

Assessment Committee Minutes

August 12, 2011

Present:

Meeting was called to order by Dr. Steve Housel at 2 pm, there being a quorum present.

Dr. Housel welcomed the two new members: Dr. Brenda Tuberville, coordinator of developmental studies, and Dr. Djalalidin Djayanbaev, member of the mathematics faculty.

Old Business

- Formal evaluation of face-to-face peer review process: consensus of those conducting the peer reviews was not to do a post-review survey every year
 - It was suggested that those programs to be peer reviewed in the upcoming cycle should be surveyed pre-review.
 - Dr. Varner announced that notifications of upcoming reviews (for degree programs, general education, and developmental studies student learning reports) would be going out in the next couple of weeks.
- Completion of assessment forms
 - Dr. Housel announced that these forms are now available to the committee members through the N drive.
 - A discussion ensued regarding whether there might be some disjuncture between student learning outcomes as they were previously worded and the new outcomes recently ratified. Dr. Housel indicated that Dr. Beck wants the new (four) outcomes on the forms and that, perhaps, a mention that this is a “transition” year could be included to explain incongruities.

New Business

- New chair: Dr. Steve Housel was re-elected unanimously for 2011-2012.
- Secretarial function:
 - Dr. Housel mentioned that, perhaps, it should be on a rotating basis, with each member taking a turn. He also mentioned that one of the student workers in his department could be given the task to compile the minutes and ensure that they are put in the RSU-template format.
 - Dr. Tuberville volunteered to act as secretary through the end of the fall semester.
- Peer Review Reports (2009-2010) and Correcting Submission due dates:
 - Due dates for student learning report submissions were changed as follows:
 - Degree reports: now due OCTOBER 5
 - General Education and Developmental Studies: now due OCTOBER 19
 - Dr. Monica Varner reported on the internal evaluation and peer review process to be undertaken by her department in upcoming weeks.
- Peer Review Reports 2010-2011
 - Size of peer review teams: it was decided to keep the size of the teams as they currently stand: three (one lead reviewer, two associates)
 - Number of peer reviews per session: discussion centered on whether three reviews per session were too many; Dr. Housel suggested that they be cut to two depending on the number of reports to be covered. (Some departments may have more reports to go over than others in the upcoming review cycle.)
 - Questions in advance of peer review session: It was the consensus of those present that receiving questions in advance of the peer review session was helpful and should continue.

- Due dates for peer review reports: Dr. Housel stated that these had already been adjusted (see above).
- Schedule of peer review sessions for 2011-2012:
 - The upcoming cycle will include 30 degree plans, 9 general education courses, and two reports from developmental studies (one for writing/reading and one for math/science), which equals 41 potential reports.
 - These face-to-face sessions would begin in early November.
 - A discussion ensued about the possibility of having some sessions occur simultaneously. While it was agreed that it could possibly reduce the number of sessions necessary, Dr. Grabowski brought up the point that concurrent sessions for programs or general education courses from the same school (liberal arts, math/physical science, etc.) would restrict the opportunity for the deans to be present for as many sessions as possible.
 - Coordinating the set-up of session dates:
 - Dr. Housel reported that, last semester, Evalon St. John emailed potential dates to all concerned and had them sign up for specific dates.
 - A potential problem was brought up with the number of sessions to be held versus the number of possible Friday meetings (from early November until the end of the semester).
 - Dr. Housel mentioned that we will need more peer review team leaders if we have concurrent sessions and that some flexibility may be needed (some sessions concurrent if variables fall into place, some sessions not concurrent).
 - Dr. Grabowski suggested that we keep the number at three sessions per day.
 - Dr. Craig Zimmerman volunteered to coordinate this, with Dr. Varner assisting.
 - Due dates for peer review reports: after a discussion, it was agreed that peer review reports should be due four weeks from the completion of the session.
 - Workshops: it was the consensus of the committee that no workshops are needed due to the revised, simpler forms.
- Schedule meeting days: it was agreed to keep meetings at 1 pm on Fridays (not conflicting with Academic Council or Faculty Senate).
- General Education Program Committee:
 - General Education Task Force had previously asked the University Assessment Committee to form a Program Committee but later decided to be a Committee of the Whole, with the University Assessment Committee providing input.
 - Dr. Varner mentioned that, as the Task Force committee's charge currently reads, there is the potential for redundancy.
 - Dr. Housel addressed Dr. Beck's wishes for what these reports (a "summary report of students' progress and learning outcomes based on a peer review and analysis of departmental and standardized test reports") would accomplish.
 - Dr. Grabowski brought up the potential for additional work that these reports represent for the assessment committee.
 - Dr. Millikin brought up that the tests are broken down into four major areas to be measured: critical thinking, reading, math, and communication. Dr. Housel stated that our report would look at recurring themes or trends, shortfalls, and tendencies, addressing best practices and similarities/difference between our results and those of comparable schools.
 - Dr. Zimmerman expressed some concern regarding the possibility that the results from the standardized test and the imbedded test might show markedly different outcomes.
 - Dr. Housel suggested we table any decisions regarding the reports, their impact on current UAC workload, and the potential for future problems.
- Membership Rotation: Dr. Housel will be sending to us a copy of the rotation schedule currently in the possession of Dr. Mary Mackie of the E&H department, showing when members of specific departments should be rotated on and off various university committees.
- Assessing Organizational Leadership Degree:
 - Dr. Housel brought up that this degree (that RSU currently offers online) is not currently assessed due to perceived difficulties due to its online nature, and he asked the committee if this degree program *should* be included.

