

# Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

August 29, 2014

Present: Clark, Sarah; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Kirk, Johnny; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Oberrieder, Matt; Saffarian, Massood; Smith, Marla; St. John, Evalon; Weller, Kirk; Zimmermann, Craig

Absent: White, Joel

Called to Order: 12:06 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

**Approval of the minutes of the meeting from April 23, 2014 and May 23, 2014.**

## Announcements and Reports

### A. Announcements

- i. **Agenda Item: Welcome New Members** Dr. Matt Oberrieder from English and Humanities will be shadowing Dr. James Ford (as he has a conflicting schedule this year with UAC meetings) and Evalon St. John from Mathematics and Physical Science will be filling in as a veteran UAC member for Dr. Jaenbai's remaining term.
- ii. **Agenda Item: Communications Department Representation** The communications department will not have representation by choice. For a number of reasons Dr. Gentry, when asked to be a representative for the UAC declined. As has been the case in the past and not isolated to the communications department, many of the communication faculty members felt that representing their department on the UAC did not benefit them promotionally.
- iii. **Agenda Item: Fall Meeting Days and Times** The only time that fit the members' schedules was noon on Fridays.
- iv. **Agenda Item: Hub-based Internal Assessment Website** This will allow all members of the faculty access to an internal assessment website. Blank assessment forms such as SLRs, PRRs, and previous year's reports can be accessed for use and reference. Dr. Housel is working with Cathy Burns from Computing Services to populate the fields on the website and anticipate completion in September.
- v. **Agenda Item: Convocation- Professional Development** Dr. Dotterer emphasized the importance of educating the faculty on the migration from Angel to Blackboard and the significance it will have in becoming the segway to Quality Matters. This would be a great forum for a professional development day. Dr. Millikin stated that Dr. Teri Bycroft is the faculty chair for the university development committee. She has big plans for faculty professional development outside of convocation. Dr. Housel noted that the university development committee was in a neutral position until Dr. Bycroft was appointed chair. Dr. Marla Smith said that the committee has already conducted a brown bag lunch with the deans under her direction.

## Reports

- i. **Agenda Item: Quality Matters** Dr. Housel defined the national benchmark for online course design (Quality Matters). It has sprung up all throughout the U.S starting as a three million dollar grant for facilitators at the University of Maryland to develop quality assurance in the online distance learning courses. The program at the University of Maryland is now self-sustaining and Quality Matters is being adopted by institutions all over the U.S. RSU's OU board of regents are members of Quality Matters. Dr. Housel, along with the collaboration of Dr. Gary Dotterer from the Center for Teaching and Learning are investigating the program and how it could be implemented at RSU. In their findings they determined a revealing issue in that students who were enrolled in online courses at RSU but residing in another state would need to have an agreement with the institutions in the students' residing state to allow this

student to take the course(s). RSU would be charged a fee for providing courses to said student. To be compliant, RSU would have to be affiliated with Quality Matters to continue with distance education programs. The courses offered online would be reviewed by an oversight committee every three years by a team of four reviewers.

