

Assessment Committee Minutes

August 20, 2010

1:00 p.m., Baird Hall 124. Prepared by Steve Housel.

Attendance: Members attending: Sipes, Zimmerman, Saffarian, Grabowski, White, Brimer, Evusa, Varner, Housel, St. John. Also attending: L. Andrews and D. Djayanbaev. Members absent: Luscomb.

1. The Approval of Minutes. The minutes from the April 2, 2010, meeting were approved unanimously.
2. Welcome New Members.
 - a. Housel provided a brief summary of all the business to be dealt with during the meeting. The purpose was primarily to provide an overview to the new members, Brimer and Evusa, who had to leave early. Housel said he would arrange a time to brief them and Luscomb, the new member who was absent.
 - b. The members for the 2010/11 school year are:
 - Thomas Luscomb, Applied Technology
 - Craig Zimmerman, Biology
 - Massood Saffarian, Business
 - Juliet Evusa, Communications
 - Evalon St. John, Developmental Studies
 - Frank Grabowski, English and Humanities
 - Bryce Brimer, Fine Arts
 - LeeAnn Sipes, Health Science
 - Steve Housel, History and Political Science
 - Evalon St. John, Mathematics & Physical Science
 - Monica Varner, Psych, Soc & Criminal Justice
 - Joel White, Sports Management
 - Linda Andrews (ex officio), Research, Planning & Assessment

3. Old Business

- a. Critique Modified Forms & Templates.

Andrews volunteered at the last meeting to incorporate members' suggestions for improving (1) the *Program Student Learning Report* and *Program Peer Review* forms and (2) the *General Education Student Learning Report* and *General Education Peer Review* forms. She said she had finished with the program forms, but was still working on the general education forms. She said she would post them on the N-drive, which is a storage area accessible to administrators and administrative assistants.
- b. Peer Review – Developmental Studies – J. White

At the April 2, 2010, UAC meeting White and former member Phillip Payne volunteered to complete the Peer Review of the Developmental Studies Student Learning Reports. Due to the departure from RSU of Professor Payne, the Peer Review was not completed. Housel asked L. Sipes if she would join Professor White and complete the work. She agreed. No due date was set.
- c. Consider UAC Recommendations Regarding:

External Testing of General Education Programs

At the April 2, 2010, meeting the UAC postponed taking a position on whether to recommend that RSU adopt an external assessment off the general education program. Committee members were to confer with their departments and report their findings. After members gave a recounting of their departments' views, Housel summarized UAC's position as being cautiously supportive. Taking into account that a General

Education Task Force has been created to address all aspects of the general education program--from revising the mission of the general education program to developing its learning outcomes to recommending a standardized test—UAC members expressed their hope that the task force would make decisions experimentally, rather than making decisions that could not be adjusted should faculty feedback and experience warrant. During this discussion it was suggested that a review of the IDEA Center be put on the next UAC agenda.

d. Selection of External Testing Instrument

At the April 2, 2010, meeting the UAC postponed taking a position not only on whether to recommend that RSU adopt an external assessment of its general education program, but also on which among several notable instruments might be best. Since the General Education Task Force has been charged with recommending a standardized test to measure general education outcomes, the UAC tabled making a recommendation; but it again expressed its hope that the task force include a trial period with whatever instrument it selects.

4. New Business

a. Select Meeting Day and Time

Members agreed to keep Fridays at 1:00 for Fall 2010 meetings.

b. Due Dates

The assessment reports must be turned in to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment by the dates provided below. Department chairs and deans may require earlier dates.

- Oct 1st – Student Learning Reports - Programs
- Oct 15th – Student Learning Reports – Developmental
- Oct 15th – Student Learning Reports – General Education

L. Andrews noted that the Fall 2010 Academic Council meeting times were also scheduled for 1 p.m. on Fridays:

- September 10th
- October 15th
- November 19th
- December 10th

c. New Approach to Peer Reviews

“Cameron Model” Housel suggested that a subcommittee be created to recommend ways in which elements of the Cameron University approach to assessment might benefit RSU. Housel highlighted those aspects of the Cameron approach that improved inter-rater reliability and brought faculty and assessment committee members into a learning-sharing dialog. E. St. John and F. Grabowski volunteered to be on the subcommittee. Members will have until August 25 to volunteer. Members felt that Spring 2011 would be a target time for moving forward with peer reviews, possibly with subcommittee recommendations in place. The subcommittee will make a report at the next UAC meeting.

d. Consider Faculty and Administration Survey

M. Varner developed a survey which she designed for the purpose of gaining information from faculty (including chairs and deans) about how they relate to the assessment process. She reviewed the survey, answered questions, and took note of suggestions. The UAC voted unanimously to support her effort. Varner will be open to consideration of other recommendations through August 25, at which time she will move forward with her preparations to distribute the survey, collect and analyze the data, and make a report to the UAC at its next meeting. The results will also be made available to the General Education Task Force.