- The consensus of the committee is that this degree program should be included as any other degree program would be.
- Presentation by Dr. Millikin
 - Dr. Housel then introduced Dr. Mary Millikin who was present to inform the committee regarding the fall semester's standardized tests for incoming freshmen (with no general education credits from other colleges/universities):
 - Instrument: ETS Proficiency Profile (short form)
 - Schedule: Pre-test (first three weeks of semester); Post-test (last four weeks of semester)
 - Methodology: Random (629 total students currently identified; 100 will be used)
 - Dr. Millikin and the committee then discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the two versions – embedded and non-embedded – in areas such as cost to the university (including student incentive), ease of testing implementation, and availability of testing facilities. Possibilities discussed were embedding the test into a course that the highest percentage of incoming freshmen might be taking their first semester (i.e., Microcomputer Applications); drawbacks to this would be weeding out those students who wait to take such courses until much later in their academic careers.
 - One area of concern (for both Dr. Millikin and the committee) was the ambiguity of ETS's "Peer Institutional Use" statement on their literature. The three colleges listed seemed comparable to RSU (in mission or size).
 - The University Assessment Committee would then participate, along with the General Education Program Committee, in analyzing the results of this test to check for areas of concern and trends to be addressed.
- Invitation to Dr. Millikin:
 - After her presentation, Dr. Millikin left the meeting, and the committee began a discussion of how extensive or inclusive an invitation should be extended to Dr. Millikin (regarding her involvement in future meetings).
 - After much debate (too much restriction might send the wrong message to the administration vs. restriction of dialogue within meeting parameters due to Dr. Millikin's administrative position), it was decided by vote that the committee would extend an invitation to Dr. Millikin to attend committee meetings on a case-by-case (as needed) basis.
- Next meeting date:
 - It was decided that the next meeting date would be announced after Dr. Zimmerman distributed the peer review session sign-up sheet.

Respectfully submitted: Dr. Brenda Tuberville, Acting secretary, University Assessment Committee.

Assessment Committee Minutes

September 9, 2011

Present: Shirley McNickle, Dr. Craig Zimmerman, Dr. Massood Saffarian, Dr. Frank Grabowski, Dr. Joel White, Dr. Monica Varner, Dr. Steve Housel, Dr. Djalalidin Djayanbaev, Dr. Brenda Tuberville. **Also Present:** Dr. Mary Millikin. **Not Present:** Bryce Brimer, Dr. Juliet Evusa, Thomas Luscomb.

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Housel at 1:05 p.m.; he welcomed Shirley McNickle of the Health and Physical Sciences department to the committee. Due to Dr. Millikin's need to leave early, approval of previous minutes, announcements, and new business were postponed until later in the meeting. (Dr. Housel mentioned some changes to the minutes, and Dr. Tuberville suggested they meet separately to incorporate those changes.)

Dr. Millikin reported on the most recent data she's received from ETS regarding the Proficiency Profile test currently being given to incoming freshmen (those with no previous college experience). Dr. Housel mentioned that the General Education Task Force had met to discuss the ETS test and the imbedded approach that has been proposed. Dr. Millikin explained the purpose of the test (and its focus on general education) and how we plan to track progress of students with the results; we will be able to see how we compare (positively or negatively) with comparable institutions.