- ii. **Agenda Item: General Education Committee** All department heads know what the SLO (five) are for the GE program. Dr. Housel cannot make it to all of the meetings due to class schedule conflicts so Dr. Craig Zimmermann will attend all meetings in his place. Dr. Jim Ford is the chairperson and will be able to relate discussions from the GEC back to the UAC. Dr. Housel feels that it is important to align the UAC, GEC and the Distance Learning Committee as they are interconnected and work toward the same goals for the institution.
- iii. **Agenda Item: ETS Data Collection** Dr. Mary Millikin provided a **\*handout see page \*** on ETS testing. Results from the most recent data reveal that freshmen are taking the test seriously whereas the sophomores, having taken the test their freshman year, are not. They don't seem to see a benefit and hence the mean score drops overall for sophomores. This is a very similar trend in the national database. Dr. Millikin sent letters out to the incoming freshmen to take the ETS test by the end of September 2014. Those that take it early have higher mean scores whereas those that wait until they have a hold from early class registration have lower mean scores. It raised the question about the efficacy of the positive/negative enforcer. Dr. Kirk Weller and Dr. Peter Macpherson discussed creating a sliding scale for students to help with the scores. Having a sliding scale positive enforcer would allow students the opportunity to obtain a higher score for a larger reward (in this case a credit on their Hillcat card). Dr. Housel asked when Accountability and Academics will begin testing seniors. Dr. Millikin responded that her office will have review the budget to decide what is available for the incentive.
- iv. **Agenda Item: Assessment Day/Six-day week** Academic Council appointed a committee to investigate the possibility of a campus-wide assessment day. RSU would need to look at a 6-day week with Saturday classes a possibility as a way to improve acceptance from the state legislation. The committee will have to look at other institutions to see how this is done. Dr. Massoud Saffarian and Dr. Macpherson have come from institutions where it was orchestrated very well and very well received by faculty and students.
  - All campus activities were canceled for this assessment day to help with participation. Testing was done in computer labs (including ETS), lecturers were invited to present and professional development was offered.
- v. It was particularly difficult to get students from the business department to come take assessment tests. This day set aside (on a Wednesday) allowed the institution the opportunity to capture a number of students from all departments including the business department.
  - Dr. Housel, Dr. Macpherson and Dr. Saffarian have a conference call scheduled with an expert to discuss the assessment day in detail. In the meantime, they will follow up with the committee's progress over the fall semester.
- vi. **New Student Learning Report forms** Dr. Housel presented an example of the new student learning report form on the Smartboard for review from the UAC. Dr. Marla Smith discussed the need for the health sciences department to submit a report particularly for the EMS program that has measures that mirror the measurements from the accreditation institution. The UAC agreed that the section Part IV. of the student learning report could use these measurements. It was noted that the health sciences department will still need to have representation in the UAC for discussion as long as they are answering parts 2, 3, and 5 of the SLR. Hybrid- will see how it affects the PR.
- vii. **New Date for SLR Submission** The dates for program SLRs are September 19 and General Education SLRs due September 26, 2014.
- viii. **MBA SLOs** Dr. Bruce Garrison is in the process of creating the SLO for the new MBA program. During the HLC site visit for the implementation of the MBA program (July 2013) the reviewers suggested trimming down the SLO objectives on the rubrics. They thought that the outcomes of the rubrics were quite strong but were not sustainable.

## **New Business**

- A. Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule 2014-2015** It has been very difficult getting 6-7 UAC members for large blocks of time to facilitate the peer review sessions increasing the workload for Dr. Zimmermann to create the schedule for the peer reviews. Dr. Johnny Kirk offered to help with the scheduling.
- B. Agenda Item: Representation for Department of Communications** Dean Elwell is not aware that the communications department does not wish to provide a faculty member to represent their department in the UAC. It was suggested to present the concern to the Faculty Senate. The UAC collectively felt that the communications department should have representation on the UAC.
- C. Agenda Item: New General Education Outcomes**
- D. Agenda Item: Outcomes and Objectives (\*handout Course Objectives vs Student Learning Outcomes and Letter to Faculty from Dr. Richard Beck\*)** Dr. Millikin and Dr. Dotterer have reviewed a sample of the fall 2014 syllabi in regards to course objectives and the course outcomes. Currently, the outcomes are printed under the objectives and not separated out. The HLC looks at program level outcomes separate from objectives.
- Evalon St. John cautioned the UAC that several faculty members in her department were sent up to four different versions of the syllabi instructions rather late in the semester when classes had already resumed. It confused the faculty as to what was the correct format. She said that Dr. Sue Katz Amburn, a faculty member in her department remembers a time when the course objectives and course outcomes were in the syllabi integrated with the department goals. Over the course of time, they were taken out.
  - Dr. Dotterer noticed variety in the syllabi and saw a need for systemization of syllabi particularly in regards to course objectives, course outcomes and ADA statements. He sent out a sample syllabi template as a suggestion to the departments. Academic Council did review the lists months before. Dr. Jim Ford added that the RSU Policies and Procedure Handbook is the golden rule for syllabi format and that the other syllabi instructions were merely suggestions.
  - Dr. Millikin suggested that syllabi can be outdated and need to be amended to fit with the guidelines. The next step is to review the syllabi and present the findings to the Faculty Senate then to the Academic Policy Committee and then to the Academic Council for their recommendation.
  - Discussion ensued about the need for both student learning outcomes and program student learning outcomes. This may be new for some faculty. The university needs uniformity. There is a need for an objective statement and Dr. Millikin recommended that it come from the UAC and the committee should present it for direction of the definitions of the two. Dr. Oberrieder suggested the need for reporting the student learning outcomes for the department. There is course embedded assessment and there is the program level assessment (the program level being broader and the course level being narrower). The key point is:
    - one is course level
    - one is student level
  - The objective is the plan and the outcome is the end result. It is important to get to a decision quickly before the HLC site visit in November. Departments are wrapping it up for the academic year 2013-2014 for their student learning reports so would need to set up the change for next year. The educational piece could roll out next year as professional development. HLC uses outcomes for the program whereas the state board of regents uses program outcomes. Dr. Housel asked for volunteers for a subcommittee to develop two to three sentences to define objectives and outcomes. The committee members are Dr. Housel, Dr. Oberrieder and Dr. Marla Smith.
- E. Agenda Item: Review of tutoring Labs and Advising Services**

