

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

August 23, 2013

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Andrews, Brian; Clark, Sarah; Evusa, Juliet; Ford, Jim; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Millikin, Mary; Saffarian, Massood; Smith, Marla; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Macpherson, Peter

Called to Order: 2:01 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Housel. Introduction of all in attendance. Dr. Housel posed the question to Sarah Clark why the library was interested in having representation in the UAC. Sarah responded the library asked to have representation because of their role supporting faculty and staff. She feels personally being involved with UAC is aligned with her professional development in obtaining her PhD specifically with her emphasis on assessment.

Approval of the minutes of the February 21, 2013 and May 7, 2013 meetings moved by Dr. Zimmermann and seconded by Sarah Clark.

Reports and Announcements

Agenda Item: Announcements

Due Date for FA12/SP13 SLRs. The General Education Task Force will be charged with the following duties (Dr. Housel presented a slide outlining the duties of the GE task force):

- Provide oversight of all aspects of GE
- Evaluate the GE program to ensure it is accomplishing its mission
- Coordinate with appropriate standing committee (assessment, curriculum, distance education, and administration offices) as part of that evaluation
- Recommend improvement and refinement of the GE program in accordance with the evaluation
- Recommend to Faculty Senate appropriate composition, function, and scope of a standing university committee on GE

Discussion ensued about the GE task force. Members of the task force had not been formally announced at the time of the meeting. Dr. Housel stated the GE task force had a similar mission to UAC and should be sensitive to what the GE task force proposed and thought and conversely, UAC to GE task force. It is critical for both committees to have clear communication to prevent duplication/cross purposes. Dr. Saffarian asked if GE task force will consist of the same members that started the original GE task force. Dr. Housel held it will be determined by Dr. Beck. Dr. Zimmermann indicated he was asked by Dr. Beck to be on the task force, but is unsure if was same since Dr. Seward was also asked, but she has since left RSU.

Dr. Saffarian posed a question: "Will macroeconomics be added to the GE program?" Dr. Housel indicated it would be determined by the GE task force, adding macroeconomics to the GE program was approved by UAC early in 2013. Dr. Saffarian assumed so, but by his observation at GE Forum it appeared to be eliminated. Discussion ensued. Dr. Housel understood since department of business did not send an evaluation for GE program, it was not included in the forum. However, he confirmed that it has not been eliminated from the GE program.

Dr. Zimmermann thought the task force seemed like a prototype committee, yet the mission statement defined extensive charges, particularly the oversight of all aspects of GE also stating it will recommend a standing committee.

Dr. Millikin supported the conjecture that the new task force has a bigger charge than the original task force. It will be in charge of developing a way forward for RSU's GE program, similar to that of Cameron University's, which is to establish and review guidelines for certifying courses to meet general education program requirements, evaluate general education assessment results and propose appropriate modifications, promote professional development for GE faculty, and report annually on the effectiveness of the GE program.

Dr. Housel understood that it can be read by this mission statement put forth by Dr. Beck that the evaluation and the determination of the program is no longer the responsibility of the UAC.

Dr. Zimmermann pointed out that the GE task force as prescribed in the slide, has much more responsibility and it seems more than simply the selection of the GE committee. Dr. Housel agreed that it does appear that the written mission statement of the task force is confusing. He further pointed out, that it would seem that the GE task force was charged with creating the mission, where this document from Dr. Beck displayed a concrete mission.

Dr. Millikin offered her understanding of the mission and the structure in that it would be efficiently aligned with the Curriculum Committee, Distance Education Committee, the UAC, and the Faculty Development Committee.

Dr. Evusa thought that assessment by the GE Committee would be problematic to peer review the program.

Dr. White questioned how the GE Committee might decide to take over the assessment portion.

Dr. Millikin referred to the a handout on universities in the region with GE committees which had been presented at the May 7 meeting by Dr. Ford. The document reported GE Committee charges for nine out eleven regional universities.

Dr. Housel summarized the history of the first GE Task Force. The GE Task Force had concluded its mission and it was moving in the direction of establishing an independent and permanent GE Committee. At the time, Dr. Housel strongly advocated that the role of carrying out the mission of the GE committee be taken over by the UAC. The timing was not good, peer reviews were being initiated, and those reviews took all of the UAC focus. And one year, the GE program was not assessed. The UAC stepped in and carried the GE task force. After some time, the UAC became accustomed to carrying out of all of the duties of the GE task force and successfully hosted a GE Forum with 50+ faculty members in attendance. The GE Forum brought to the attention of the VP for Academic Affairs that the former GE task force had not officially completed its duties. This served as a catalyst for revitalizing a new GE task force with the authority to oversee process issues for GE curriculum and assessment, as well as responsibility to suggest permanent GE committee membership. Dr. Housel concluded that it became clear that there are limits to what the UAC can do hence, he perceived this newly formed GE task force as a positive result. He specified that Dr. Beck would like a report from the GE Task Force by Spring Break of 2014.

Agenda Item: Reports

Convocation Breakout Sessions:

- “Shift Happens! Changes at the Center for Teaching and Learning” by Dr. Gary Dotterer and Kay Brown
- “Money for the Taking: Are You Getting Funds for Your Project?” by Daniel Marangoni
- “Adventures in the Land of the MOOCs” by Dr. Frank Elwell
- “Navigating Through the ZipSurvey Portal” by Dr. Mary Millikin
- “Early Alert Training” by David Barron

Dr. Housel asked for feedback about the sessions.

- Dr. Millikin presented a handout from the ZipSurvey *see pages 10-15* that was conducted after the Convocation event asking faculty members to provide feedback. Results showed 20 members attended Dr. Dotterer’s presentation, 10-15 members attended Daniel Marangoni’s and 15 members attended Dr. Elwell and Dr. Millikin’s. Dr. Housel stated that attendance was down from last year.
- With regard to Dr. Easterling’s presentation comments about pre- and post-testing for program assessment, Dr. Evusa commented that she found this assessment methodology useful.
- Dr. Marla Smith commented on Dr. Easterling’s presentation. She found it remarkable that ORU has so many issues prior to their accreditation and yet their assessment committee remained cohesive and was able to lead the institution to accreditation success.
- Dr. James Ford found Dr. Easterling’s portion of the presentation (concerning the issues that shrouded ORU prior their accreditation process) disconcerting in that ORU had all of the issues to contend with and still were accredited.
- Dr. Millikin revealed that ORU has an expensive program called Chalk and Wire where students are required to upload all of their assignments to this sophisticated and advanced system giving them the opportunity to take their portfolios with them after graduation. This helped ORU with a successful assessment process that was instrumental in securing its accreditation.
- Dr. Ford stated that he would have liked more practical and beneficial information from Dr. Easterling that would provide RSU with useful information for its assessment process.
- Dr. Millikin revealed from the ZipSurvey results that faculty are interested in more breakout sessions in conjunction with Convocation. Specifically, faculty would like to see:
 - More professional development with classroom teaching ideas and assessment techniques
 - An HLC overview
 - More survey tools for classroom instruction
 - Wiki tools
 - How to set up online courses
- Faculty also thoroughly enjoyed the university committee meetings imbedded in the morning schedule.
- Dr. Ford stated that it was interesting to see faculty leaving briefly and coming back for the sessions. He suggested it may be possible to offer another section of sessions for next year’s convocation.
- Dr. Evusa pointed out that 50% of the courses offered are taught are by adjunct instructors yet they were not responsive in attending Convocation. Dr. Housel would like to see the adjunct included in the lunch provided funds are available. Dr. Millikin offered to send a personal email to each adjunct instructor inviting them to attend the breakout sessions. Dr. Ford advocated that perhaps breakout sessions could be offered in conjunction with the new faculty orientation. Dr. Evusa stated that her department is currently using new faculty orientation for professional development with great success.