Dr. Millikin then explained that we will have four different classifications (Carnegie classification) to choose from: basic (baccalaureate/associate's, colleges/universities); size and setting (medium, four-year, primarily non-residential); undergraduate profile (medium, full-time four-year, inclusive); and enrollment profile (exclusively undergraduate four-year). In comparing our results to other institutions, she stated, we have to be careful because local colleges do not have the same information available. ETS has identified ten institutions that are comparable to our comparison criteria—Shawnee State University in Portsmouth, Ohio, and Dickinson State University in Dickinson, North Dakota. Dr. Saffarian mentioned that Missouri Southern State in Joplin uses ETS and may be comparable to us; Dr. Millikin promised to check on this possibility. Dr. Saffarian stated that he would like to see at least two Oklahoma universities on the comparison list; Northwestern State University in Alva may also be using the ETS test.

Dr. Millikin reported that, as of that morning, they had 54 students identified (at least 50 are needed for a report), so ours may be a small sample size. Dr. Millikin also mentioned that the university would like to see this information broken down, eventually, into degree programs and schools.

Dr. Housel asked when the data from the upcoming test (fall semester) would be available; Dr. Millikin stated that the time frame for taking the test had to be extended for another week, so we hope to have the compiled data by the end of fall break (hopefully).

Dr. Grabowski stated that the Faculty Senate should be consulted and their approval obtained regarding which test (imbedded or testing center implementation) should be administered. Dr. Housel responded by saying that we will be using the Testing Center this semester and next semester, so we have time to get this before the faculty for their approval.

After Dr. Millikin left (to chair a meeting of the Academic Council in Dr. Beck's absence), Dr. Housel moved on to our vote in the last UAC meeting regarding making the AVPAA an ex-officio member of the committee, and Dr. Zimmerman suggested we open the floor for a discussion of this matter. He reported on his meeting with Dr. Millikin after our vote and on her response. Two days later, he received an email from Dr. Millikin relating Dr. Beck's response. He brought up the fact that the Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual states (in section 2.3.2 "Assessment Committee") that "The Institution Research and Assessment Officer will serve as ex-officio member of the committee."

The committee then discussed what the committee's response should be.

It was recommended that we inform the Policies Committee that we want to have that part of the Policies Manual changed, that we want that particular line stricken. Dr. Zimmerman so moved, seconded by Dr. Grabowski, and the proposal passed unanimously.

The committee then moved on to a discussion of the Peer Review Schedule. Dr. Zimmerman submitted his proposal for team membership, department and program assignments, and proposed session dates; a discussion then followed regarding the splitting up of the work load among team leaders (old and new) and to make the number of sessions and reports equitable for all committee members.

Regarding session dates, it was discussed whether it would be better to send departments a list of the dates shown on the proposal and have them choose *or* to consult with team members to see when they are available and relay *those* dates to the departments. Dr. Zimmerman stated he would be sending out an email to committee members to ascertain dates of availability so teams can coordinate specific session date suggestions. A motion was made (by Dr. Varner) and seconded (by several committee members) to accept Dr. Zimmerman's proposal; the motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Housel then brought up the General Education reports and the need to remind departments that the outcomes being measured are now **four** instead of the previous **nine**. The nine courses selected by the Task Force (ENGL 1213, SPCH 1113, POLS 1113, HIST 2493, MATH 1513, HUM 2113, BIOL 1114, GEOL 1014, and SPAN 1113) will be included in this year's peer reviews; Dr. Varner mentioned that the other 37 general education courses' reports plus the reports from these nine would then go to Dr. Millikin's office, and then she will generate her report.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Dr. Brenda Tuberville.

Assessment Committee Minutes

May 7, 2012

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Housel at 1:20 PM. Those in attendance were: Dr. Steve Housel, chair, Dr. Craig Zimmermann, Dr. Massoud Saffarian, Dr. Monica Varner, Dr. Juliet Evusa, Mr. Tom Luscomb, Dr. Mary Millikin, Dr. Djalalidin Djayanbaev, Dr. Joel White, Dr. Brenda Tuberville