## Old Business

- A. Agenda Item: Revising Peer Review Sessions (\*handout of the Student Learning Report Degree Program Checklist\*)** There is considerable time spent on form design and not so much on pedagogical design. By utilizing the checklist, the time spent by the UAC representatives will be significantly reduced by assessing the completeness of the program and general education SLRs before they are formally submitted. This checklist will make the department UAC representative responsible for settling any issues prior to formal submission. To implement the checklist the representatives will need the bulletin, last year's SLR, this year's SLR, and the most recent Peer Review Report. Completion of this initial task will allow more time to talk about the bigger issues in the Peer Review Sessions. There is a need for pedagogically stimulating information in these student learning reports. Dr. Housel sent an email to deans and department heads to send completed SLRs by September 19, 2014 to Dr. Housel and Susan Wong (for archiving). He would like to bring in the unit action plan to the process. **(\*handout of example of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness for the History and Political Science Program\*)** The strategic planning at the department level is slow. The question was posed, "does the UAC look at the most recent unit action plans or go back five years?" The unit action plans don't always relate to the assessment plan. Dr. Ford reported on observations from faculty that there are many questions about deadlines, the reporting, and should the department not want to do this or claim they have completed the SLR what alternative does the UAC have in reinforcing the changes it recommends? There is an opportunity to address this now that the deadline date for SLRs was pushed up one month. The SLRs will be done earlier this fall. It is expected to take 30 days to consider the reports and accept them or send them back to fix issues. Dr. John Kirk offered that some authors will say they did not have much input. The UAC members don't have reduced service time by doing this. The capacity building by the UAC is becoming versed in the strengths and weaknesses of the reports.
- B. Agenda Item: Dr. Zimmermann's DGS (Data Gathering and Sorting) software** Dr. Zimmermann summarized his data gathering and sorting software search and his development of a prototype for instructors to upload into a DGS he created. It was determined that an in-house DGS would be the best format at this time. DR. Zimmermann's DGS allows the instructor the opportunity to upload their own data. This would allow real time results for analyzing the data. It would take one to two semesters to explain how this will benefit the departments and the UAC. It was decided that Dr. Zimmermann will be excused from peer review sessions to implement this DGS in the spring of 2015. Dr. Smith asked the committee if it was acceptable to send out reminders to the departments in regards to the due date. She suggested sending out a reminder for the due date and for the new form. Discussion ensued how the departments are struggling with their program assessments and the strategic plan and institutional effectiveness. The unit action plan is attached to assessment and it will drive really great faculty members away that are already overburdened. The UAC needs to find a way to connect it so that faculty are aware/informed of what the strategic plan is without overwhelming them. Could pose the question "does your strategic plan have anything to do with your assessment?" Dr. Kirk suggested three stages of the review:
- Checklist
  - Student Learning Report
  - Strategic Plan (just bring it up)
- C. Agenda Item: Summer Projects**
- Quality Matters- Instructional Design Subcommittee
  - Populate Internal Assessment Website
  - Report on Assessment Processes and Instructional Changes
  - *Faculty Insights* Newsletter

Meeting Adjourned at 2:01 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted by Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Scribe.

# Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

October 10, 2014

Location: BH Rm. 124

Present: Clark, Sarah; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Kirk, John; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Oberrieder, Matthew; Saffarian, Massoud; Smith, Marla; St. John, Evalon; Weller, Kirk; Zimmermann, Craig

Absent: White, Joel

Called to Order: 12:09 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

## Approval of the meeting minutes from August 29, 2014.

### Announcements and Reports

#### A. Announcements

- i. **Agenda Item: Sport Management Representation** Sports Management will have representation from either Dr. Joel White or the department head, Dr. Susan Willis. It is difficult for their two-person department as they are the only faculty members that could represent the UAC.