Assessment Facilitator

- Dr. Housel is proceeding with meeting all department heads of each department. The primary purpose of the meetings with the department heads is to obtain evidence of instructional change within the institution. He felt the department heads would possess the history and evidence needed for HLC. From the two departments that he met with (Dr. Bert Tollison's Business Department and Dr. Jeff Gentry's Communications Department) he obtained anecdotal evidence that was not documented in the Student Learning Reports. His scheduled meetings will be completed by the end of September 2013.

Faculty Insights Newsletter

- Dr. Housel reported that only two departments out of 11 submitted Best Practices for the newsletter. He would like to have four to complete the newsletter. By the end of the semester he would like to have the second newsletter in circulation.
- Dr. Zimmermann suggested combining the newsletter with the RSU publication, Hilltalk that is distributed online and through hard copy magazines on campus. This publication is readily available to a wider audience (all RSU staff, faculty and students). Dr. Smith offered her classroom best practices for the next publication.

Dr. Easterling (consultant)

- Dr. Millikin provided Dr. Easterling RSU's Student Learning Reports for review and evaluation. It was determined by the UAC early in the year to provide these documents for his review and recommendations. The UAC will provide copies of PRRs for evaluation to Dr. Easterling. Dr. Housel planned to schedule an appointment with Dr. Easterling to discuss his findings and recommendations. Dr. Easterling will also provide input for RSU's GE Program.

Assessment Websites

- Dr. Housel was successful in adding assessment resources to the RSU website. He stated that all SLRs and PRRs will remain housed on the secure internal website allowing access only to the UAC. Access will be found through Hillcat Hub. Thomas Luscomb and Dr. Millikin had been trained by Cathy Burns (Director of Computing Services) to upload documents to the RSU website. Dr. Housel added that Kelli Fields (Web Marketing Coordinator) indicated to him that if documents are in PDF format, the program ImageNow is not required to upload documents. She confirmed that uploading PDF documents in this format is a simple and user-friendly process.

Old Business

Agenda Item: Meeting Time for Fall Semester

Dr. Housel presented a slide displaying Dr. Peter Macpherson's work schedule. Due to his time constraints, he was not available for today's meeting. He asked the UAC to generate some times that may work for the members to meet. Discussion ensued on the best fit for all members. Dr. Macpherson was eager to participate in the UAC and the committee agreed that a schedule that would include him would be the best solution. The UAC agreed to use the Doodle technique to find a suitable time for all members to meet. Dr. Zimmermann will initiate the process after the meeting.

Agenda Item: Assessment Day

Due to time constraints and the fact that Assessment Day requires lengthy discussion, the item was tabled.

New Business

Agenda Item: Review Revisions to Assessment Forms

Dr. Housel distributed one of the three types of assessment forms (the Degree Program Student Learning Report) *see pages 16-26*. Earlier in the week, three of the UAC members (Dr. Housel, Dr. Evusa, and Sarah Clark) went over the 3 different SLRs line by line for review. This form presented to the UAC revealed the corrections. Dr. Housel presented a slide of the old version to compare to the corrected form. He asked the UAC for their input on these changes:

- Degree Program Outcomes changed to Student Learning Outcomes.
- The #2 narrative “list and discuss and” Was made a bit clearer.
- Last year’s forms included some examples of better SLO examples. These were removed along with the references. The thinking was to use the public website as a vehicle to demonstrate the best practices in a more user-friendly way to review the reports.
- Part 4 added “the strengths and weaknesses of their performance”. This corresponds to the language in the rubric.

Dr. Zimmermann stated that there was quite a bit of discussion from the departments in the last peer review cycle about columns A of Student Learning Outcomes matching part B of 1. They are verbatim the same. Whatever is in the 1B Student Learning Outcome needs to be mirrored in 4 A. The degree program objectives are different than the student learning outcomes. The Nursing Department and the Communications Department took issue with this.

Dr. Ford proposed maintaining the four statements from the original form (the slide not the handout) as they provided an overview of what displays a good assessment report.

Dr. Kirk Weller offered that having the standardized format would provide continuity from year to year.

Dr. Evusa suggested moving the instructions for the documents to the end of the form.

Dr. Ford suggested changing the wording “developed” to “articulated”. Dr. Housel suggested “clearly articulated”. Dr. Ford thought by using the term “developed” in the statement suggested that measures are being done in a particular format without the evidence to support it. Instead, by using “clearly articulated” the statement implied evidence is shown that measures are being done in a particular format. This will put the statement in line with the other two about what is happening rather than what will happen.

Dr. Ford suggested changing the format to reflect the correct style for the entire report.

Dr. Zimmermann asked about the Best Practices portion of the SLR. Dr. Housel summarized that this portion did not receive any attention by the faculty. As a result, they often were scored a “1” for undeveloped. Dr. Ford also questioned should the department submit the same best practice every year or come up with a new best practice each year? Dr. White, Dr. Evusa, and Sarah Clark suggested making it an option on the form. Dr. Evusa asked “does HLC want to see assessment and instructional changes?” Dr. Housel understood that HLC wanted to see changes. Dr. White feels that it should be left in the rubric and faculty should be graded accordingly. Dr. Housel stressed that the Faculty Insights newsletter was created as a resource for best practices for faculty.

He offers three strategies to address the Best Practices portion of the SLR: Leave as written; Change it; Make it optional.

Dr. Evusa proposed giving it another year without changes. Dr. Zimmermann reminded the group that the Best Practices was a charge out of the GE task force. He felt that the Best Practices was a better fit for the General Education SLR and not for the Degree Program SLR. Dr. Ford recommended omitting the third sentence from the section 6 statement. Discussion ensued about how to present the Best Practices section.

A motion was made by Dr. Kirk Weller to leave section 6 as it reads, but make it optional. Dr. Zimmermann seconded the motion. All were in favor. SLRs are due by October 15, 2013.

Agenda Item: Peer Reviews

Time constraints prohibited addressing this agenda item: Schedule, Staffing, Protocol, Online Oversight

Agenda Item: Ex Officio Members

It was determined by the UAC that Dr. Millikin would be the only Ex Officio member at this time.

Agenda Item: Members with Limited Responsibilities

Dr. Housel described the difference between an Ex Officio Member and a member with limited responsibilities. He is interested in asking departments to send representatives as members with limited responsibilities to assist with some of the UAC assessment duties. They would not have responsibilities other than offering assistance with tasks such as Peer Reviews. They would have a voice in committee meetings, but without voting privileges. He suggested Evalon St. John as a possible member with limited responsibilities. She served on the UAC in the past and could offer her expertise. All faculty members are welcome to attend the UAC meetings.

Agenda Item: Assessment Calendar

Dr. Housel addressed the SLRs. He stated that the department heads are aware of the due date, but there are still 2 or 3 missing Peer Reviews at this time.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:42 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Secretary.