Next Meeting and Adjournment: The next meeting will be Friday, September 17th, 1 p.m., BH 124. The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:45 p.m.

Assessment Committee Minutes

October 8, 2010

- I. Approval of minutes from last meeting (Sept. 17, 2010)
 - a. The meeting was called to order by Steve Housel. The meeting minutes for September 17, 2010 were reviewed. A motion to approve was made and seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.
- II. New Business
 - a. Preparing for Data Collection 2011 – S. Housel
 - i. Steve Housel discussed dates and tutoring procedures. It was recommended that new UAC members receive training in the Assessment process including SLR's and Peer Review process. It was recommended that last years responses from question 4,5, and 7 in the SLR be included in the present SLR. The committee agreed that it would be best to obtain last year's copy of the SLR and Peer Review from the "N" drive and all three documents be utilized in the peer review process.
 - b. Theory & Principles – L. Andrews
 - i. Linda Andrews provided the committee with two examples of Guiding Principles for Assessment and the Handbook for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. Linda Andrews asked the committee to review the guidelines and handbook and submit recommendations no later than November 1, 2010.
- III. Old BusinessPeer Review
 - a. Developmental Studies – J. White & L. Sipes
 - i. L. Sipes reviewed the Developmental Studies Peer Review and provided feedback for the Developmental Studies Program.
 - b. Report on UAC Assessment Survey – M. Varner
 - i. M. Varner reviewed the conclusions for the UAC assessment survey. Linda Andrews shared the UAC committee should implement strategies in response to the survey recommendations which includes an increase in Assessment Communication and Training to improve the assessment process. It was requested by Dr. Clayton that the survey results be shared with all faculty and administrators. M. Varner communicated with the IRB committee and they saw no reason why the results could not be shared. A motion was made by to approve, it was seconded and the committee voted unanimously to share the results with faculty and administrators.
 - c. Report by UAC Subcommittee on Presentations
 - i. Guests in Attendance at Presentations
 1. E. St. John shared rationale for having the presentations open to the university community and general public. The open or closed presentation issue was discussed by the committee. M. Varner and F. Grabowski suggested a closed session to the public, but include program faculty, Department Head's, and other department faculty members. A motion was made to vote on the closed session and listed attendees, the motion was seconded, the committee voted, 1 abstain, 2 opposed, and 6 agreed. The motion was approved by majority vote. F. Grabowski requested and be noted in the minutes that the public presentation option and attendance format be revisited in April 2011.
 - ii. Focus Group
 1. M. Varner reported that a Focus Group was being planned to assess and evaluate the presentation assessment process. J. Evusa and M. Varner have agreed to facilitate the Focus Group.
- IV. Date Reminders
 - a. The committee was reminded the due dates for GE SLR and DS SLR.
 - i. October 15 – General Education Student Learning Reports
 - ii. October 15 – Developmental Studies Student Learning Reports
- V. Next Meeting
 - a. Next UAC meeting is scheduled for November 12, 2010 at 1:00 pm, conference room Baird Hall. Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

[Minutes submitted by M. Varner, UAC Secretary.]

Assessment Committee Minutes

November 12, 2010

Attended: Steve Housel, Monica Varner, Frank Grabowski, Craig Zimmerman, Joel White, Tom Luscomb, Bryce Brimer, Juliet Evusa. Absent: Linda Andrews, LeAnn Sipes, and Massood Saffarian.

- I. Approval of minutes from Oct. 8, 2010. A motion was made to approve the minutes, minutes were approved.
- II. New Business
 - a. General Education Program Task Force – S. Housel (15 minutes)
 - i. Possible New Role for UAC

S. Housel discussed Gen Ed Task force mission, general mandate, mission statements, reduction of goals. He explained the new Gen Ed process could become part of UAC responsibilities with additional UAC members to assist with additional responsibilities.
 - b. Mission Statements – F. Grabowski (10 minutes)
 - i. Grabowski discussed two different mission statements for UAC and asked if the mission statements should be changed, and does the 2.1 Assessment mission statement coincide with the faculty mission statement from Academic Policies and Procedures? S. Housel agreed to discuss the differing mission statements with faculty senate and administration and report back in December.
- III. Old Business
 - a. Peer Review – M. Varner & E. St. John
 - i. Pilot Study – M. Varner (15 minutes)

