed in Comp I making it qualitatively relevant to add it to General Education, showing it is not just a matter of numbers, but of measuring outcomes as well.

Motion: Thomas Luscomb motioned to add Comp I to General Education Super 12. Teri Bycroft seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.

3. Panel Members- Recommendations by General Education Committee are: Dr. Steve Housel, Dr. Mary Millikin, Dr. Monica Varner, Dr. Frank Grabowski, Dr. Sara Beam, and Dr. Jamie Graham. It was determined there will be 8 courses in Liberal Arts under Dr. Grabowski, 3 courses in Math and Physical Science under Jamie Graham, and 1 course in Business and Technology under Sara Beam should they accept the role in regards to General Education Forum. Dr. Varner would serve as panel leader. UAC members were in agreement to correspond with selected faculty member through email for accepting the role.

Motion: Craig Zimmermann motioned to invite Jamie Graham, Sara Beam, Jamie Graham and Monica Varner to serve as Panel Members for General Education Forum on April 12, 2013. The motion was seconded by Teri Bycroft. The motion passed.

Discussion: All members of UAC have a vital role in General Education Forum to be held April 12, 2013 from 2:15- 4:30 pm. in Baird Hall Room 131. That role will entail assisting department heads in preparing questions for March 25, 2013 deadline and providing input to questions from audience at the forum.

4. General Education Program Questions- handout \*see page 7\* There will be 3 documents available at the forum. The masters Student Learning Report, the master Student Learning Narrative Report, and a diagram with student learning that includes the general education course embedded learning outcomes and the ETS proficiency profile content. Department Heads are responsible for gathering questions from UAC members and submitting to their faculty members. Faculty will be able to go into the ZIP survey link and upload individual answers to the questions selected. This will be available to all faculty members even though they may not teach in the General Education Super 12 as their input is equally valued.

Discussion: It was suggested that in addition to summer General Education Forum, a smaller forum be presented in fall that not only addresses specific issues relevant to 2 or 3 courses, but would address gaps that were found in the summer forum for all departments. There was discussion about linking 2 or 3 learning outcomes to all courses, not just one learning outcome as seems customary. The idea is to provide evidence of student learning outcomes in all departments at all levels, not just in general education courses. It was determined the general education forum provides many opportunities for enrichment. Any time a student is asked to demonstrate the desired outcome, they will rise to the occasion by adapting the concepts that are presented.

**C. Using Peer Review forms for questions-** Steve Housel- the UAC committee members felt that filling out the questions on the forms prior to the sessions proved most efficient. Once the leader of the session completed the form, it was distributed to all reviewers to use in the face-to-face peer review. Notes could be taken, and edited during the session. It was determined to keep a copy of the pre-review form and to compare it to the post-review form for future reference.

---

## New Business

**A. Ordering, Changing, timing individual peer review sessions-** Steve Housel will verify the order if scheduling the sessions for degree programs with the department heads before making the schedule for the peer review sessions.

**B. Managing Peer Review of Super Twelve-**It is Monica Varner's recommendation to have the General Education Forum of the Super Twelve courses Peer review simultaneously with the UAC Peer Reviews sessions so as not to seem like it is a duplicate process. That way the Super Twelve courses get individual feedback about their General Education course while reducing the amount of work required by the UAC members by having a separate review session. It was decided to delay the decision until summer until after the General Education Forum.

**C. At-large Members-** the members began the discussion of having three more members representing the three schools. The at-large members would need to be a veteran with previous UAC experience, but would not be required to serve for three years and would not have voting rights. The purpose is to strengthen the bench, provide more expertise, and provide assistance in carrying the responsibility of the increasing obligations of the UAC. To allow department heads to rotate in as members at-large would be a more meaningful way for them to engage in the assessment process at their department level.

**D. Length of Nursing SLRs-** The current SLR for the BSN is 30 pages. The committee is wondering if it is possible to reduce this form down making it more manageable for the peer reviewers to utilize. It was discussed and decided to table until the summer when the Nursing Department meets to discuss such topics.

**E. Degree Program Outcome vs. Student Learning Outcome-** there is a question as to whether these are the same thing or should they be reported differently? It was recommended to have a separate column for each with the degree program outcome and the student learning outcome in clean and organized columns, and to provide a glossary of terms to show the differences between the two. It was recommended to change Degree Program Outcomes to Degree Program Objectives.

**F. Protocol for Peer review report distribution-** the targeted distribution is four weeks. The completed peer review forms should be sent to Mary Millikin, Steve Housel, the UAC department representative, and the department head first, before sending to the individual faculty members.