Not in attendance: Dr. Jim Ford, Dr. Bryce Brimer

REPORTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Dr. Housel stated that Sara Brennan, Dr. Millikin's administrative assistant, will become the committee's secretary, starting after the end of the Spring 2012 semester.
- Dr. Housel next announced that, according to the rotation calendar, the following departments were scheduled to appoint new members to the committee: English & Humanities, Business, Health Sciences, and Developmental Studies. He then stated that, after talking with Dr. Frank Grabowski, interim chair of English & Humanities, Dr. Jim Ford would be staying on as the representative from E&H. Dr. Tuberville stated that the representative from Developmental Studies would be either the new hire (search just started) or she would stay on. Dr. Zimmerman asked if freshman faculty can serve on committees. Dr. Housel (along with Dr. Varner) stated that this is sometimes a department decision, sometimes a Faculty Senate decision. As for the other members scheduled to rotate out, Dr. Nancy Diede will talk to Shirley McNickle about continuing her representation of Health Sciences, and Dr. Bert Tollison has indicated that Dr. Saffarian has agreed to stay on the committee.
- The next item on the agenda was a report of the 2011-2012 Peer Review Sessions. Dr. Housel distributed a table showing when reviews were done, when the departments/programs received the questions from the peer reviewers, and when the review report was delivered. Dr. Housel mentioned that additional information (whether or not the department chair attended the review, what if any other department faculty members attended) were left off this table but would be added.

OLD BUSINESS:

- General Education ("Super 9") Best Practices and Peer Review Survey – Dr. Varner reported that, overall, there was growth in faculty engagement and dialogue; however, General Education best practices and program best practices do not come from this committee.
 - A question was raised as to whether or not a question could be inserted in the Student Learning Report (SLR) asking departments or programs what best practices have been identified and will be implemented (based on past reviews). Dr. Varner indicated that this will require departmental dialogue and discussion to ascertain the satisfaction level on what is being done now and what, if anything, could be done differently.
 - Dr. Zimmerman asked if this information might be the same as the current ETS report results to help identify what we are doing (best practices) that enhance student learning (outcomes).
 - Dr. Varner gave an example from the Community Service program, and Dr. Zimmerman asked if this could be broadened to apply to any type of knowledge. Dr. Housel asked if it could be synthesized into a paragraph to share with others (since generalizability is key to best practices).
 - After much discussion, it was agreed that departments and program faculty should discuss these best practices in order to identify best practices unique to certain majors or courses (i.e., using PowerPoints in class vs. not using them). It was also agreed that we should incorporate questions about best practices on all review forms.

- Dr. Jamie Graham's use of student engagement in current events regarding her class's area (geology) was discussed; Dr. Housel suggested she be asked to give a brief presentation to the committee regarding this practice.
- Dr. Evusa mentioned that it might be a good idea for one of the breakout sessions during Convocation to be about the issue of identifying best practices.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 2011-12 Peer Reviews (Review and Recommendations) – Dr. Zimmerman expressed some concern that we are seeing the same mistakes being made year after year.
 - Dr. Varner suggested that this may be due to lack of resources and some level of apathy and said that we (and the faculty) need to remember that the Peer Review process is still in its infancy.
 - Dr. Saffarian stated that these problems may stem from a lack of involvement by the deans, who need to be ultimately responsible for the report (since they are the last to sign off on them). Deans should compare reports and note any mistakes.
 - Dr. White brought up the fact that one of the original points was that the deans should not be involved, that the SLRs needed to come strictly from the faculty.
 - Dr. Varner mentioned that to combat this lack of consistency across campus, there needs to be uniformity, structure, and intra-school discussions. Recurrent mistakes may be caused by absence or lack of feedback from the administrative level.
 - Dr. Zimmerman stated that a lack of feedback may be applicable to the faculty as well.
- New Requirements – Dr. Housel brought up that both online and on-ground courses should be assessed and asked if this could be mandated. Dr. Millikin said that it could be.
 - Dr. Zimmerman suggested that final exams include assessment questions.
 - A general discussion ensued regarding what measurements could be used in an online course; must all assessment measurements for a particular course ~~must~~ be the same?
 - Dr. Millikin stated that these are mostly prescriptive, philosophical questions from those who set up the protocol.
- Department/Program Assessment Facilitators – Dr. Housel stated that he had talked with Dr. Millikin about letting Assessment Facilitators get a course release; however, as Dr. Millikin indicated, this depends on budget, which will come from Oklahoma City in mid- to late June.
 - Dr. Housel brought up the fact that many things will be decided in the meantime concerning these facilitators.
 - Dr. Millikin suggested that Dr. Housel send a letter to Drs. Beck and Rice, requesting administration support.
 - It was so moved by Dr. Saffarian, with a second from Dr. Varner, and the motion passed unanimously.
 - Dr. Varner mentioned that we might have to go through Academic Council and Faculty Senate to get their approval as well.
- More Meaningful Conclusions/More In-depth Data – Dr. Housel brought up that this is something we have all run across in Peer Review sessions. Data need to be more specific (grade breakdowns, etc.), and conclusions need to be more informative regarding what the data mean. He suggested that it might help if faculty members who are involved in that outcome were to write the conclusion for that outcome, perhaps looking at trends from previous years.
 - Dr. Millikin also suggested that this would be a good place for faculty to reflect on specific best practices.
 - Dr. Housel suggested that the committee write the guidelines and put them out to faculty in a memo.
 - Dr. Varner added that we need to put that attendance is required (by those writing the conclusions) and definitely have guidance on what the committee is looking for in these conclusions in the memo and on the form itself.
- Policy on Missed Peer Review Session – We ran into this situation in this past Peer Review round (two degree programs not face-to-face reviewed since the individual responsible for the report was unable to attend).

