

Assessment Committee Minutes

September 23, 2004

3:30 PM in BH Conference Room

Attending: Tom Carment, Pam Fowler, Roy Gardner, Ken Hicks, Sue Katz, Greg Petersen

Excused: Wanda Baker

Approval of Minutes: NA

Motions: NA

Set Business:

1. Elect Officers
2. Set Schedule for the Year
3. Discuss Action Items to be addressed this year

Motions: (all of which passed unanimously)

1. Chair, Greg Petersen
2. Secretary, The representative of the department being reviewed - prepares the agenda and minutes. We will rotate for or other meetings as well.
3. All meetings will take place on Thursdays between 2 and 5 pm.
4. We approach one department at a time, doing one per month.
5. ALL members participate with no one abstaining since sometimes the faculty member has had no input on the plan and report or would like to make comments they are unable to within their own departments.

Next Meeting: Training

1. Thursday, Sep 30, 3-4 pm
2. Back-up date: Oct 14

Future Business:

1. Assessment recommendations for Student Evaluations.
2. GE Outcomes for foreign languages.

Assessment Committee Minutes

September 30, 2004

3:30 PM in BH Conference Room

Attending: Tom Carment, Pam Fowler, Roy Gardner, Ken Hicks, Sue Katz, Greg Petersen, Wanda Baker

Excused: NA

Approval of Minutes:

Motions: Motion, Second, and Pass.

Chair Report

1. GE Outcomes for foreign languages leading to the following questions: Are faculty allowed to change:
 - a. Program Mission Statements? Can change occasionally
 - b. Purposes for the Program? Can change occasionally
 - c. Assessment criteria and implementation procedures? Can change as needed
 - d. What parts of the assessment plans are part of the contract, and what parts can be changed?
Nothing is really carved in stone except for the University documents, which includes GE.

Set Business:

1. Right now we are using a 4 point spread. Do we want to add + (plus) and - (minus)? Yes
2. Training by Wanda Baker on Assessment of Assessment
 - a. Need to focus on content
 - b. Cite evidence
 - c. Constantly tie to the language in the rubric
 - d. Provide Suggestions

Motions: See #1

Future Business:

1. Assessment recommendations for Student Evaluations?
2. Dates and Times for Department Assessments

Motions: Motion, Second, and Pass.

1. Greg email everyone RSU mission statement and objectives
2. Ask Dept. Heads for feedback within 30 days of the Dept Assessment Evaluation
3. Train Faculty on Assessment: 1 hr? Myra on outcomes? Wanda on assessment?
4. Work with Curriculum Committee

Next Meeting:

Motions: Motion, Second, and Pass.

1. Wed., 7 Oct 2004, 3:30 pm BH Conf. Rm.

Assessment Committee Minutes

October 7, 2004

3:30 PM in BH Conference Room

Attending: Pam Fowler, Ken Hicks, Sue Katz, Greg Petersen, Wanda Baker

Excused: Tom Carment, Roy Gardner

Approval of Minutes:

Motions: After making a clarification, Motion, Second, and Pass.

Set Business:

2. Feedback from dept. heads
3. Training faculty on assessment
4. Working with the curriculum committee
5. Decide if we are going to make assessment recommendations for students evaluations
6. How to evaluate department and school mission statements in relationship to the RSU mission statement and objectives.

Motions: (all passed unanimously)

1. The Chair write a letter to Dr. Minks and Dr. Boyd, with a copy going to Faculty Senate, requesting that the Departments Heads do the following:
 - a. After the Assessment meeting with the Department Head the Depart Head replies with some kind of memorandum of understanding. This may take the form of one of the following:
 - i. A copy of minutes from a departmental assessment meeting, or
 - ii. A departmental memorandum to the Assessment Committee, along with
 - iii. How the feedback from the Assessment Committee is going to be included as part of their assessment cycle (what the department is going to keep and what they are going to change).
 - b. The letter is to be submitted to the Assessment Committee for the next meeting for their recommendation and approval.
2. The Chair send an email to all Department Heads requesting one hour to do assessment training for the department faculty.
3. Pam Fowler serve as the Assessment Committee liaison to the Curriculum Committee.
4. The Chair check the mission statements of the faculty committees to see if Student Evaluations are articulated in any of them. If not, we will request that a task force address them.
5. We do some review of department plan and report together before reviewing our first department as an internal quality control measure.
6. We do all Department Reviews during Spring Semester to not distract focus from NCA this fall.