M. Varner shared the Peer Review Communication Sessions Memo which will be sent to Dr. Beck. Some discussion occurred addressing if the memo would be shared with Academic Council. M. Varner shared it would be, but would report back if this was not the case.
 - ii. Schedule for Peer Review Sessions – E. St. John (10 minutes)

E. St. John shared the peer review faculty presentation schedule. She shared presentations would be schedule for Fridays plus UAC meeting days. A total of 13 sessions running from 1:30-2:30 and 3-4 with peer reviews in between. F. Grabowski suggested days that Academic Council meet should be excluded from the schedule. C. Zimmerman recommended having the groups concurrently. It was discussed that it would interfere with the flexibility of the schedule and would eliminate substitutions. M. Varner recommended smaller groups to decrease the number of Fridays. She reported some departments have several degrees, so when you combine UAC meetings, peer reviews, and attendance of all communication sessions for your department you utilize almost of all Fridays' for the semester. M. Varner and J. Evusa verbalized they preferred two Fridays a total of six hours for peer reviews. E. St. John discussed three member groups. She agreed to rework the schedule and email it to the committee.
 - iii. Assessment Team Approach – M. Varner (10 minutes)

M. Varner distributed the Assessment Team Approach for faculty to consider. She included justification from Assessment Survey which was given in September to explain why she developed this approach. The assessment survey revealed faculty wanted to see more leadership and support by department heads, faculty, and UAC. Faculty also reported that an intradepartmental or internal peer review would strengthen the assessment process and majority of faculty desired to have Deans and Department Heads more involved in the assessment process, and only 20% feel confident with the forms, and 1/3 of the sample are not familiar with assessment. M. Varner asked the committee to review and to share their comments in the January UAC meeting.
 - b. IDEA Center – F. Grabowski (15 minutes)
 - i. Whose Responsibility
 - ii. Next Step

- c. F. Grabowski shared that faculty senate was going to take the lead to determine if the IDEA evaluation process be continued. Members of faculty senate were going to inquire with their faculty members concerning satisfaction of IDEA instrument. B. Brimer asked if faculty senate reported they didn't prefer the instrument, who would be selecting a new one? F. Grabowski reported the senate had not discussed the selection of a new instrument and would report back to the committee.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm. Next schedule meeting is December 3, 2010 at 1:00pm. Respectfully submitted by
Monica Varner, UAC Secretary.

Assessment Committee Minutes

December 3, 2010

1:00 pm

Attended: Steve Housel, Frank Grabowski, Craig Zimmermann, Joel White, Tom Luscom, Bryce Brimer, Juliet Evusa, LeAnn Sipes, Massood Saffarian, Monica Varner, and Linda Andrews

I. Approval of minutes from last meeting (Nov. 12, 2010) The meeting minutes were reviewed and a motion was made to approve; the minutes were approved.

II. Old Business

a. Peer Review Calendar and Suggestions for Procedures – St. John

E. St. John reviewed the Peer Review schedule and team procedures. The group discussed protocol for the peer review sessions. A veteran UAC member (Grabowski, Housel, St. John, Varner) would lead the peer review session. The team would review the SLR from the previous year, Peer Review recommendations, and the most recent SLR. The chair of UAC will present the Peer Review Session proposal to the Academic Council on 12/10/2010.

b. Peer Review Issues -- E. St John addressed issues and protocol.

i. How Many UAC Members Per Team? Three per team.

ii. Attending First Session? Steve Housel would lead the first session and UAC members could attend.

iii. Types of Presentations? Faculty and department administrators could select any of the three formats: (1) formal presentation, (2) informal presentation, or (3) no presentation, just open for discussion.

iv. Providing Guidance for Departments' Sessions. The Peer Review sub-committee (E. St. John, Steve Housel, Monica Varner, Frank Grabowski, LeAnn Sipes) would discuss guidelines for the departments and training for reviewers. An assessment meeting would be set in January prior to the first Peer Review Sessions with UAC members. Steve Housel will submit appropriate information to DHs and UAC members to share with the faculty.

v. Will sessions be open or closed? A motion was made to revisit the issue. The "Advantages of Open Peer Review," submitted by E. St John, was again discussed. Originally the UAC voted 7 to 3 to close the session to Deans, VPs, and other university personnel. After a lengthy discussion and the assurance that this process would not become an administrative oversight, but a collegial peer review process, a motion was made to vote on the proposal again. By a 10 to 0 outcome UAC members voted to include Deans and VPs; however, the committee emphasized its intent that the peer review sessions be supportive, collegial, and designed for the benefit of the university community.

vi. Nomenclature (Peer Review Sessions)? This was not discussed.