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

October 25, 2013

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Clark, Sarah; Evusa, Juliet; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Marerro, Abe; Saffarian, Massood; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Andrews, Brian; Ford, Jim; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Smith, Marl

Called to Order: 2:10 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel. Approval of the minutes of the August 23, 2013 meeting moved by Dr. Steve Housel and seconded by Dr. Weller.

Announcements

Agenda Item: Next Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled after final examinations unless something arises that require immediate attention. Finals end on December 10, 2013.

Reports

Agenda Item: General Education Task Force

A General Education Forum was held April 12, 2013 in Baird Hall Performance Studio. In response to this forum, a General Education Task Force was appointed by Dr. Richard Beck comprising of Dr. Craig Zimmermann, Dr. Steve Housel, Dr. Jim Ford, Dr. Juliet Evusa, and Dr. Laura Gray. The committee has since met four times.

The first session with Dr. Beck resulted in reviewing his written bullets for the GETF.

The second session with Dr. Mary Millikin resulted in reviewing the Educational Testing Services data results.

In the third and fourth meetings, the GETF reviewed the four student learning outcomes as published in the current 2013-2014 bulletin. The group found the description of the outcomes too brief and void of specific guidance needed to prescriptively define the General Education Program. It was determined by the UAC and the newly formed GETF that the first mission of the GETF group was to write a concise, prescriptive format defining the four student learning outcomes and include them in the next bulletin.

This task will be completed by Spring Break 2014 and submitted to Dr. Beck for review and approval. The GETF evolving into the General Education Committee is subject to approval through the committee channels according to university policy. Once approval has been stamped through all committees, the General Education Task Force would become General Education Committee.

Agenda Item: Assessment Facilitator

Dr. Housel pledged to meet with new faculty members in small groups and review the UAC and assessment process within the student learning reports and the peer review reports. He will explain how data is collected for the student learning reports and the peer review reports and go over the peer review schedule with them.

Dr. Dotterer, Director for Center for Teaching and Learning, will collaborate with Dr. Housel to better develop assessment protocols for online and blended courses (will be discussed later in the meeting). See Reports Part II

As chair of the UAC and Co-Chair of the Self-Study Chapter 5 Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning (Evaluation and Improvement), Dr. Housel is in the process of interviewing 5 of the 11 departments heads as well as veteran faculty members to assist with the accreditation self-study portion pertaining to assessment. The Higher Learning Commission requires the university to document the use of assessment as a tool to demonstrate concrete improvements in student learning and classroom instruction. Insufficient evidence is documented through the SLR, but a significant amount of evidence is documented within the departments. These department heads and veteran faculty members have/will provide this documentation for the self-study evidence.

Agenda Item: Faculty Insights Newsletter

Dr. Housel reports five contributors to the next edition of Faculty Insights Newsletter giving their best practices for teaching.

Dr. Joel White remarked that while recently filling out the SLR, he questioned the integrity of reusing best practices on the student learning reports. He was opposed to this practice because although one may demonstrate a stellar example of best practices, it should not be reused each time. It should instead evolve and show marked evidence of continuous improvement for institutional integrity. Discussion ensued about best practices and the evolution of said best practices.

Dr. Evusa suggested that the UAC should meet with adjunct faculty since they teach a large portion of the general education courses. She recognized this as a positive opportunity to include them in reviewing the data and explaining the benefits of best practices.

Dr. Abe Marrero added that in his observation many adjunct faculty have been at RSU for so long that they are now institutionalized demonstrating knowledge and understanding of best practices. It would not necessarily be beneficial to include all adjunct faculty, but perhaps limit to new adjunct faculty in reviewing the data.

Dr. Zimmermann recommended using Faculty Insights Newsletter to draw attention to the best practices for new adjunct faculty. An issue with a collection of best practices could be compiled and presented to new faculty as a resource. Dr. Housel stated that this was precisely the intent for the Faculty Insights Newsletter. If something caught the eye of the faculty member, s/he could contact the contributing faculty member for more information regarding singular best practices.

Dr. Marrero asked what was the method of distribution for this newsletter. Dr. Housel replied that the newsletter is widely distributed across campus through the generated email list of faculty and staff through Outlook Express. Dr. Zimmermann suggested using Hilltalk as another vehicle to distribute the newsletter.

Agenda Item: Internal and External Assessment Websites

The external assessment webpage is available to the public through the RSU website. To access the webpage:

- Home Page, Faculty and Staff, Committees, Assessment

Everything that is made public is available including the mission statement, the UAC agendas and meeting minutes, Faculty Insights Newsletters, the OSHRE reports, Resources and Accountability and Academics Assessment.

The new internal assessment webpage once launched will only be available to deans, department heads and faculty: Home Page, Hillcat Hub and enter your login information, Assessment on the right

The PRRs and the SLRs will be subdivided into these categories: developmental (going back 5 years), general education, and program.

Cathy Burns from Administrative Computer Services will make note of the date they are received and once SLRs and PRRs are uploaded they will be available to view within 48 hours. Dr. Zimmermann voiced his concern about confidentiality when using this format. Dr. Evusa felt that the stakeholders involved would want to view this information and noted that PRRs and SLRs are only available to deans, department heads and faculty members. Dr. Housel posed the question "should the availability of PRRs and SLRs on the internal website go through the approval channels within the university?" All agreed that providing transparency is recommended and should send it through the channels for approval. Discussion ensued about sending a formal announcement to all deans, department heads and faculty once the approval has been obtained through all university channels according to university policy.

Dr. Kirk Weller motioned to have the necessary university committees review the proposal to display the PRRs and the SLRs on the internal Hillcat Hub on the RSU website. Dr. Zimmermann seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Approval is pending to submit PRRs and SLRs to Dr. Millikin and follow up by sending to Cathy Burns for inclusion on the internal website.

Agenda Item: ETS Update (tabled until next meeting)

Old Business

Agenda Item: Ex Officio Members

Dr. Housel presented the idea at the August 23, 2013 meeting to invite ex officio members to serve on the UAC to assist with the many tasks consigned to the committee. Dr. Ford felt that this was not the correct term to describe these members and it was decided to table the agenda item until the next meeting. Since then, two important things happened that would make the need for ex officio members unnecessary:

It was brought to the attention of the General Education Task Force in the meeting with Dr. Beck that a nationally accredited degree program like Nursing does not require a separate student learning report for the institution. If Dr. Beck agrees that the UAC would not need to complete the institutional SLR, the nursing program SLR could be eliminated. Dr. White wondered if that meant the Nursing program would not need representation on the UAC. Dr. Housel replied, "Yes, they would still have representation on the UAC." Another option discussed in the meeting with Dr. Beck was for the UAC to become familiar with the assessment forms Nursing and EMS use with their accrediting bodies and accept these in lieu of the RSU format. This process would serve to keep an active assessment dialogue between Nursing faculty and the UAC.

Dr. Easterling (HLC consultant) stated that HLC does not expect every department to evaluate 100% of the SLRs annually. The idea is that all program SLRs are evaluated within the four years for a bachelor's degree program and two years for an associate's degree program. Another option is for faculty to assess a portion of the SLRs each year and complete all SLRs within four years. Dr. Marrero agreed with Dr. Easterling's position requiring 100% of SLRs annually may be redundant especially for confirmed programs within the institution.