#### B. Reports

- A. **Agenda Item: Communications Department Representation** A meeting with Dr. Frank Elwell, Dr. Richard Beck, Dr. Mary Millikin and Dr. Jeff Gentry determined that the communications department will have representation on the UAC.
- B. **Agenda Item: Assessment Day/Six-Day Week Investigation** There is no report from the committee (Dr. Housel, Dr. Massoud Saffarian and Dr. Peter Macpherson) at this time as they just formed a month ago. The process of having an assessment day will take one to two years to implement. Dr. Saffarian discussed the possibility of inviting a guest speaker from OSU to discuss the benefits of having an assessment day and how to engage students in the process. It was suggested that he be invited in the spring and meet with the UAC for a lunch meeting. OSU has their assessment day in April and has been very well received. Dr. Millikin suggested offering sessions on innovative programs for course evaluation and course development on this day. Dr. Craig Zimmermann suggested offering training in multi-disciplinary skills across the institution. Sarah Clark offered providing a segment on literacy information across the disciplines. It was universally agreed that is imperative to a highly successful event as a bad experience would prove difficult getting a good turnout for future events. The members recalled the success of the Convocation breakout sessions. Because they were so well received by the faculty, it is anticipated that this assessment day will be as well.
- C. **Agenda Item: Program and General Education SLR Submissions** All reports have been submitted at this time. Having the SLRs submitted at this early date has proved most beneficial for Dr. Millikin in obtaining data for the Board of Regents report due at the end of October.
- D. **Agenda Item: HLC Peer Reviewer Training** Dr. Housel addressed Dr. Dotterer in regards to the programs the Center for Teaching and Learning has been developing for faculty training. Dr. Dotterer responded that the CTL has been producing a training module for faculty that instruct in blended or online courses. Dr. Dotterer sent a survey to randomly selected faculty in hopes to receive feedback specifically for blended and online courses. At the time of the meeting, he had seven responses from 32 of the selected faculty members. The CTL created a checklist for faculty to utilize before they proceed with teaching blended or online courses. Dr. Dotterer is proposing this checklist as a means to help faculty implement a common standard across all curriculum and schools. Dr. Dotterer is optimistic the Academic Council will approve a checklist for the blended and

online courses that week. Once approved, the CTL will have the checklist available for the spring 2015 blended/online courses. Dr. Marla Smith reiterated the need for standard policies across the institution. It was brought to her attention that students expressed confusion over the varying policies from one area of the institution to another. It was the desire of Dr. Dotterer and Dr. Housel to have a checklist implemented prior to the HLC site visit November 17-19, 2014 to show that RSU has evidence addressing this matter. It was noted that this checklist would only apply to blended and online courses and not to courses that use supplemental online components in their course instruction.

**E. Agenda Item: Update from the General Education Committee** Dr. Jim Ford stated that the GEC has been meeting frequently. They passed a new GE course proposal. They are moving forward with the assessment of the GE courses. There are five new outcomes across five major GE areas. Each department has done its own GE report (should they continue doing this process and do the same assessment or should they go more global rather than departmental?). Some of the feedback:

- It seems to be the most manageable way to assess.
- The GEC does not want to interfere with the UAC's format. The GEC is open to feedback and recommendations. Dr. Housel felt the UAC lacks the time to implement anything at this stage. They do have the option of not assessing the GE courses at this time and turn it over to the GEC.
- It was suggested that they could do the review sessions jointly with the UAC and the GEC. Currently, the UAC has three review members for each peer review session. It might prove beneficial to ask for a GEC member to attend the peer review sessions.
- If the GEC does take over the peer review sessions, an option would be to have them "train" with the UAC in joint sessions this year.
- Dr. Ford reminded the group that the sessions would be longer that day or increase the load for the reviewers.
- Dr. Kirk Weller offered that if the GE courses/program were separated out, it would make the departments participate more. It also could prove more difficult if they are spread out and could increase the workload for the UAC.
- Dr. Macpherson suggested parsing out especially the GE courses as some programs don't have GE courses (like ACCT, BADM).
- Dr. Weller stated that the GE courses (three in Fine Arts) have commonalities and it may be similar in other programs. It may prove beneficial to look at the commonalities and have a discussion about specific points, in a larger meeting like a forum. This could provide quality assurance in a broad forum (which was the idea for the April 2013 Forum).

Motion: Dr. Weller motioned and Dr. Housel amended: The UAC authorizes the GEC to take over the peer review assessments of the GE classes and take it out of the review for the department peer-to-peer meetings for this year. The UAC and the GEC will together review how it has worked in the past and meet again to look at how they would like to proceed for the next year. Sarah Clark seconded. All in favor, no abstentions.

**F. Agenda Item: Data Gather/Sorting** Drs. Housel, Macpherson, and Zimmermann are collaborating on a format that will make data gathering for student learning reports user-friendly for faculty. They are calling upon colleagues at other state institutions to see how they are implementing this process at their respective institutions. Discussion ensued over the components remaining the same but the design changing. Some of the feedback:

- Dr. Mary Millikin offered insight from her training at HLC in Illinois previously that month. She stated that HLC has certain expectations that RSU has already implemented. RSU is viewed as thorough. The UAC puts a great deal of thought and time into the reviews. However, it is good practice to provide continuous improvement moving forward.