Adjournment: 3:56 pm. Next Meeting: TBD. TH 2:00 pm. Baird Hall Room 124. Minutes submitted by: Susan Wong  
Minutes approved by: Mary Millikin, Steve Housel

# Assessment Committee Minutes

May 07, 2013

Location: BH Rm. 124

Present: Bycroft, Teri; Evusa, Juliet; Ford, Jim; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Luscomb, Thomas; Macpherson, Peter; Saffarian, Massood; Varner, Monica; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Clark, Sarah; Millikin, Mary. Guest: Grabowski, Frank.

Called to Order: 1:01 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel. Introduction of current member, faculty position and the years of service with UAC.

---

## Reports and Announcements Part 1

### A. Agenda Item: New and Departing Members

- i. New members Peter Macpherson and Kirk Weller will replace exiting members Bryce Brimer and Thomas Luscomb.
- ii. Dr. Frank Grabowski, a former UAC committee member, was invited to attend the meeting to act as a resource for the meeting. Dr. Grabowski and Dr. Varner were instrumental in shaping the General Education Forum held April 12, 2013.

---

## New Business Part 1

### A. Agenda Item: General Education Committee (Presented by Dr. Richard Beck)

- i. The HLC accreditation site visit team determined in 2004 that it was in favor of RSU's general education program-level objectives but found no evidence or documentation to support student attainment.
- ii. The HLC accreditation team of 2004 suggested that RSU develop an effective method for measuring student attainment of general education goals and display evidence of said program prior to the next accreditation site visit.
- iii. To fulfill HLC's suggestion, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Beck would like a program in place with supporting evidence prior to the November 2014 HLC accreditation visit. Moreover, RSU desires to implement a process for continuous quality improvement of its general education program.
- iv. As data and recommendations come forward to the office of Academic Affairs, UAC, Academic Council, and Faculty Senate, questions arise as to who is responsible for a GE program.
- v. Dr. Beck appointed a GE task force in 2009, and this task force was instrumental in reviewing and updating RSU's GE student learning outcomes by the 2010-2011 AY. A revitalized GE task force needs to be reformed by fall 2013. This task force will be responsible for appointing members to a GE program committee (two entirely different entities that may or may not be comprised of the same members). The GE committee will be responsible for the scope, direction, reports, findings, and progress reports for the GE program. The GE committee will look at the mission and ascertain the direction the program is heading. The GE Program Committee assess RSU's GE curriculum as one unified program with associated outcomes and requisite modifications.
- vi. Dr. Ford presented a handout on comparable regional Oklahoma Universities' General Education Committees and Councils. This handout provides a summary of the regional universities and their GE Committee's responsibilities (**\*see page 10 and 11**).
- vii. Dr. Grabowski posed a question: What is the makeup of these regional universities' GE Committees and Councils (is it administration-driven or faculty-driven)? The makeup is undetermined. Dr. Grabowski raised concern about having a faculty-driven GE committee as faculty is already stretched thin with university committee obligations. Dr. Beck sees a GE committee with existing university committee members as the only option.

- viii. Debate ensued over which department and with what type of membership makeup (academic departments, university committees, or administration) should be responsible for appointing a committee for this academic year. Also in question is which department should provide oversight (quality assurance and continuity throughout the university) of the GE program.
- a. Dr. Housel expressed concern why administration is contacting UAC at the end of the process for determining this task force instead of at the beginning of the process. Dr. Beck agreed that this was not the intention, however, time is of greatest importance and there is now an immediacy to move this process forward, hence his appeal to the UAC.
  - b. Dr. Weller suggested that the meeting was part of the process of determining the makeup of the task force, and the UAC is not removed from it.
  - c. UAC would like to see a lean and mobile program with representatives from UAC, University Curriculum Committee, and the Center for Teaching and Learning.
  - d. Dr. White proposed that these committees appoint representatives for the task force.
  - e. Dr. Beck added that this task force would require immediate coordination due to a number of sequential actions that take place in accordance with academic policies and procedures (approval from Academic Policy Committee, Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Dr. Beck, and President Rice).
  - f. Dr. Varner suggested that the time between now and the HLC site visit of the fall of 2014 does not allow time to compile data and synthesize it as evidence for the GE program.
  - g. Dr. Bycroft pointed out the complexity of the GE issue stating that the task force members should be chosen with the knowledge and ability to synthesize the content of the GE program.
  - h. Drs. Grabowski, Ford, Zimmermann, and Varner agreed that the selection of the task force members requires concentration on members with backgrounds in GE, assessment, distance education, and curriculum to make the best task force. This narrows the possibilities for this charge. Dr. Zimmermann suggested that the task force and the GE program committee be comprised of the same members (no change of the guard).
  - i. Dr. Macpherson offered while the composition of the task force is important the need to appoint members of the task force immediately is paramount.
  - j. Dr. Varner suggested that the task force will be the committee to do investigative application and analysis and should be comprised of the same members for the GE program committee.
  - k. Dr. Weller proposed (due to time constraints) that administration appoint the task force members based on the parameters and suggestions provided by the UAC.
  - l. Thomas Luscomb proposed creating subcommittees as a means to initiate the process immediately.
- ix. Decision: Drs. Beck, Ford, and Housel would appoint a small task force committee of 5 members from the five content areas with room for other members from the fully functioning university-wide campus committees. These members will determine the makeup of the GE committee, the scope, and direction (and determine the need for installing a permanent committee). The GE committee will be comprised of a small group of faculty members that currently teach GE courses, have a desire to contribute to the cause, and work well with all campus committees. UAC will be responsible for aligning with the task force committee and with the GE committee once formed.
- x. Decision: The names of the task force members will be provided in the summer months by Drs. Beck, Ford, and Housel.