It was noted that HLC could see the implementation of a biennially report as a progressive maturation of the university.

New Business Part 1

Agenda Item: Staggered Peer Reviews

Discussion ensued about the yearly SLR and PRR. Dr. Zimmermann questioned whether the associates program should be tested more often than the bachelors program and would the UAC rotate programs within a department.

Dr. Weller offered the solution of allowing time for the assessment evaluation and conclusions data to affect changes within the program for the next year. By reporting every second year, it would allow the program time to implement the changes and show valid reflections of what changes were made in the next assessment cycle. It was suggested to take the majors in a biennially review rather than yearly so that faculty doesn't have to review with the UAC every year. Dr. White raised concern about the departments not reporting every year.

Dr. Evusa stated that it seems as though the UAC/university keeps changing the rules every year and she did not think this was a good idea. It does not allow the opportunity to implement suggestions and best practices that were discussed when there is constant change.

Dr. Marrero offered that the data do not go away. The graduation survey is required every year and you should not collect data just for the purpose of collecting data. Dr. Evusa suggested that the UAC review SLRs every year and perhaps the PRR every 2nd year. Dr. Housel added that the data would be collected every semester, but would only do the report every 2nd year. Dr. White is in favor of the UAC allowing time for improvement to be implemented by reporting in a 2nd year/3rd year cycle.

Dr. Housel suggested that the UAC consider the workload when there are deadlines, data collection, data synthesizing, and the report. By only reporting every 2nd year on the SLRs, it would reduce the workload for the UAC. Dr. Housel stated that the General Education Committee, once formed, would be responsible for the General Education assessment.

Dr. Weller voiced his concern about the act of generalizing the SLR for the department that has more than one program. It can be problematic for one person to complete the SLR without any formal meetings or discussions by other faculty members within the department, especially when the programs vary significantly. He proposed a safeguard to prevent this from happening moving forward.

Dr. White and Sarah Clark considered looking at how Cameron University staggered their reviews.

Dr. Housel suggested tabling this topic until after the meeting with Dr. Beck.

Reports Part 2

Agenda Item: Assessment Facilitator

Dr. Housel summarized his conversation with Dr. Dotterer in regards to Distance Education. The Distance Education Committee created the Best Practices document (as seen in the May 7, 2013 meeting minutes). The Best Practices document has since gone through the necessary approval channels. This document outlines suggestions only for online courses.

Dr. Housel reported that Dr. Easterling specified that it is not sufficient to have only suggestions for best practices for online courses. The HLC will not allow instruction beyond competency in Angel technology. Online instructors must possess certified knowledge and ability to build an online course conceptually to at least the tier one level of a tier three system.

Currently, faculty can teach online courses without any knowledge of Angel technology. This raised concerns for Dr. Dotterer. He suggested for integrity and professionalism at RSU the institution must require all faculty that teach online courses to participate in training. The training would provide knowledge and understanding of the Angel technology and also training in the conceptual development of online courses. The faculty would complete training and be certified before teaching. HLC requires faculty to understand how to conceptually develop online courses to at least the first tier of a three-tiered process. A benefit to a three-tiered process would be that it would provide substantially more guidance for faculty and likely result in higher quality course delivery.

Dr. Marrero added that currently there is no mechanism in place for department heads to screen the adjunct faculty that teach online courses. He sees Dr. Dotterer's proposal as a welcome initiative to require training and to certify faculty.

UAC mission includes: "ensures quality education" without much verbiage about the responsibility the UAC has in regards to online courses.

Dr. Housel raised the concern about Dr. Dotterer's suggestion for this initiative. Currently, the approved Best Practices suggestions for online teaching are not in accord with the Dr. Dotterer's/Dr. Easterling's/HLCs recommendation. His concern is that if the University pushes forth a change in process immediately on the heels of this Distance Education protocol, it may not be favorably received by faculty.

Agenda Item: Meeting Time for Spring Semester

Dr. Zimmermann will set up a Doodle schedule for all UAC members to participate.

Agenda Item: Assessment Day

Dr. Housel suggested thinking about the value of this day. This would be a day in which the university has no classes for the designated assessment day. All the computers would be made available for ETS for students. This would be an opportune time for Dr. Millikin's office to capture data on a single day.

Dr. Zimmermann suggested hosting breakout sessions for improving student learning on this day.

Dr. Marrero agreed with using this as a professional development day for faculty members. He suggested structuring the event for productivity to prevent low faculty attendance.

Time is a resource that is limiting faculty from participating in these types of events. Dr. Evusa suggested modifying the M-W-F scheduling to help ease the conflicts that arise on Fridays.

Dr. Massood Saffarian contributed his experience with an assessment day with a former institution. He said that it was fun for the students and productive for the faculty resulting in a positive experience for all involved.

New Business Part 2

Student Learning Reports

Schedule- Dr. Zimmermann will set up a Doodle survey to see what days the UAC members are available.

Agenda Item: Peer Reviews

Schedule- Fridays- Dr. Zimmermann will set up a Doodle survey to see what days the UAC members are available.

Protocol- Dr. Zimmermann will create a different program this year to reorganize the teams with the UAC members. It was recommended that senior reviewers from the UAC should lead each review: Dr. White, Dr. Zimmermann, Dr. Jaenbai, Dr. Evusa, Dr. Housel, and Dr. Ford. Dr. Housel will ask the GETF about the Super 12 reviews that need to be completed for this year. This will require six reports from the GETF.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Secretary.

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

November, 22, 2013

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Evusa, Juliet; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Marerro, Abe; Millikin, Mary; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Clark, Sarah; Macpherson, Peter; Saffarian, Massood; Smith, Marla

Called to Order: 2:05 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

Approval of the minutes of the October 25, 2013 meeting after said changes.

Discussion ensued about the responsibility of the UAC in regards to assessment of online courses and instruction. The UAC's role is solely with the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the UAC wishes to promote the conscientious assessment of online course rigor and subsequent student learning. To this end, the UAC supports the development of training modules and possible certification of online instructors. Dr. Dotterer will be responsible for developing and implementing the training and the certification using the Angel platform. The UAC suggested that the training should not be limited to online courses but should be extended to on-ground courses as well. It was mentioned by Dr. Mary Millikin that providing training through professional development of fulltime and part-time faculty and staff is outlined in the Self-study as an initiative for RSU's continued development.

A motion by Dr. Steve Housel to approve the meeting minutes and the changes was seconded by Dr. Kirk Weller. All were in favor of the meeting minutes.

Announcements

Agenda Item: This Semester's Last Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled Thursday, December 12, 2013 at 1:00 p.m.

Agenda Item: Meeting times for next semester

Dr. Craig Zimmermann will begin the process of organizing the Doodle scheduling program to determine the UAC members' best times to meet for the spring 2014 semester. The time allotted will be an hour and a half.

Agenda Item: Internal Website Approval

Dr. Ford offered his suggestion to move forward with uploading the SLRs to the internal website. He does not feel that approval is required by Faculty Senate or Academic Council.

Reports

Agenda Item: General Education Task Force Update

The group has met twice only for an hour each time limiting the scope of work to be completed. The main focus of the meetings has been on the review of RSU's existing general education student learning outcomes

(SLOs). The GETF anticipates approval through the university committees and the formation of a permanent university committee by late spring semester (April/May).