- Dr. John Kirk commented that the forms proved difficult to work with in the pdf format. He suggested using a Word document to construct the report and submit the final document in pdf.
- Dr. Zimmermann discussed his investigation into a for-profit company that offers software and implementation of data collection called Elumen- <http://elumen.info>. The software (from Minnesota) has been in existence since 2003. The cost for the program is \$5,000 (including training) for set up and \$10,000 per year to maintain. Drs. Dotterer, Zimmermann, Millikin and Housel will meet in the next 2-3 weeks to discuss this option.
- Dr. Matthew Oberrieder currently collects data for his department. He said it would be greatly appreciated and well supported if faculty could upload the data to a user-friendly platform that would have real time analysis to obtain results tied to outcomes and objectives. Dr. Zimmermann will send out a Doodle survey to the UAC to find interest in a group meeting with a representative from Elumen. If the UAC agrees to a program like this, it would need to go through the budget hearing process in April to implement in the fall of 2015. (It was determined that Xitracs was an expensive program that provided things beyond RSU's needs).
- Dr. Kirk offered that the assessment data could help with the gradebook as the information would be readily available.

### **New Business**

#### **A. Agenda Item: Completion of Checklists Agenda Item: Peer Review Sessions, 2014-15**

**\*Handout Student Learning Report Degree Program Checklist pg 6\*** The idea for the checklist is for the committee reviewer to review the reports with the checklist as the guide and to identify areas that need amendments prior to final submission. Dr. Massoud Saffarian concurred that the checklist was a great tool in working with Dr. Bert Tollison on the business department program SLRs (making the task much more effective and efficient).

#### **B. Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule 2014-15** Dr. Housel is not sure how they will work out incorporating the unit action plans into the peer review sessions. There has been very little discussion about unit action plans prior to this meeting. For best practices, they are designed to be used at the program level to promote discussion. The first objective for incorporating the unit action plans is academic. In order to successfully incorporate the unit action plans, they would need to have a strategic plan to move forward. Dr. Zimmermann presented an example of a strategic plan on the RSU website with the Smartboard. By incorporating the strategic plan:

- It would allow an in-depth discussion about measurable objectives.
- Keep the eye on assessment (not on mismanagement of time or resources).
- Could glean information from the reports from the last five years prompting a review and possible changes.
- The Unit Action Plan and the SLR are interchangeable and influence one another. They will not be grading the Unit Action Plan just looking at them a bit more thoroughly if they know they have an audience.

Possibilities for Fall Peer Review Session dates:

- October 31, 2014
- November 21, 2014
- These dates would serve as "test runs" for the new process. Review teams would remain virtually the same as last year with new members replacing outgoing members.

#### **C. Agenda Item: New General Education Outcomes eliminated**

#### **D. Agenda Item: Meeting with Deans and Department Heads and Dr. Beck** Dr. Housel posed these questions on behalf of the UAC:

- What feedback do they have for the UAC for 2015-2016?
- What could the UAC do to help them?
- Would could they do to help the UAC?

Dr. Beck will send a letter in January 2015 to fifty randomly selected faculty to review the strategic plan that is due in 2015.

## Old Business

**A. Agenda Item: Outcomes vs. Objectives** Dr. Millikin described the non-prescriptive method that HLC utilizes and in doing so, they will not mandate terminology for institutions in their charge. It was her conclusion from the HLC training session she attended, that the outcomes are at the program level whereas the objectives are at the course level. HLC leaves it up to the institution to decide how to use the terminology. It was also discussed that the degree programs could be viewed as having outcomes where course programs have objectives.

- Dr. Oberrieder suggested that the issue is the measurability of knowing what we want the student to learn. Outcomes can be used appropriately in both programs and courses.
- Dr. Housel pointed out that in Quality Matters it is exactly the opposite.
- Dr. Millikin suggested revising the jargon of the assessment plan on the web page. The UAC decided this plan can change the language.
- It was decided to share it at the next meeting and vote on it.
- Dr. Ford cautioned that if it is revised then the syllabus protocol needs to change in the RSU policies and procedures. This would need to cycle through the university committee approvals taking up to a year. Once approved, the assessment plan would need to be revised. Dr. Ford suggested that the GEC could hold a forum this year involving the UAC and could review the reports to expedite the process.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Scribe.



# Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

December 10, 2014

Location: BH Rm. 124

Present: Clark, Sarah; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Kirk, John; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Oberrieder, Matthew; Saffarian, Massoud; Smith, Marla; St. John, Evalon; Weller, Kirk; Zimmermann, Craig

Absent: White, Joel

Called to Order: 10:03 a.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

**I. Approval of the meeting minutes from August 29, 2014 and October 10, 2014.** Tabled.

## **II. Announcements and Reports**

### **A. Announcements**

- i. **Agenda Item: Department Representation: Communications & Sports Management** Evalon St. John mentioned the importance of having representation while reviewing the communications department in their peer review session. She addressed the burden that is placed on other departments when departments do not provide a representative. After much discussion, it was determined that some of the challenges in finding committee members can be contributed to:
  - a. Twenty percent of faculty have reassigned service time
  - b. Course release requires more money and more faculty (adjuncts) to redistribute the workload

Friday, December 12, Dr. Housel and Dr. Zimmermann plan to attend the Academic Council meeting to discuss this issue. Dr. Ford foresees the Academic Council adhering to the academic policies and all departments will have representation in the UAC.