- Both Dr. Housel and Dr. Varner suggested that those persons who must miss their sessions write out their answers to the assessment team's questions and submit them to the team if the department or program cannot be represented.
 - This brought up a discussion on whether this option would give some faculty the (mistaken) idea that attendance at Peer Review sessions is not mandatory (if they can just submit answers without attending, why schedule the face-to-face sessions at all?).
 - Dr. Varner suggested that, in the future, if the faculty from a degree or program cannot be present at the face-to-face meeting, they be rescheduled (if it is early enough in the review cycle); also, writing out answers does not necessarily negate attendance (for example, the session for Basic Writing/Dev. Reading where answers to team's questions were typed out and copied for team members).
- Convocation – Dr. Housel stated that a memo has gone out to all faculty soliciting their input on potential breakout sessions. Dr. Millikin reported on the results so far from that survey.
- Summer Subcommittee – Dr. Housel stated that there is much to do this summer (regarding forms, peer review process, convocation, and Task Force¹ and UAC Obligations); therefore, a subcommittee should be assembled to discuss these matters and present its recommendations to the overall committee in August².
 - Dr. Tuberville, Dr. Housel, Dr. Zimmerman, Dr. White, and Dr. Evusa all said they would be available.
- Conversion to Electronic Report Formats – Dr. Zimmerman presented information about converting existing assessment forms to an electronic format which would automat formatting and databases and might be available (for beta testing) as early as October. He will be working with Dr. Peter Macpherson from Business and Technology to put together forms that would give access to previous years' reports, would allow responses by choosing options from a drop-down menu, and would access to an embedded calculator for data analysis and distribution tables.
 - It was suggested that the form include a section on best practices and that conclusions respond to ETS data and any noticeable trends.
 - Dr. Zimmerman stated that this will be developing over the summer and should be beta tested before distributing it to all faculty.
- Election of UAC Chair for 2012-13 – Dr. Housel was re-elected by acclamation to continue as chair next year.
- A brief discussion ensued regarding how best to incorporate changes based on Peer Review Team comments into the new forms.
 - Dr. Varner explained how the current format provides space to incorporate these changes and suggested that recommended changes from a department or program Peer Review team be automatically put into the new online forms where those composing the report can have ready access to them.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted: Dr. Brenda Tuberville.

¹ Dr. Housel stated that, since the inception of the Gen Ed Task Force, four of its members have left RSU; he also stated that he has been in contact with Dr. Beck about getting a new Task Force started.

² Dr. Housel stated that the Fine Arts department may not be represented on the committee starting in the fall.

Assessment Committee Minutes

June 21, 2012

ATTENDING: Dr. James Ford, Mr. Thomas Luscomb, Dr. Monica Varner, Dr. Mary Millikin, Dr. Steve Housel, Dr. Brenda Tuberville, Dr. Craig Zimmerman, Dr. Juliet Evusa