Agenda Item: ETS Update

Dr. Millikin updated the UAC on the fall 2013 ETS Proficiency Profile testing of general education competencies of incoming freshmen. She reported that to date a total of 85 of the selected 110 freshmen have completed testing. The cohort consists of first time, full-time, bachelor degree-seeking freshmen who have not received credit for concurrent, general education or transfer courses prior to attending RSU. Further, students who are enrolled primarily online were omitted. These criteria resulted in an eligible population of 140 students, from which 110 students were randomly selected to take the ETS test due to Testing Center capacity. In spring 2014, sophomores will be tested as well. Seniors and associate seeking students will be added to the testing next year. This will give three years' worth of results for freshman and two years' worth of results for sophomores. The results show our students testing at or slightly below comparable level institutions as freshmen. The sophomore students show that they are testing at or slightly above the level of comparable institutions. The General Education Committee will work collaboratively with the UAC and with Dr. Millikin's office to use the results to enhance student learning.

Nursing/EMT exemption - Dr. Millikin clarified that HLC does not/did not prescribe how student learning is to be assessed. HLC mandates that it be assessed in some way to be determined by individual institutions. OSRHE does accept letters from national certification agencies, such as ACEN for Nursing and the EMS national registry exam, in lieu of program reviews. This does NOT mean that Nursing and EMS are exempt from review by the UAC. Rather, it suggests that the UAC might consider allowing these two programs to use their national certification program reviews in lieu of the RSU assessment forms.

Dr. Housel stated that Dr. Richard Beck of Academic Affairs was comfortable with Nursing and EMT not using the RSU assessment form each year. While under consideration, it was determined that a formal SLR would not have to be administered this cycle. There would still be representation on the UAC from this department. It was determined prudent to allow for innovative ways to discuss assessment with the Nursing and EMT programs.

Old Business

Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule

Dr. Zimmermann completed the UAC peer review assignments for the UAC members for the spring 2014 semester. He observed that several UAC members have been on the committee for years and have served as Peer Review team leaders. It is conceivable to expect these members to transition out of the UAC committee and it could be problematic for peer reviews without seasoned leaders to mentor the new UAC members. Historically, four team leaders were selected that had experience with peer reviews to mentor the newer members. Dr. Zimmermann expressed the obvious choice to take Dr. Monica Varner's place is Dr. Juliet Evusa given her experience with Peer Reviews.

Dr. Zimmermann and Dr. Housel thought it necessary to start training the newest UAC members as soon as possible. Sarah Clark, Dr. Kirk Weller, Dr. Peter Macpherson and Dr. Johnny Kirk were selected for the newest peer review team members. The charge for the team leader would be to make sure the review team is ready to provide a quality report and a quality interaction on the peer review session day. There was discussion about leaders becoming entrenched in a program and all felt that rotating the team leader and the teams around the different departments was beneficial for providing fresh ideas and input from various perspectives. It was noted that some leaders like to review a program that is familiar.

A member cannot review their own program. Dr. Zimmermann outlined the details of the schedule:

- There are 35 total programs to review (five are General Education, two are Developmental Studies)
- There are three that were not previously reviewed: Organizational Leadership, Social Entrepreneurship, and Elementary Education

Assigned the teams so that the members do not review their own program and the number of reports to be completed are equitable (three). An error was detected in the handout of UAC Peer-Review Assignments. The A.A. for Social Sciences and the B.S. for Social Science is listed under History and Political Science and not under Psychology, Sociology, & Criminal Justice. Changes will be made prior to the December 12th meeting.

Dr. Ford offered these points to consider:

- It helps to have similar comments from different members on rotating peer review teams.
- By rotating the peer review teams the new peer review members will practice a greater learning experience by learning the new report each time and identifying the important issues for each department.
- It may also provide the department evidence as to whether a peer review leader or team seemed unbiased, unfair or unduly harsh. Having a different team will help eliminate the occurrence of this happening.

Dr. Evusa saw a potential for contradicting comments when rotating teams through the departments. Dr. Marla Smith offered that it may be easier for a team leader to mentor a new reviewer if they've reviewed the same program several times. Dr. Marrero offered that the principles of assessment do not change but the program can change. From his point of view, conflicting reports make it very difficult to ascertain the course of action for a program based on the peer review. Dr. Evusa specified that the UAC peer review members use the same assessment module preventing the occurrence of this happening.

The next initiative would be to proceed with the schedule by switching Dr. Ford with Dr. Johnny Kirk, changing the A.A. for Social Sciences and the B.S. for Social Science under History and Political Science to be listed under Psychology, Sociology, & Criminal Justice and to send out a request to the departments for their availability for review dates.

Agenda Item: Assessment Day (tabled)

Agenda Item: Online/On-ground

Dr. Housel mentioned that the understanding from Dr. Easterling is that as long as the syllabus for the online/on-ground courses are the same that from Dr. Easterling's experience the data would not need to be separated out for the assessment reports. However, Dr. Beck suggested keeping tabs on variations between the two for measure.

Dr. Millikin described an instance where an online course in Business Statistics is much more challenging than the same course on-ground and would suggest an exception in a case such as this one. Past reports show discrepancies between online/on-ground courses lend the question are the discrepancies with the course or the instructor?

Dr. Marrero suggested making sure that the instructors have taught the course on-ground before they can teach it online.

Dr. Housel reviewed the OSHRE's policies and procedures stating that online and on-ground courses need to be equivalent in terms of rigor. Discussion ensued about OSHRE's non-prescriptive policy on blended courses.

It's not clearly defined in regards to courses and their rigor as a blended course. Dr. Marrero's experience with a blended class recently showed that an instructor assigned 20 chapter questions from the textbook as the online component. This does not seem rigorous. The blended portion of the course is often used as a day off for faculty/staff. This suggests that there is a need for a university standard and for training of blended classes as well as online classes. Dr. Evusa adds that faculty were strongly encouraged by the deans to use blended courses. It should be up to the UAC to construct a valuable tool to extract data from these courses.

Dr. Marrero suggested asking faculty to submit outlines detailing what will be expected/accomplished in the blended portion of the course. He then started archiving these outlines in his department to be used as best practices documents for new adjunct faculty. Dr. Evusa suggested pulling data for the attrition rate of students from blended courses to get a better feel for the success of these courses compared to online/on-ground. Dr. Millikin suggested this could be a report conducted by the Associate Director for Accountability and Academics, Cheryl Hakel.

Discussion ensued about blended courses. Who is the governing body- the department head? All agreed that they want to encourage the faculty to have rigorous material for the blended portion of the course as well as the remainder of the course. Dr. Ford would like to see the data separated for online/on-ground and blended courses. Dr. Zimmermann suggested graphing the data captured. Dr. Millikin reported that a preliminary analysis was conducted last summer, and she will bring the results to the next UAC meeting.

As a reminder, the definition of a blended course was any piece of the course that is not class room time. Courses are wholly online/ wholly on-ground, or blended. Blended courses can be ¼ blended, 1/3 blended, 1/2 blended, or 2/3 blended. This guidance can be used for assessment.

The issue was tabled until the next meeting.