### **B. Reports**

- i. **Agenda Item: HLC Visit** Dr. Mary Millikin discussed the reporting from the HLC visitors when they viewed the Pryor campus and facility in 2013. The criterion was met and they did mention that the facilities were somewhat lavish. They noted some areas for improvement:
  - There should be some books available in the library
  - There should be a presence for assisting students with financial aid
  - There is a need for regular full time faculty to teach the courses ( high number of adjunct faculty teaching)
  - There is a need for a concerted effort to provide professional development for adjunct faculty

Discussion ensued in relation to the Quality Matters initiative in regards to online/blended courses. A question was posed: "Is the online/blended student comparable to those in on-ground courses on the Claremore campus? It would be beneficial to know if the students are enrolling in Pryor on-ground courses more frequently or online/blended courses from Claremore (which would negate the need for the facility in Pryor). Dr. Kirk Weller spoke on a similar trend seen with students in Bartlesville. Some of the issue has been reported seem to be due to advisement. Bartlesville students claim they must resort to enrolling in courses on the Claremore campus to fulfill degree requirements. They report that the atmosphere is not welcoming and do not like to attend the Claremore campus. Dr. Massood Saffarian said that is unfortunate that they feel that way. He finds the SAP program students from Bartlesville in particular, academically stronger than regular business students. Dr. Millikin stated that for the last two semesters, first time freshmen enrollment has decreased in Bartlesville.

Dr. Millikin followed up on reporting from the HLC site visit in November 2014. The report will not be available until after the winter break. Some points worth early mentioning:

- The process of the Self-study was conscientious and thorough
- The Self-study highlighted and identified RSU's concerns
- There is a perceived need for enhanced shared governance on issues
- There was a trend toward more complicated processes that need to be simplified (like the Strategic Plan)
- This was the first time any of the reviewers heard of a Peer Review process for assessment of SLOs.
- Suggested examining the committees/service time and becoming more efficient
- Would like to see enhanced transparency and decision-making
- Would like to see inclusion of the faculty in the decision making processes or at least in the university communication process.

President Rice will outline the new Strategic Plan process and its development. The president's office is considering Convocation for January 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup>. This would be a perfect opportunity to introduce the new faculty and adjuncts and to roll out the new Strategic Plan process.

- i. **Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule 2014-2015** Some of the peer review teams are in place. There may be concurrent schedules for the spring. Dr. Beck would like to attend at least one session (considering April 17). Criminal Justice and Business are scheduled on that day and it was determined that this might not be the best representation of the process if he attends these department's sessions. Dr. Housel suggested that he and Dr. Millikin could visit with Dr. Diane Clayton and Dr. Brian Watters prior to the Criminal Justice session to promote a positive session.
- ii. **Agenda Item: Distance Education Committee** Discussion about merging CTL, ACS and the helpdesk into one helpline telephone number to assist students and faculty with computer technical issues. Coverage would be available from 8 am until 10 pm 7 days/week. It is worth noting that ninety percent of the time it's password specific issues.
- iii. **Agenda Item: General Education Committee** The UAC is currently reviewing the SLRs. The question was posed, "Will the GEC members be aware of the 40 reports?" The GEC is expecting information from the UAC.
- iv. **Agenda Item: Faculty Development Committee** Dr. Teri Bycroft continues to move the committee in a productive direction.
- v. **Class Schedule Committee** Dr. Ford spoke to the proposed class scheduling designed to accommodate students with class overlap for four days/ week with block classes on Fridays. A recent survey indicated that 28% of the students that responded were interested in weekend classes and seventeen faculty members were interested in teaching weekend classes. A decision would need to be made very quickly to accommodate the fall 2015 scheduling.
- vi. **Agenda Item: ETS and RSU Student Data Collection** Rewarding students on a sliding scale may help boost better results on the testing. The fall 2014 semester did not have enough sophomore students responding to the ETS to generate a report. Dr. Millikin will need to review the budget for funding to test the seniors for spring 2015. She also mentioned that the administrative survey vendor tripled their fees making it difficult to complete all the requested testing. The freshmen ETS reports will be available before Spring Break of 2015.
- vii. **Agenda Item: MBA SLOs** Dr. Millikin \*handout page 6\* discussed the visit from the HLC reviewers in June 2013. The reviewers felt there were too many SLOs and that it would not be sustainable to continue with this level of reporting. A change was recommended for the business department's SLOs. The changes have not been implemented at this time.
- viii. **Agenda Item: New Peer Review Sessions: E & H and Communications** The first session took place on Friday, October 31, 2014 with English and Humanities. The peer reviewers consisted of Evalon St. John, Dr. Kirk Weller, Dr. Craig Zimmermann, and Dr. Housel. The second session took place on Friday, December 5, 2014 with the same team. The team had the opportunity to compare and contrast the two departments. Dr. Kirk reported that the new and improved approach was much more productive and moving in the right direction. The departments had a better understanding of the process and the role of the UAC. Ms. St. John reported that the English and Humanities department sent three pages of questions to the review team. Once the UAC reviewers revised the process, the Communications department was able to send only one