---

## Old Business Part 1

### A. Agenda Item: Convocation Breakout Sessions

Dr. Housel presented a question for Dr. Beck concerning Convocation this year. He summarized; last year, Convocation provided two breakout sessions in the morning and two in the afternoon. The sessions were oriented either toward assessment or professional development. Dr. Housel asks Dr. Beck: Is this the direction administration would like to go this year? Dr. Beck will need to coordinate with the parties that have a vested interest in Convocation and report back at a later time. He agreed that it is reasonable for the UAC to plan their assessment session at this stage in preparation for Convocation. Discussion ensued about organizing two or three breakout sessions after lunch. The details of lunch have not been determined.

### B. Agenda Item: Fall General Education Forum

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck about the feasibility or need for a fall General Education Forum. Dr. Beck stated that while a fall forum would be effective, he feels that the work of the task force might cause a delay in organizing the event.

### **C. Agenda Item: Assessment Facilitator:**

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck: Should UAC break out separate conclusions for reporting of online/on-ground course assessment (the report for assessment is due October 15<sup>th</sup>)? Dr. Beck stated that this is a primary way to show evidence of “no significant difference” between online/on-ground courses.

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck: Are we wrong to suggest departments follow the prescribed standards put forth by UAC? Dr. Beck replied no and agrees with changing the wording in assessment rubric to “strongly encouraged” (UAC does not want to be perceived as having oversight of individual departments). He offers that ACS or the office of Accountability and Academics run reports for the departments with standard measures imbedded. This would reduce the workload for the assessment facilitator and for the individual departments concerning online assessment specifically. The feasibility of this idea will be investigated.

### **D. General Education:**

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck: is administration looking for wholesale curricular change or smaller changes within the GE courses as it pertains to assessment? Dr. Beck is looking for programmatic improvement in GE (as opposed to improving the content of a single course) and how that improvement provides evidence of closing the loop.

- Dr. Evusa cautioned that obtaining data lumped together created a challenge for individual conclusions of courses themselves.
- Dr. Ford suggested lumping the conclusions together with a brief summary of what changes are needed where.
- Dr. Zimmermann posed a question: what is the best way to measure wholesale changes?

Dr. Housel will make a tour of the campus department heads prior to the fall semester start date. He will present a portfolio to the department heads demonstrating the best way to present data. This could also be a time to meet with faculty members.

### **E. ORU Visitor:**

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck: What is the status of Dr. Easterling from ORU visiting RSU this summer? Dr. Beck replied that the visit is being discussed but has not been confirmed.

### **F. Academic Policy Committee:**

Dr. Housel posed a question for Dr. Beck: Who writes the mission for a standing committee? Dr. Beck responded: The Academic Policy Committee is the first committee to draft committee policy, and then presents it to the Faculty Senate, and then to Academic Council, then if any changes are made, it goes back to the committee and back through the channels for approval. Once approved, the mission and policies of the committee will be published in the policies and procedures manual (generally showing a short statement about what the committee does, membership and a summary of the reporting structure).

### **G. Once all UAC issues were addressed, Dr. Beck departed.**

### **I. Approval of Minutes from last meeting (Thursday, February 21, 2013):**

Dr. Housel discussed the need for the minutes to include the handouts that were distributed in the last meeting. The committee secretary must provide handouts with the minutes. Meeting minutes will be amended and resubmitted with the handouts for the next meeting.

---

## **Reports and Announcements Part 2**

### **A. Agenda Item: Distance Education Committee Recommendations**

A handout for best practices provided by Dr. Tait for online education was distributed to the UAC members for review (**\*see page 12-15**). The members will report back on their findings, concerns, and suggestions by the next UAC meeting. Dr. Tait did specify if there were any questions or concerns about the best practices to contact him directly for clarification.