New Business

Agenda Item: Peer Reviews

Protocol for handling the peer review form. The format is proposed in this manner:

- Watermark the document as a draft.
- Supply the comments and concerns and provide the necessary data.
- Present this form to the department prior to the review session. This will allow the department time to review the comments, concerns and data and prepare for the review session.
- For the peer reviewers, this will allow a template to be used during the course of the review session.
- When the session concludes, the team will make modest adjustments and return to the department within two weeks' time. If all peer reviewers agreed to utilize this format they will become familiar with the forms and it is anticipated that it will decrease the amount of time spent with the peer review documentation.

An advantage to using this format will allow a misunderstanding to be cleared up in the review session. If all were in agreement that it was a misunderstanding, the comment or concern could be stricken from the final form. Dr. Jalal Jaenbai was in favor of this technique and agreed that it would save a great deal of time for the peer reviewers.

Dr. Ford warned that it is common to see ambiguity in the forms when they are prepared prior to the peer review session. Mistakes tend to be less common. He also noted that the language could be clearer on the

form. He suggested adding a statement in the instructions about ratings: "ratings will be completed following the peer review session." He suggested adding a box on the form to address specific questions/concerns that were not addressed in other areas.

The agenda item was tabled until the December 12, 2013 meeting.

Agenda Item: Alternating SLRs (tabled until next meeting)

Agenda Item: Incorporating (tabled until next meeting)

Department Strategic Plans; Program Reviews; Proxies (tabled until next meeting); Assessing the MBA (tabled until next meeting)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Secretary.

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

December 12, 2013

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Clark, Sarah; Evusa, Juliet; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Kirk, JohnnyMark; Millikin, Mary; Saffarian, Massoud; Smith, Marla; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Macpherson, Peter; Marerro, Abe; White, Joel. Guests: Dr. Gary Dotterer and Dr. Teri Bycroft.

Called to Order: 2:08 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

Approval of the minutes of the November 22, 2013 meeting. Changes are to me made to:

- Attendees: Dr. Marla Smith was present not absent.
- Announcement/Reports, Agenda Item: General Education Task Force Update: The group met 4-5 times instead of twice. Agenda Item: ETS Update: strike last sentence.
- Old Business, Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule: next initiative to proceed with the schedule by switching some of the teams, changing the A.A. for Social Sciences and the B.S. for Social Science.

A motion was made by Dr. Kirk Weller to approve the meeting minutes and the changes and was seconded by Dr. Marla Smith. All were in favor of the meeting minutes changes.

Announcements

Agenda Item: Meeting Times for Next Semester

Discussion ensued over the schedules for the UAC meetings and the Peer Review sessions. Based on the results from the Doodle survey, it appeared that there was not a general consensus for the UAC members to meet on a specific day of the month. Because so much of the time will be spent in face-to-face Peer Reviews on Fridays through the spring, the task warranted more time and consideration and would be discussed at the next meeting.

Reports

Agenda Item: General Education Task Force Update The group will be meeting December 13, 2013 to approve the new student learning outcomes.

Old Business

Agenda Item: Angel Certification

Dr. Dotterer presented handouts to the UAC members regarding Angel Technology Certification. Dr. Dotterer, his staff and the Instructional Design Committee members are in the process of implementing changes that are consistent with RSU's mission for student learning outcomes in regards to technology. One of these changes begins with the installation of the new CV equipment. The second major change will be with the institution's management system (LMS). Dr. Dotterer, his staff and the Instructional Design Committee are developing ways to make the transition with the new equipment/system as effortless as possible. Their desire is to make the three main technical programs in use at RSU consistent with one another. After research

and analysis with key stakeholders it was determined that it would be in the best interest of the institution to begin the start of two new technical programs by providing training to all faculty in Angel technology resulting in certification. This training would address navigation and not content. Students would be trained as well (Section 508 Accessibility Standards states that the institution cannot offer only one technical modality to the students). Best practices are implemented in the departments and have general principles in development and instruction. The proposed course would allow faculty to train in the center for teaching and learning laboratory where they would:

- Be shown how to, told how to, allow to, and check the knowledge gained in Angel technology
- Create the elements that the students are expected to navigate
- Learn the new management system (LMS)
- Learn new innovative ways to present material

Due to that fact that Angel technology will no longer provide security after June 2014 it will be phased into BlackBoard. BlackBoard owns Angel. BlackBoard is the latest and most comprehensive technical modality in higher education. The change- over would take 1-2 years. This would require additional training in BlackBoard.

E-campus: These are the components, they are the initial elements faculty believed should be included but is amendable. This would be for all part time, full time faculty that use any element of the LMS, blended, online, supplemental. If faculty already have expert knowledge of the system, they could “test” out the system for reference for colleagues.

Question from Dr. Housel: What is the UAC’s role? The University Assessment Committee (UAC) supports assessment by guiding and evaluating an assessment process that helps to ensure quality instruction. The primary functions of the UAC are to:

- Provide feedback and support to Departments about assessment of student learning outcomes through a review of reports and processes about the assessment of student learning outcomes.
- Coordinate the assessment of general education student learning outcomes by establishing procedures and practices by which Department-based assessment findings may be connected and aggregated.
- Communicate outstanding assessment practices with faculty and the University community to highlight promising assessment models and promote faculty ownership of the assessment process.
- Advise the Office of Academic Affairs about institution-wide initiatives to assess student learning outcomes.

HLC requires rigor. Criteria for Accreditation:

- Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement: The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs
- Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness: The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

- Core Components: The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

Dr. Mary Millikin referred to the November 22, 2013 meeting minutes stating that the UAC's role is solely with the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the UAC wishes to promote the conscientious assessment of online course rigor and subsequent student learning. To this end, the UAC supports the development of training modules and possible certification of online instructors.

It has been observed and noted through the Center for Teaching and Learning that the quality of student learning is suffering as a result of lack of technical training.

Dr. Ford suggested looking at assessment data before jumping mandating technical training for the faculty.

Dr. Millikin presented a handout for On-ground and Online Course Mean GPA Comparison in August 2013. The results show a marked difference in the mean GPA from on-ground to online. Dr. Millikin's office will continue to extract data to provide comprehensive results to investigate.

The crisis lies in the competency test as it does not address complaints about the on-ground courses. There will come a time when the UAC will need to express a measure for minimum competencies standards for both on-ground and online courses. In the meantime, that practice lies with the department heads.

HLC will randomly look at courses during the accreditation process.

Dr. Dotterer pointed out that there are 1196 faculty registered in the Angel system since 2009. Currently, there are 146 adjunct professors registered in Angel. There is no record showing what instructors were trained in Angel or when. He added that the University of Arkansas Ft. Smith requires training for full/ part time faculty. It's not designed to be a burden but an asset to the instructor's best practices approach. This is to provide a gateway to the use of technology and it's benefits for the students learning outcomes.

OSHRE is about to put in a new system.

Quality control problem should go to the department heads and not to the UAC

Agenda Item: Fall UAC Schedules

Peer Review Sessions; UAC Meetings;

Agenda Item: Online/On-ground Data Collection

NEW BUSINESS

- Agenda Item: Peer Review Forms
- Agenda Item: Assessment Day
- Agenda Item: Proxies
- Agenda Item: Assessing the MBA
- Agenda Item: Alternating SLRs
 - Department Strategic Plans: Program Reviews; Relationships with Adjunct Faculty

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Secretary.