- I. Minutes of the Last Meeting
 - a. Two changes needed:
 - i. On page 3, the previous minutes read: “however, as Dr. Millikin indicated, this depends on the budget which will come from Oklahoma City in mid- to late June.” It should read: “the budget which will be available when the Oklahoma Board of Regents releases the new budget (by mid-July).”
 - ii. Dr. Millikin mentioned that another error occurs in the second bulleted point on page 3, that it should say “administrative support,” not assistance. (The previous minutes read: “Dr. Millikin suggested that Dr. Housel send a letter to Drs. Beck and Rice requesting administration support.”)
 - b. Dr. Varner moved the minutes be approved as amended, seconded by Mr. Luscomb. Motion passed.
- II. Announcements:
 - a. Dr. Housel announced that Sara Brennan has accepted another position and will not be able to take minutes for the committee. Dr. Millikin stated that the search has begun for her replacement.
 - b. Dr. Housel announced that Dr. Tuberville has been appointed to the Global Skills for College Completion Project.
 - c. Annual Student Assessment Report – the due date is approximately Dec. 1 (summary of reports from departments and degree programs).
 - i. There was a report from Dr. Varner on Gen Ed assessment reports, who reported assessment figures and who did not. Dr. Housel brought up that several classes were taught (13 total) for which no assessment figures were submitted. In some cases (Spanish, Physical Science), extenuating circumstances may have prevented these figures from being compiled and submitted.
 - ii. A discussion ensued on how best to ensure submission (Dr. Millikin’s office will oversee collection of non-submitted data), what role the UAC should play in informing departments of classes not reported, and membership requirements on certain committees.
 1. Dr. Ford stated that both Academic Council and UAC require a member from each department.
 2. Dr. Housel suggested that the UAC communicate with the department heads, requesting missing information by the first of the fall semester.
 3. Dr. Varner mentioned that this information can be taken from SLRs, and future reports can state that these courses were not assessed, detailing ways or measures being taken to remedy the situation.
 - d. Meeting with Dr. Millikin: Dr. Housel reported on the meeting he and Dr. Varner had with Dr. Millikin in preparation for their meeting with Dr. Beck.
- III. Old Business:
 - a. Convocation and Professional Development Groups
 - i. Fall Convocation will be on August 9, 2012. A tentative schedule for the professional development breakout sessions was provided.
 - ii. Dr. Beck has approved the idea, the money for lunch has not yet been approved by Dr. Rice, but Dr. Beck was “99% sure” it would be.
 - iii. Schedule of Sessions:
 1. Dr. Housel suggested each session last one hour and 15 minutes, to be presented by a sponsor, a panel of professors associated with each topic, and include time for Q&A.
 2. A discussion ensued on whether to plan for three sessions each for the morning and afternoon or whether to go with two to maintain quality.

3. It was suggested by Dr. Varner that evaluation forms be provided for feedback on each session.
- b. UAC Membership:
 - i. Dr. Housel announced that Dr. Nancy Diede will talk with Shirley McNickle about continuing to serve on the committee.
 - ii. Fine Arts has a question mark. Dr. Housel has spoken with Dr. Moeller about the possibility of having Kirk Waller (director of bands) serve, but Dr. Moeller declined, so no definite representation from Fine Arts on the UAC is clear at this time.
 - iii. Developmental Studies – Dr. Tuberville will continue to serve for Developmental Studies.
 - c. Peer Review Survey:
 - i. Drs. Housel and Varner have submitted a proposal to the University of Indiana PUI, and it was accepted.
 - ii. Communication regarding the survey will be forthcoming (early in the fall semester).
 - d. General Education Task Force:
 - i. Dr. Housel explained why the task force was originally created and what its mission was to be.
 - ii. Since its inception, the Task Force has lost three or four of its members, and Dr. Housel stated that the general belief is that there is no longer a need for the task force, a belief that he said Dr. Beck shares.
 - iii. General Education can be treated as a program, which will allow for closing the loop and making the assessment process more useful.
 - iv. Dr. Millikin stated that the ETS gives us quantitative information needed, and with embedding the qualitative data, we will be covering our bases.
 - e. Conversion to Electronic Format:
 - i. Dr. Zimmerman has contacted Peter McPherson who is helping with this conversion. He is gone for the summer, so this process will recommence in the fall. Dr. Zimmerman stated that Mr. McPherson has designed something similar to what the UAC needs for the Curriculum Committee (to track curriculum change proposals).
 - ii. It was suggested that Dr. Millikin's office be involved to give Mr. McPherson a better idea of the qualitative information we need. Dr. Millikin mentioned that this will be especially important if we are going to aggregate results.
 - iii. On a side note, Dr. Zimmerman has agreed to continue scheduling the peer review sessions.
 - f. New Requirements:
 - i. The draft of communication to faculty regarding assessment was presented (with a new second bulleted item).
 - ii. Dr. Ford stated that we need to be clearer regarding what specifically is needed from departments in the way of assessment information.
 - iii. Dr. Housel expressed a need for departments to conduct their own assessment. This isn't currently a requirement, but we will ask UAC members to report on their department meetings and who attends.
 - iv. Dr. Varner mentioned that if one department meets 8-9 times a year, it might inspire other departments to do likewise.
 - v. Dr. Housel mentioned that the "in support" sentence in the draft was added by Dr. Beck.