Future Business: Motions: See motions above.

Next Meeting: Motions: (passed unanimously)

Thursday, 28 Oct 2004 at 2:00 (3:00 if necessary)

Assessment Committee Minutes

October 28, 2004

2:00 PM in BH Conference Room

Attending: Carment Thomas, Fowler Pam, Gardner Roy, Katz Sue, Petersen Greg, Baker Wanda,

Excused:

Absent: Hicks Kenneth

Approval of Minutes: Motioned, seconded, and passed unanimously after minor editorial clarifications

Set Business:

1. Mission Statements
2. Letter to Department Heads (see attachment)
3. Letter to Dr. Minks and Boyd (see attachment)
4. Assessment Training

Motions: (All passed unanimously)

1. We focus on the "design and implementation of an assessment process." It is not up to us to ensure quality instruction, but it is up to us to have an assessment process that makes quality instruction possible.
2. Sue Katz submit to the committee a more affirmative letter that will go to the department heads.
3. Greg Petersen send the letter to Drs. Minks and Boyd.
4. Wanda Baker will check with Drs. Minks and Boyd to see if we can clarify and strengthen the assessment rubric before we doing our own training and that to the departments.

Future Business

1. Letter to Department Heads
2. Assessment Training, specifically strengthening the rubric (if possible)

Next Meeting: 4 Nov 2004, 2:30

Assessment Committee Minutes

January 12, 2005

Present: Greg Pederson, Ken Hicks, Sue Katz, Roy Gardner, Wanda Baker

Absent: Tom Carment, Pam Fowler (As this meeting was scheduled on short notice it will not be counted toward the committee's normal work)

Summary:

The committee met to look over Wanda's first draft of assessment rubric so that it could be presented to the Academic Council this Friday. There was general discussion of how the rubric could be streamlined, and the decision was made that Wanda would email the committee members instructions on how to evaluate the rubrics with an eye toward creating a common scoring framework for evaluating the departmental plans and reports.

Minutes:

The initial question was whether the rubric could be shortened. Wanda responded that pretty much everything was on the table, and while the rubric appeared to long it would have the effect of 'front-loading' a lot of the work so that the scoring process would be streamlined the further the committee proceeds into the process.

Much of discussion focused on questions of whether the rubrics could be compressed into a more manageable form. Wanda emphasized a willingness to hear the committee's proposals while avoiding the tendency to reduce the scoring process to an exercise in 'brute quantification' (my term). Wanda suggested that the process was designed to set up a holistic basis for making 'gut impressions' that could fairly clearly categorize assessment programs.

In terms of overall questions, much of the discussion revolved around the following:

- Can the rubric be broken down into 'mission-critical' elements?
- Can 'sine qua non' ('without which not) elements be more heavily scored?
- Can similar elements be collapsed into a single category?

Outcomes:

The committee agreed that Wanda could present the rubric to the Academic Council as a provisional document indicating direction ('This is where we are headed).

Wanda proposed sending out instructions to the committee members for how to read through the rubric. The committee members should then use those instructions for a 'mark up session' next meeting.

Agreement on a 'timed discussion' format for the next meeting to complete the work on this document.

Next Meeting: 1/26/05 from 2:00-4:00 Baird Hall Conference Room

Assessment Committee Minutes

January 25, 2005

Present: Greg Pederson, Ken Hicks, Sue Katz, Roy Gardner, Wanda Baker, Pam Fowler, and Tom Carment

Summary: The committee met over 2 hours to extensively re-write the proposed rubrics Wanda created to aid in the assessment of program plans and reports. The committee went over the shorter rubric for reports page-by-page, and then proceeded to the longer rubric for program plans. Recommendations largely involve suggestions for changes in organization and wording of the rubrics for three purposes: a) simplify the language for 'non-assessment' faculty; b) establish clearer distinctions (where possible) among the exemplary/established and the developing/undeveloped categories; and c) reorganize or collapse/expand the horizontal tiers to reflect a variety of priority concerns of various members.