Dr. Ford summarized the results of the meeting with Faculty Senate in respect to the distance education best practices.

- A disclaimer needs to be included in the course schedule stating that the student is responsible for his/her computer, for computer applications, and all the things required taking an online course.
- The online grade book may be eliminated as instructors are not utilizing it
- An online syllabus needs to be more comprehensive than the on-ground syllabi for the same course

Discussion about developing assessment rubric for online course syllabi. The UAC mission states: design and implement an assessment process that will ensure quality instruction.

### **B. Peer Review Sessions Report**

Dr. Housel would like the team leaders Drs. Varner, Zimmermann, and Ford to fill out the provided form and return at a later time with these specific details:

- The dates that the peer review teams met with the faculty
- The times they met
- Who was in attendance
- When did you send your questions to the departments
- When did you send your reports to the departments

---

## **Old Business Part 2**

### **A. Agenda Item: Peer Review of General Education Super 12**

The discussion for the review was tabled for the summer meeting (this is the best time to discuss this agenda item). Dr. Housel would like the committee members to provide their summer availability to discuss this item.

### **B. Agenda Item: General Education Forum**

Discussion ensued in response to the conflict between the GE forum and the task force. Key members of UAC initiated what they thought was the task force with a forum taking place on April 12, 2013, in Baird Performance Studio at 1:00 p.m.

- It was in response to this event, and by review of the faculty survey results obtained by the office of Accountability and Academics to evaluate the GE Forum, that Drs. Beck, Millikin, Ford, and Housel met to discuss the task force. This group discussed the need to obtain members from university-wide committees for the task force in an effort to eliminate issues of burnout from the UAC who contribute so much and are not being fully recognized.
- Dr. Ford reminded the group that a task force was established prior to the GE Forum with member Dr. Grabowski taking the chair person's (Dr. Mary Mackie's) place during her sabbatical. Dr. Beck was under the impression that the task force was intact at the time of the GE Forum.
- Dr. Housel added that he was on the GE task force and it was turned over to the UAC due to membership changes. He reminded the group that Dr. Beck had specific instructions for the task force to create a GE program committee. The task force could never however, figure out how to close the loops and it was not formalized into a GE committee.

The goal is to have a GE committee fully installed with a GE program in place illustrating evidence of said program by the November 2014 HLC accreditation visit.

Discussion ensued about the evidence of a GE program on the RSU website. Although it represents measures for reporting assessment of student learning outcomes, many changes have occurred within the GE courses themselves (in regards to assessment and student learning outcomes). This demonstrated that the evidence does not represent a GE program as a whole.

Decision: Dr. Beck, Dr. Housel, Dr. Ford will determine the task force committee members as outlined in New Business Part I.

### **C. Agenda Item: Faculty Insights Newsletter**

Feedback from the faculty has been positive.

Contributing faculty members have committed articles for the fall newsletter. The deadline is July 15, 2013 for article submissions. Discussion ensued about combining the Insight newsletter with the campus Hilltalk newsletter for an online version providing availability to all faculty and staff members.

**D. Agenda Item: Assessment Websites**

Internal URL is under Dr. Millikin's development. Because Dr. Millikin was unavailable for the meeting, the UAC will follow up with Dr. Millikin for a report on the progress of the URL after the meeting. Dr. Housel demonstrated the UAC website features on the Smart board.

---

**New Business Part 2 Continuation**

**B. Agenda Item: Summer Availability**

- i. Index cards were distributed and filled out by each member for their summer availability.
- ii. Cards were returned to the chair person Dr. Housel to determine the best meeting times.

**C. Agenda Item: Update SLRs and PRRs**

- i. Dr. Housel would like to schedule a meeting with Dr. Macpherson and Dr. Weller to introduce them to the SLRs.

**D. Agenda Item: Expand UAC Resources**

**E. Agenda Item: Assessment Day**

- i. Dr. Saffarian presented the option of having a dedicated assessment day on a specific school day or on a Saturday to conduct assessment as some institutions have. Dr. Housel would like to see a sub-committee put together a package to propose this idea to the various university committees.

**F. Agenda Item: Annual Review**

- i. Report
  - ii. Substance
  - iii. Process
  - iv. Recommendations
- (Lack of time prevented the discussion of this item)

**B. Agenda Item: Election**

- i. Time to elect a new chairperson for the August meeting. In an effort to conclude the meeting, this item was tabled until the summer meeting.

**Next Meeting:**

**A.** Need to review the Peer Review sessions. Need to have a meeting prior to August. Need to make changes within the documents themselves concerning the headings and the formatting. A time will be set at lunch when everyone is available this summer. Dr. Housel will provide pizza and salad.

**B.** Reports are submitted Oct. 1 and Oct 15, 2013.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Secretary.