page of questions. She felt it was more effective addressing specific issues unique to each respective department. The reviewers found the Communications department collected their assessment data by May, checking what they were missing (if anything) against the SLR from the UAC. The Communications department reported:

- having regular departmental meetings
- they do not have course overload
- have time for research

In comparison, English and Humanities faculty mentor adjunct faculty ensuring quality in their courses. The comparison process was successful for the reviewers to glean information that may be useful for many departments. Dr. Zimmermann suggested having prior meetings with a set of discussion points prior to the peer review meeting. In fairness to the English and Humanities department the peer review seemed like the old approach instead of the new version as was intended. Paperwork needs to correspond with the direction they are expecting. Currently, there are two components:

- with the student learning report
- followed by the peer review session

Integration of the Unit Action Plans were very well received. It may be helpful to send out questions to the rest of the committee. **\*Handout from Dr. Zimmermann page 7\*** HLC looked at the Unit Action Plans and thought it may be a bit too much. They commented that there was very little effective leadership in Unit Action Plans and strategic plans (many faculty don't know what they are). Ms. St. John asked how they might integrate the Unit Action Plan with the SLR? The peer reviewers were not scoring this year. The teams will share their reports with comments instead. The checklist proved to be valuable (for clarity) for "scrubbing" the report before the face-to-face sessions. No SLR should make it to the peer review before first going to the UAC representative from that department. If a UAC member says the report is good, it is good. The question was posed: "Does the UAC want a standard set of questions for all the departments?" Dr. Holly Kruse from the Communications department recommended a table of contents on the first page of The SLR. Communications were enthusiastic about talking about their Unit Action Plans. The Communications had stellar accomplishments exceeding their goals from their Unit Action Plan.

### III. New Business

- A. Agenda Item: New Approach to Peer Review Sessions: Takeaways** Dr. Housel presented a demonstration on the Smartboard of the many new features available on the RSU website. Dr. Housel navigated to the Assessment page where all SLRs for 2013-2014 are housed for public view. Dr. Jim Ford suggested offering a narrative in a column on the page (an overall summary describing the intent of the SLR). Dr. Housel asked if Peer Review Reports should be uploaded to the RSU website. It was determined by the group that it could possibly be viewed in a negative light if the comments or reporting were not favorable. Dr. Kirk Weller spoke to the part 2 and part 5 of the report and asked if this will be addressed? One of the discussions showed conclusions precipitating change for part 5. Part 5 transfers to Part 2 for the following year. The discussion was tabled for changing the SLR form. Discussion ensued about preparing philosophical questions for the department to preview ahead of the peer review session instead of just meeting and not knowing what to expect from the reviewers. An example of this came from the questions from English and Humanities. The questions spoke to the boxes of information and not to the philosophical information about the department. It would be good to see discussions at the end of the review with summative conclusions. It might also be beneficial to let the peer review team decide what might be best practices for the peer review session.
- Ask the Department what they would like to discuss
  - Is there anything you would like to start with?
- B. Agenda Item: SLR Data Collection and Checklist Review SOPs**
- C. Agenda Item: Spring Meeting Days and Times** Dr. Zimmermann will create a Doodle survey to look at availability of the UAC members.

- D. Agenda Item: Review of Tutoring Labs and Advising Services** The UAC lacks time and resources to take on the task of reviewing these departments. Can tutoring labs have outcomes? Perhaps consider for a discussion next semester? There might be a point to have face-to-face reviews every other year. It was decided to bring it up to Academic Affairs if any entity should assess/review these departments. There is documentation showing that these departments are being utilized. The question was posed, "Is there oversight and is it substantial?"
- E. Agenda Item: Chairs of UAC, FDC, DEC, and GEC Meet** It may be a good idea to have them meet once a semester to work together on tasks/issues. They would have the opportunity to compare notes and report back to their respective committees.