Report, Page 1: Many of the changes recommended are reflective of a desire to achieve more uniform language throughout each of the rubrics, much of which will be reflected in the committee's opening discussion of the first page of the rubric for program reports. Several issues were raised, including:

- Greg recommended adding a third horizontal tier by breaking up or moving up the rationale to the first tier to reflect the importance of rationale for the assessment process.
- Concern was expressed for the last sentence of the Page 1 rubric premise: "If no planned changes were reported last year, simply state, 'No planned changes reported.'" The committee agreed the language should attempt to elicit language explaining why no changes were planned.
- The committee attempted to arrive at language that would differentiate a (4) from a (3) by inserting qualitative language
 - Exemplary (4): "The rationale for any modifications to the planned changes is brief, concise, clear, well-organized, and exhibit sound writing mechanics."
 - Established (3): "The rationale for any modifications to the planned changes is brief, concise, and well-written."
- In the "Developing" (2) Category, concern was raised over the language of tier 1, and a rephrasing was recommended:
 - Some modification show incomplete planning or poor execution.
- In the "Undeveloped" (1) Category, concern was raised over the language of tier 2, and a rephrasing was recommended:
 - "The rationale for any modifications to the planned changes is absent, poorly written, or characterized by the failure to follow through on planned changes."

Report, Page 2: Most changes were related to creating a uniform language based on the page 1 recommendations.

Report, Page 3: The committee recommended deleting tiers 3 and 4, and reordering tier 3 to tier 1 to reflect its importance.

Report, Page 4: The committee recommended the inclusion of an 'analysis' step between tiers 1 and 2, and collapsing the 3rd and 4th rows to reflect the role theorizing plays in the conclusion phase of an assessment analysis. Additionally:

- The committee attempted to elaborate qualitative distinctions among the different analyses of conclusions: a (4) denotes excellent conclusions; a (3) denotes good conclusions; a (2) denotes adequate conclusions; and a (1) denotes weak or inadequate conclusions.

- In the 'Developing' and 'Undeveloped' tiers, the committee recommended language to denote the absence of theorizing as part of the justification for such a score to reflect continuity on that tier with the rest of that grid.

Report, Page 5: The committee recommended revising the language where applicable to the p. 1 report recommendations.

Plan, Page 1: A number of changes were proposed, including:

- On tier 1 under "Established" (3), changing to "Assessment plan includes an adequate list of planned changes to the program's assessment procedures.
- On tier 1 under "Developing" changing to "Assessment plan includes a partial list of planned changes to the program assessment procedures," and deleting the rest of the statement
- The committee noted the misspelling of verbose in tier 2 in the "Developing" and "Undeveloped" grids.
- The committee advocated deleting or collapsing tier 4 with tier 1

Plan, Page 2: Two recommendations:

- Collapsing tiers 2 and 3 as somewhat redundant.
- Attempt to differentiate "Exemplary" (4) from "Established" (3) by deleting clearly from the tier 1, grid 3 statement to read "The educational objectives for the program are clearly based on the program's mission statement."

Plan, Page 2: Two recommendations:

- Collapse tiers 2 and 3.
- Soften language relating to 'psychometric properties' to read as follows:
 - Exemplary (4): "All measures are valid."
 - Established (3): "Most measures are valid. Where there are weaknesses, additional measures to provide more evidence have been identified."
 - Developing (2): "Some measures are inconsistent."
 - Undeveloped (1): "Most measures are weak or unknown."

Plan, Page 3: Only one recommendation:

- Tier 1, grid 1, differentiate 'exemplary' from 'established' by including 'clearly' in the tier 1 statement, which would then read:
 - "For each educational objective, a performance standard is clearly identified."

Plan, Page 4: The only recommendation is to revise the language to the standard set on the report p. 1.

Plan, Page 5: No changes recommended.

Plan, Page 6: Several recommendations:

- Create a third tier which elicits the following:
 - "Who was involved? What did they do? How well did they document their contributions?"
- In tier 2, change the following statement: "Active involvement by the program coordinator, department head, and assessment representative is evident, but none of these individuals bore sole responsibility for the planning process."

Plan, Page 7: Two basic recommendations.