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

April 23, 2014

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Clark, Sarah; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Macpherson, Peter; Saffarian, Massood; Smith, Marla; Weller, Kirk; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig. Absent: Evusa, Juliet; Ford, James; Marerro, Abe; Milikin, Mary.

Called to Order: 1:05 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

Approval of the minutes of the January 19, 2014 meeting. Minutes were not available and will be offered for approval at the next scheduled meeting.

Announcements

Rotations: Dr. Evusa will be leaving UAC. Discussion included the limitation as to who can replace her. The rationale in the handbook will be review by Dr. Housel with clarification to be presented at the next meeting.

Fall UAC Meeting Days and Times: A calendar, in moodle format, will be sent out to all committee members for input as to the best days/times. The data will be assessed for best match.

Assessment Facilitator Summer Agenda: The facilitator needs to address the below listed items. The completed list timeline is August 1st, 2014.

- 2014 Peer Review Forms (Drafts and Final Versions). There are 6 forms that need to be reviewed.
- On ground/online data collection. Should already be collecting for on-ground, on-line, and hybrid.
- Identifying and posting examples of exemplary SLRs. Need to identify best-practice and post on the web to benefit the teams that are constructing their learning reports.
- Assessment Day possibilities. Will seek Dr. Beck's approval and brainstorm for ideas.
- Action Plan

Reports

General Education Task Force: The task force met, reviewed, and has already made recommendations for a permanent General Education Committee. One of the noteworthy recommendations: A process must be established when new general education courses are to be added or deleted be. The new committee is expected to follow through with the recommendations. The academic council has approved all recommendations.

Migrating to Blackboard: The university will be transition to blackboard for the next academic year. Pilots will begin in the fall. There are additional add-ons that may be purchased that could include measuring SLO's. Any faculty that uses blackboard must be certified. Dr. Dotterer is constructing a checklist that will include levels of proficiency.

Quality Matters Rubric: A workshop is being held Friday _____ at Rose State College in Oklahoma City. Dr. Housel will be attending.

Convocation 2014: Knowing more about what to expect when the Higher Learning Commission visit occurs will be the predominant theme for this year's convocation. However there may also be a need to conduct learning an assessment workshop.

Old Business

Reviewing General Education SLRs. Due to the newness of the General Education Committee, they will probably be assessed as before. However, the following year there may be multiple changes to accommodate predicted changes.

New Business

Review of this year's peer reviews. No discussion.

Peer Review Protocol

The following items were discussed in general and it was determined that a sub-committee may need to be formed to produce a more effective operational process.

- Teams meet together to produce initial comments and suggestions
- Watermark the Peer Review Report as a draft.
- Submit to department comments and concerns on the draft PRR 10 days in advance of the session.
- Within two weeks after the review session, the team will confirm or adjust comments and suggestions, remove the draft watermark, score the review questions, and send the final version of the PRR to the department's UAC representative and the UAC chair.

Alternating Peer Reviews

General discussion included: inviting only one-half to present each year to encourage more meaningful dialogue.

- Department Strategic Plans – as it is tied to the department outcomes
- Program Reviews – no discussion
- Relationships with Adjunct Faculty – no discussion

Removing Evaluations

(Underdeveloped, Developing, Established, Exemplary) from PRR forms. Tabled for next meeting.

Election

A motion was made by Joel White, and seconded by Sara Clark for Dr. Steve Housel to continue as Chair of the University Assessment Committee. General discussion ensued including Dr. Housel stating that he would accept the responsibility of continuing in the position recognizing the importance of the HLC visit. Committee voting was held with unanimous support of the motion.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m. These minutes are respectfully submitted, Marla Smith, UAC Committee member.

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

May 23, 2014

Location: BH Rm. 124. Present: Clark, Sarah; Housel, Steve; Jaenbai, Jalal; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Smith, Marla; White, Joel; Zimmermann, Craig; Grabowski, Frank (sitting in for Ford). Absent: Evusa, Juliet; Ford, James; Kirk, John; Saffarian, Massoud.

Called to Order: 1:35 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel. Weller, Kirk

Approval of the minutes of the meeting from April 23, 2014. The meeting minutes were not available for this meeting and will be available at the next meeting for comments and approval. Dr. Marla Smith scribed for the April 23, 2014 for the UAC scribe. The meeting minutes will be available at the next meeting. Dr. Housel suggested uploading the meeting minutes as soon as possible.

Announcements

Agenda Item: Rotation: A handout of the Rogers State University Committees 2014-2015 displays the newly formed General Education Committee. Dr. Housel discussed the topic of expiring terms for the UAC members. Dr. Juliet Evusa's term will expire this year and the UAC is looking at the possibility of the department heads coming forth to represent their department if a faculty member cannot be selected. In the case of the Communications department, Dr. Jeff Gentry would be the representative until a faculty member was selected.

Announcement: A decision was made at the last meeting to remove the evaluations from the peer review session. The rationale is that the UAC and faculty are colleagues and for purposes of collegiality, it was decided to eliminate the ratings.

Agenda Item: Fall Meeting Days and Times to be determined at Convocation on August 7, 2014.

Agenda Item: Convocation: A new chair will be elected at the UAC meeting at Convocation. Dr. Housel will represent the UAC for one more year if the UAC approves by vote. Dr. Housel discussed the significant role that the UAC plays in Convocation. He listed the planned events:

- State of the University address by President Rice
- Address by Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Richard Beck re: the Self-Study findings and the upcoming accreditation visit
- Update by Dr. Gary Dotterer, Center for Teaching and Learning, regarding migration from Angel to Blackboard learning management system

Faculty Senate asked for permission to hold University Committee meetings at Convocation during the first breakout session. Discussion ensued about the options for breakout sessions in the afternoon.

- Quality Matters
- Enhancing online/hybrid courses
- Paid guest speakers for selected topics. (Discuss possibility with Dr. Beck). Rose State hosted a Quality Matters workshop. It was well attended with state-wide participation.
- Topics new and experienced adjunct faculty are interested in
- Library resources for teaching

Agenda Item: Hub-based Internal Assessment Website: This website is currently only available to faculty and administrators. Dr. Housel discussed the availability of this hub to adjunct faculty. Cathy Burns will be available to populate the fields early September 2014 to provide access to the PRR, SLR, templates, and model templates. Dr. Housel discussed the addition of quality examples of PRR and SLR on this website. These will serve as a resource for faculty and tie into best practices.

Reports

Agenda Item: General Education Committee: Members and Reporting The General Education Committee is newly formed and will be well represented with the UAC members. The GEC will have representation from the Curriculum Committee, Distance Education Committee and the UAC. A committee chair will be elected at Convocation. They will determine the meeting schedule for the year and what to address. Dr. Housel will be attending each GEC meeting as an ex-officio member to represent the UAC and make sure there is continuity between the committees due to the alignment of the goals and missions in relation to assessment. Discussion ensued about the general education courses, how they integrate into the General Education Program, and how they will be assessed.