(It was at this point that the minute taker had to leave the meeting due to other commitments.)

Submitted 12 July 2012 Dr. Brenda Tuberville. Dr. Tuberville left the meeting at 2:05 to teach a class. The balance of the meeting notes were taken by Dr. Mary Millikin.

Draft of Email Communication to Faculty

Dr. Housel has drafted an email to faculty to foster more comprehensive assessment processes and practices that would include assessment of all online courses and programs, all part-time faculty as well as full-time faculty.

Dr. Ford suggested adding a third bullet to Dr. Housel's email to read as follows:

- Departments are encouraged to draw meaningful and significant actionable results from assessment outcomes.

Dr. Housel may add an example to this bullet.

Discussion continued regarding the documentation of department meetings at which assessment of SLOs is discussed. Dr. Beck has recommended that dates and times of such meetings be tracked and made available to the Higher Learning Commission accreditation team in fall 2014. UAC members agreed that this should be promoted and included in the email to faculty.

Assessment Repository

Dr. Varner suggested making available all assessment documents on the N: drive, including peer review reports and student learning reports. This would provide for greater transparency and make available these resources with less restricted access. Dr. Zimmerman suggested making this new repository available through the Hillcat Hub. Dr. Millikin volunteered to investigate the possibilities.

General Education Cognitive Assessment

Dr. Millikin provided a review of advantages and disadvantages of forced Testing Center versus course-embedded General Education testing. Dr. Housel reported that Dr. Beck has recommended RSU's General Education assessment, using the ETS Proficiency Profile (PP), be mandatory for entering freshmen and sophomores with 45-60 semester credit hours and be conducted in the Testing Center rather than course-embedded. A statement has been added to the RSU Bulletin as of June 20, 2012 which would facilitate this.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of the full ETS PP versus the abbreviated version. Testing Center staff has reported that the average freshmen in fall 2011 spent between five and ten minutes completing the abbreviated version. Dr. Ford expressed concern about results of such outcomes. Because Dr. Evusa had to leave the meeting at 2:42 and a quorum was no longer maintained, this topic was shelved until next meeting.

Next UAC Meeting

The next meeting was set for Thursday, June 28, and the meeting adjourned at 2:45.

Submitted 6 June 2012 Dr. Mary Millikin

Assessment Committee Minutes

July 12, 2012

This is a continuation of the meeting held on June 21, 2012)

ATTENDING: Dr. Steve Housel, chair, Dr. Massoud Saffarian, Dr. Juliet Evusa, Mr. Tom Luscomb, Dr. Mary Millikin, Dr. Joel White, Dr. Brenda Tuberville, Dr. Jim Ford

Minutes from the last meeting (both those taken by Dr. Tuberville and those taken by Dr. Millikin) will be approved at the next meeting.

I. Reports

a. Repository

- i. Dr. Housel called on Dr. Millikin to talk about the new repository which will give faculty greater access to information. The existing N drive is problematic in that not all faculty have access to it; however, we currently have access to two different programs – ImageNow and Zytrak – which can be more easily accessed (and linked together). Past assessment reports and more up-to-date reports and information could be uploaded to ImageNow (perhaps one of the duties of the new Administrative Assistant in Dr. Millikin’s office).
- ii. Dr. Housel suggested that documents be uploaded in .pdf files so they cannot be changed once uploaded.
- iii. Dr. Tuberville suggested that ImageNow perhaps could be shown as a link on the Faculty/Staff webpage through the RSU website.
- iv. Tom Luscomb moved that the UAC support this repository; motion seconded by Dr. White and passed.

b. Breakout Sessions

- i. Since we have six sessions that the faculty has expressed an interest in attending, we will have three sessions in the morning (on Aug. 9) and three sessions in the afternoon.
- ii. A discussion ensued regarding what specific topics would cover, who would lead and who would serve on the panels for each.

II. Old Business

a. Final Review of Email

- i. Dr. Housel discussed his thoughts on what to include in the email to deans and department heads regarding improving responses in certain areas of assessment documents. In order to encourage faculty to be more specific and include certain types of information, it was suggested that an example both of a poor response and a more informative response be provided with the email, perhaps reproducing columns A-H (page 3 of Degree Program SLR).
- ii. Dr. Ford suggested that the examples (in future reports) be put at the end so as not to interrupt the flow of the report.