- The committee again recommended going through the rubric to insure that the language is consistent with that developed for the report, p. 1.
- Breaking the rubric into three tiers:
 - Tier 1: Description.
 - Tier 2: Quality of writing.
 - Tier 3: Closing the loop.

Outcomes:

- Ken and Wanda will work on the rubric revisions, which will then be distributed to the committee for approval
- The next meeting will include the question of whether the rubrics should be relatively weighted, and suggested a process for the members to use in producing a scoring distribution on the report.
- Wanda suggested that the committee practice scoring using the revised rubrics (SBS)

Next Meeting: 02/02/05 @ 2:00 PM in the Baird Hall Conference Room

Assessment Committee Minutes

April 6, 2005

Present: Greg Petersen, Ken Hicks, Pam Fowler, and Roy Gardner

Absent: Wanda Baker (excused), Sue Katz (excused), and Tom Carment

Summary: The Assessment Committee met with the Department of Applied Technology and conducted a 40-minute training seminar for the faculty.

Minutes: With Wanda absent, Greg handled most of the formal presentation, with Pam offering several additional comments. Greg gave an historical overview, and then distributed copies of the report and plan rubrics, and then distributed the committee's scoring of the 2003-2004 plans and reports, which were generally considered to be a considerable improvement.

Rich Ronin complained that including '+' '-' scores complicated the assessment process ("Why not just move to a ten-point scale?"). Greg suggested that he was overcomplicating the design of the scoring system, while Pam suggested that such a move would compel a move to a ten-point rubric.

Johnny Carroll questioned how the department go about improving on their plans and reports, and Greg argued that both the scoring and perhaps self-scoring would lead to improvement.

Johnny asked further when Greg would like to receive the department's Memorandum of Understanding, and Greg suggested May 6th, which met with agreement.

Finally, Johnny asked whether the current year's report should be read with last year's plan in mind, and Greg agreed that's how it ought to be done, but would lead to a significant addition to the Assessment Committee member's reading.

Next Meeting: 4/8/05 Assessment Committee meets with Health Science, 1:00 PM

Assessment Committee Minutes

April 20, 2005

Paul Hatley, Faculty Association/Senate Chair, presided.

Business

Faculty Senate Accomplishments 2004-2005

The Faculty Senate accomplishments for the 2004-05 year were listed:

- New plagiarism policy to be inserted in new Student Code (Academic Integrity Committee worked on this)
- Faculty awards will be made next AY (Faculty Development worked on this system)
- Automated student registration
- Assigned student ID numbers in lieu of use of student SSN (to prevent possible identity theft)
- Queried Computing Services about the spam filter, which is an individual filter, not a system filter
- Faculty evaluation ratings are under review by Faculty Development Committee
- Increase in pay for summer school is under discussion
- Improved appearance of pay stubs is under discussion
- Requested rank ordering of position candidates, suggestion refused (the Senate will reopen this discussion after the next round of faculty hirings)
- Requested attendance at Academic Council but the suggestion was tabled

Questions Raised

1. How is faculty advising to be affected by the new registration system?
 - Automated degree checks
 - Refusal of enrollment in courses not on the degree plan
2. Will there be an orientation for the new system?
3. Will tuition reimbursement be raised?
4. Will Faculty Senate pursue the request for attendance at Academic Council?
 - Consensus of the faculty attending the meeting is that Faculty Senate should pursue such a request.

Faculty Association Elections

The Faculty Association elections were held. The Rogers State University Faculty Senate is the governing body of the Association and represents the membership of the Association. The Senate is composed of five officers, whose terms run from June 1 to the subsequent May 31, and six Senators, one from each academic department, whose terms run from Sept. 1 to the subsequent Aug. 31.

- Officers of the Faculty Association/Senate will be
- Faculty Association/Senate Chair: Paul Hatley
- Vice-Chair: Patrick Seward
- Secretary: Ken Bugajski
- Treasurer: David Newcomb
- Parliamentarian: Phil Sample

Requests

Faculty Senate Attendance at Academic Council Meetings

The Faculty Association has requested that the Faculty Senate, as the Association's governing body, pursue the HLC suggestion that Faculty Senate attend Academic Council meetings.

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Faculty Association will be held in August 2005.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary. APPROVED by Faculty Senate April 29, 2005