- c. Report: Blending 09-10 SLR and 2010 Peer Review w/ 10-11 SLR.
S. Housel reviewed the inclusion of peer review information being added to SLR. The motion was made to table until a later date. The members agreed.
- d. Report: Different Mission Statements – F. Grabowski discussed the two different mission statements. S. Housel reported that M. Mackie was not familiar with the authorship of the 2.1 Assessment Committee Mission and Purpose. L. Andrews was also not familiar with the authorship, but suspected it was included in accreditation documentation. She encouraged the UAC committee to revisit UAC mission statement. No action taken.
- e. Report: IDEA Center – F. Grabowski reported that Faculty Senate would explore faculty opinions concerning IDEA.

III. New Business

- a. Report: General Education Program Task Force – S. Housel provided an update and reported they had submitted their recommendations to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
- b. Report: Dr. Beck's Memo Regarding Academic Council -- M. Varner reviewed the Peer Review session proposal/pilot study which would be shared with Academic Council.
- c. Linda Andrews Leaving RSU, S. Housel commented on the retiring of L. Andrews and how much she will be missed. We acknowledged our appreciate of her guidance and support.
- d. Dates
 - i. Cameron Presentation
 - 1. Dec. 9th – 11 to 12:30 Herrington Hall, Rm 146 UAC members were reminded of the presentation by Cameron and our opportunity to attend and review via video conference.
 - ii. Presentation to Academic Council
 - 1. Dec. 10th -- 1:00 p.m.
S. Housel discussed the key issues to be discussed with academic council concerning the Peer Review Sessions pilot study. It was reported the primary goal is to improve the peer review assessment process, lead to pedagogical enhancement, increase communication, and provide an overall improved assessment process which measure student learning.

Minutes Completed and Respectfully submitted by Monica Varner, UAC Secretary

Assessment Committee Minutes

January 21, 2011

Attendance: S. Housel, F. Grabowski, E. St. John, M. Varner, C. Zimmermann, T. Luscomb, B. Brimer, J. Evusa, J. White, L. Sipes, and M. Safroom. Absent: L. Andrews

- I. Approval of minutes from last meeting (Dec. 3, 2010) Minutes approved unanimously.
- II. Old Business
 - a. Academic Council Presentation – S. Housel, Monica Varner
S. Housel reviewed Academic Council presentation which occurred on 12/10/2010. Members listened, no questions were brought up. All acknowledge importance of activity.
 - b. Cameron Presentation – T. Luscomb
Discussed our thoughts on Cameron model, T. Luscomb shared his observations and conflicts that he found with their format. Group agreed they preferred a open process.
 - c. General Education Task Force – S. Housel
S. Housel reviewed the GETF memo which was submitted to Dr. Beck, waiting on his approval or recommendations, will report back a later date.
- III. New Business
 - a. Peer Review Sessions
 - i. Forms – S. Housel, Evalon St.John
Questions and Rubric – Monica Varner, Frank Grabowski
Questions and were reviewed by M. Varner and F. Grabowski
Peer Review Questions
University Assessment Committee
 1. Explain how the student learning outcomes relate to your department's and program's mission.
 2. What student learning outcomes led the faculty to make or not make instructional changes?
 3. How does your department communicate peer review recommendations to program faculty?
 4. Is Bloom's Taxonomy used in setting up evaluation measures?
 5. What indirect and direct measures did you include?
 6. How does your program's performance standard measure mastery of student learning?
 7. What conclusions led to program changes?
 8. In what ways, if any, does the assessment process (including peer review) benefit instruction in your program?
 - ii. Tips and General Discussion
General tips were shared by S. Housel, Frank G, E. St. John, M. Varner, and UAC members. Committee addressed SLR form, program missions, instructional and assessment changes, and response to last years peer review and involvement of stake holders, open and collegial atmosphere.
 - b. Mock Peer Review Session – E. St.John
E. St. John presented Developmental Program SLR, committee reviewed and commented on SLR and made recommendations.
 - c. Changes at Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment – L. Andrews
L. Andrews will be retiring on 1/31/2011, not specific date when her position will be filled, but S. Housel will communicated with Dr. Beck.
 - d. Changing the UAC meeting time. – C. Zimmermann
UAC will be changing the meeting time to Friday's 2:00pm to accommodate classroom times for UAC members.