III. New Business

a. Best Practice Ideas

- i. These are taken from peer review sessions; how best can we utilize this information? Dr. Housel provided an example from Dr. David Tait of a brief two-paragraph summary of a technique he uses in his classes.
- ii. A discussion ensued on how best to share this information (and others like it) with the rest of the faculty.
 1. Dr. Housel suggested that we ask faculty to write something similar to Dr. Tait’s example (a couple of paragraphs), then we could distribute what we get to the rest of the faculty.
 2. Dr. Housel stated that he already has three others and would like to get three more.
 3. Dr. Tuberville suggested that we start with what we have and post them, if possible, through a link on the Faculty/Staff page of the university’s website.
 4. Dr. Ford stated that perhaps this might be better coordinated by the UAC chair, and Dr. Housel agreed to handle this with the help of Kelli Fields, the university’s webmaster.

- b. Assessment Facilitator
 - i. Dr. Millikin reported on a meeting with Dr. Beck regarding this position and stated that the funding for it was “very promising.”
 - ii. Dr. Housel asked if this would have to be brought up before the Faculty Senate and Academic Council as a courtesy, and Dr. Ford indicated that it should.
 - iii. Dr. Ford then indicated that he had questions about this position (why we need it and others).
 - iv. Dr. Housel stated that the three benefits of having this position would be: (1) consistency to provide guidance with outcome statements and standards if the departments want this help; (2) provide institutional memory as the committee undergoes changes with revolving membership; and (3) a one-year trial.
 - v. Dr. Ford stated that it made more sense to him to give the UAC chair the release time that would go to a Facilitator.
 - vi. Dr. Evusa expressed some concern about a duplication of effort between a Facilitator and the UAC chair.
 - vii. Dr. Millikin stated that we would need some sort of guidance in setting this precedent (to have UAC chair act as Facilitator).
 - viii. Dr. Housel suggested he and Dr. Millikin would work on formalizing the position description and run it by Dr. Beck.
 - ix. Dr. White asked if the proposed outreach (to other departments) would justify the release time to Dr. Beck.
 - x. Dr. Millikin stated that other colleges and universities in our region have something similar to this; at NSU, each school has its own assessment facilitator.
 - xi. Dr. Housel stated that he and Dr. Millikin would put something together and bring it back to the committee.
 - c. Review – Changes to Forms
 - i. Dr. White stated that, on the SLRs, a major problem would be alleviated by sending out examples of the kind of information we want (see “Old Business: Final Review of Email” above) and that this would be the spot to provide some historical review.
 - ii. Dr. Housel asked if we wanted to add a section for best practices.
 - 1. Dr. Ford suggested that it might be added as part of the analysis (between #4-5 or #5-6).
 - 2. Dr. Housel stated that he believed putting it between #5-6 would be a good place to include this section.
 - 3. Dr. Ford suggested that we change the wording on #6 to invite the inclusion of best practices.
 - iii. Dr. Housel indicated that, in Section 4, the Nursing Department has had problems in the past with the “Degree Program Outcomes / Student Learning Outcomes” language being unclear.
 - 1. Dr. Ford pointed out that the language should be consisted for all departments.
 - 2. Mr. Luscomb asked if Nursing was the only department with a problem in this particular area.
 - iv. Dr. Housel also indicated that, on page 4 #7A, there was some confusion regarding “full-time faculty” especially for departments where full-time faculty from other departments teach some of their degree courses.
 - 1. Mr. Luscomb asked if some clarification in the language would help.
 - v. Dr. White suggested that, on the Peer Review Report, the committee should perhaps insert on page 2 between #5-6 a question about best practices.
 - vi. On the Degree Program form, page 3 column D: Dr. Housel stated that many departments with four-year degrees and small programs sample everyone; should we add “if any” here or leave it alone. It was the consensus that the wording not be changed.
 - 1. Dr. White suggested we change column E to read “N” or “Sample Size/N.”
 - vii. On page 3, Section 3, 2nd sentence: Dr. Housel stated that some are not reporting anything here, and Dr. Millikin suggested that they look at examples from others. Dr. Ford stated that time may make it easier to remember to include this particular information.
 - viii. Dr. Housel stated that he would circulate the changes and post the revised forms.
- IV. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 2:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Dr. Brenda Tuberville, Interim Secretary