Agenda Item: ETS Data Collection: Dr. Millikin reported testing on 80+ sophomores in the spring 2014. There was an increase in participation from the previous years. An enrollment hold and \$10 participation incentive (from Accountability and Academics budget) have contributed to the higher participation rate. Students receive notification that they will be tested. If they complete the test in a reasonable period time (before the enrollment hold kicks in), they will receive \$10 on their RSU Hillcat card. The raw data have been received but the detailed analysis will not be available until late September 2014. As the budget allows, the office of Accountability and Academics will begin testing seniors to measure their general education skills and the success of the general education program from freshman year to senior year.

Agenda Item: Migration to Blackboard LMS: Discussion tabled until fall 2014.

Agenda Item: Excel-based Data Collection: Dr. Craig Zimmermann has been collecting data for the General Education program in an Excel-based program. He demonstrated on the Smartboard his proto-type for data collection. Each year he has been collecting voluminous amounts of data for the Biology-related courses, and it has been problematic. The process lacks consistency in collection, and it is not end-user friendly. An online data storage repository with analysis capabilities is needed. He researched data storage repositories and is in the process of setting up a webinar with Xitrac to decide if its storage module would be helpful and affordable for RSU. Dr. Zimmermann spent considerable time creating the Excel-based data collection vehicle. This Excel workbook can be housed on the RSU Website with fulltime and part-time faculty access. He gave a demonstration of the different components:

- Table of contents
- Tabs for each assessment measure (Color Coded)
- Data input
- Data analysis and summary
- Department needs

Summer Projects

Agenda Item: Quality Matters - Instructional Design Sub-committee: A member from each academic department will be selected for representation on this sub-committee of the Distance Education Committee. The subcommittee is working with the Quality Matters rubric consisting of primary eight standards. OSRHE has not yet mandated Quality Matters, but it is likely within the coming year that OSRHE will mandate some form of online/distance education quality initiative similar to Quality Matters. QM is a nation-wide non-profit initiative to

improve online education. The challenge to universities is the cost associated with QM certifications and coordination. OSRHE is likely to ask for state institutions to contribute to the state's QM membership fee.

OSRHE will collaborate with institutions to develop online/hybrid course design standards. It was speculated that every faculty member who teaches an online/hybrid course will be expected to meet course design minimum standards established through the Quality Matters initiative. Course content will not be regulated, as this falls under the purview of faculty teaching specific courses. The Instructional Design Subcommittee will be tasked with the oversight of this initiative. Discussion ensued about the academic freedom-related issues concerning online course standards. It was noted that there have been multiple student complaints about online/hybrid course effectiveness with regard to faculty engagement. Dr. Millikin reported that each semester at least one student files a complaint with her office due to an online faculty member remaining unresponsive in an online course. E-campus tracking features can report the number of log-ins faculty and students complete each semester, and as few as three faculty log-ins have been tracked in a semester. Dr. Millikin reported that in the spring 2014 focus groups, a number of participating faculty expressed opinions that some of their colleagues regard hybrid courses as "a day off". In student focus groups, a number of students reported that some of their online courses are structured as independent study courses rather than active courses in which students and faculty are engaged.

Agenda Item: Convocation: Adjunct Faculty: Findings from the spring 2014 adjunct faculty focus group will be used to inform adjunct faculty professional development sessions beginning with Convocation.

Agenda Item: Assessment Day: Dr. Beck and Dr. Housel discussed the possibility of an assessment day. Dr. Beck agreed that an assessment day would be a possibility if it proves to be an asset to the University. Field testing in nursing, business, and biology has been done in the past and could be implemented to include all departments. Departments could create their own format for such post-testing. Dr. Peter Macpherson and Dr. Housel will work together to organize an assessment day for the upcoming academic calendar..

Agenda Item: Review Assessment Report Forms: All report forms need to be reviewed and updated. Dr. Zimmermann will be setting up a Webinar to review the use of Xitracs for summarizing and reporting assessment data, possibly replacing the existing process.

Agenda Item: Populate Internal Assessment Website: Cathy Burns has agreed to facilitate this process. Dr. Housel is working with Cathy to enable easy faculty access for all full-time and possibly part-time faculty to access peer review reports rather than request these from a UAC member or Department Head, who have access to the N: drive.

Agenda Item: Report on Assessment Processes and Instructional Changes: Tabled until next meeting.

Agenda Item: Faculty Insight Newsletter: A second newsletter is being created. Dr. Housel is facilitating this as his schedule allows.

Old Business

Agenda Item: Revising Peer Review Sessions: See handout for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Discussion ensued about revising the peer review sessions. It was thought that instead of asking all of the departments to discuss the SLR after the review that they could have a discussion about the comments, allowing the department to make revisions. This could promote a more relaxed climate while still facilitating effective discussion about student learning outcomes.

Dr. Housel suggested that for departments whose SLRs are comprehensive and whose faculty have achieved a strong conversation surrounding issues of student learning outcomes, an alternative peer review meeting could be scheduled for every other year. This alternative meeting would entail faculty discussing how the results of student learning outcomes fit into their department's strategic plan. This would also offer an additional opportunity for

faculty to be involved in the discussion and planning of department strategic plans. This was identified as a challenge in spring focus groups.

Dr. Housel suggested the following process. A review of department SLRs would be conducted by UAC members. If SLRs are comprehensive and substantive, the spring peer review process would be opened up to strategic planning discussion. If a department's SLR needs additional development, the spring peer review process would remain as it is- an opportunity to discuss student learning outcomes and process with a UAC peer group.

Agenda Item: Syllabi Requirements: Oversight - Currently, it is incumbent on Department Heads to review all syllabi in their respective departments. For the purpose of the self-study, Dr. Millikin and Dr. Dotterer are conducting a random sample study of syllabi for information required by RSU's Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures. Dr. Dotterer has preliminary findings relevant to improvement of syllabi content, specifically online and hybrid courses.

New Business

Agenda Item: New Date for SLR Submission: Dr. Housel suggested moving up the due date for SLRs in fall 2014 by one month. This would allow for the time needed by departments to discuss with faculty student learning outcomes related issues relevant to strategic planning discussions. Suggested dates are:

- Program SLRs due September 19
- General Education and Developmental Studies SLRs due September 26

Collection of Summer Assessment Data: Dr. Grabowski raised a concern about the low number of enrolled students in the summer courses. It would seem like very little data would be collected to affect the outcome so it would possibly delay the delivery of the reports in the fall. Dr. Millikin added that summer students are often a different mix of students, as some students who attend OU and OSU during fall and summer come home to the Claremore area and take a few summer courses. This may alter the student outcomes with a different mix of students. It was suggested to set aside summer collection of assessment data at this time and, rather, include it in a separate study.

Motion: Dr. Peter Macpherson moved that the UAC should not be required to collect summer data. Sarah Clark seconded the motion. Six were in favor, and one abstained.

Review of Tutoring Labs and Advising Services: These are two very important areas of student learning services that are not being reviewed or monitored. Dr. Millikin reported that advisement was one of the greatest challenges identified in spring focus groups. Further discussion of the assessment of advisement and tutoring services was tabled until fall 2014.

Student Performance, Incomplete Assignments, and Assessment: Tabled until fall 2014.

MBA Student Learning Outcomes: Dr. Housel discussed with Dr. Bert Tollison, Business Program Department Head, the need for MBA SLOs to be scaled back in response to suggestions from the HLC MBA evaluators in summer of 2013. Dr. Housel will work with Dr. Tollison to accomplish a more measurable set of student learning outcomes.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:20 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Scribe.