#### **IV. Old Business**

- A. Agenda Item: Reviewing Gen Ed Student Learning Reports**
- B. Agenda Item: Outcomes and Objectives** The Curriculum Committee should have a say in the statement. It was decided that the UAC and the Curriculum Committee should come up with an agreed upon statement.
- C. Agenda Item: Assessing Summer and Intersession Classes** It was voted not to assess summer and intersession classes. Drs. Ford and Zimmermann brought up valid points in regards to short term courses:
- Students tend to do better in short courses
  - Some courses only meet in the summer (for example Biology)
  - Everything taught should be reviewed
  - The one downside is that there is not enough time to assimilate the data by summer

Motion: Dr. Ford moved that summer or intersession status make no difference whether a course is assessed. Dr. Kirk seconded the motion. All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted, *Susan Wong*, University Assessment Committee Scribe

# Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

January 27, 2015

Location: BH Rm. 124

Present: Clark, Sarah; Ford, James; Housel, Steve; Kirk, John; Millikin, Mary; Oberrieder, Matthew; Saffarian, Massoud; Smith, Marla; Weller, Kirk; Zimmermann, Craig

Absent: Macpherson, Peter; St. John, Evalon

Called to Order: 3:34 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

**Guest Presentation-** Dr. Clayton offered a background about her various career roles in her past. She felt her experiences and views may have affected her perception in regards to the peer reviews and assessment in relation to the Criminal Justice program she manages. Prior to winter break, Dr. Mary Millikin provided Dr. Clayton with comprehensive material to review program development/assessment from previous years to help construct the necessary program review report and assessment report for the current Criminal Justice program. After many hours reviewing the documents she concluded that she owed the UAC and administration an apology.

- She initially did not understand the importance of assessment and program review.
- Through her research she was able to appreciate how the strategic plan was linked to the programs and the institution as a whole.
- Dr. Housel stated that the HLC reviewers indicated that it appeared that not all faculty were clear about the importance of assessment. HLC suggested that RSU administration communicate to faculty how integral assessment is to the larger picture.
- Dr. Clayton admitted that with a small operating budget and without support staff it is very difficult for her to complete the task for the assessment SLOs by the deadline.
- She recommended a diagram with the different types of reports with definitions of the terminology might help her department as well as others to comprehend the task.
- Dr. Millikin offered to create the diagram to help with various reports, their terminology and how they lead to the strategic plan. Dr. Millikin suggested that professional development opportunities may bring some idea like this for the summer to be implemented by the fall semester.
- Dr. Zimmermann questioned if the 2007 Assessment Handbook from Dr. Linda Andrews was still in effect. Dr. Millikin stated the state regents have mandated new/additional assessment and the UAC will need to update the handbook in the coming year.
- The program review and assessment can and is, a segue to building a program.

**Approval of the meeting minutes from August 29, 2014, October 10, 2014 and December 10, 2014** Due to time constraints this will be achieved through email review by the UAC members.

## Announcements and Reports

### A. Announcements

- Agenda Item: Department Representation: Communications & Sports Management- Housel, Zimmermann, Ford** Dr. Ford stated that the Academic Council discussed the issues of lack of representation of the Communications and Sports Management departments at the last meeting. The council determined that:
  - The policies pertaining to UAC representation from each department will be honored
  - Referred the matter to the Academic Policies Review Committee chaired by Dr. Clayton
  - The Academic Policies Review Committee has not met this semester
  - They do not anticipate a resolution by the end of the 2014-2015 academic year

Discussion ensued about the accountability and enforcement of this issue. Dr. Beck sent an email to appeal to the integrity of the department heads in these respective departments. Dr. Housel would like to be notified when the Academic Policies Review Committee has their next meeting to attend if possible. Dr. Saffarian reminded the committee that when faculty agree to the terms of employment with RSU they agree to teaching and service. Dr. Ford reminded the UAC that the Academic Policies Review Committee has its own process. Once the issue has gone through all the university committee levels of approval, Dr. Beck will enforce the policy.

## B. Reports

- i. **Agenda Item: Draft of Self-study-** Dr. Millikin discussed some of the points from the HLC site review draft.
  - All five of the Criteria were met in the Assurance section
  - Federal regulations- all met
  - Advancement- consultations, find ways for the administration to communicate
  - Communication overall needs improvement
  - RSU has two weeks to review the draft. RSU can identify errors of fact only and make suggestions for changes based of factual errors only.
  - The draft will be sent back to the HLC reviewers
  - Once they make any changes to errors found by RSU, it will be sent to the final source for final review (Institutional Action Council)
  - The final report will be sent to RSU by April 2015
  - It appears that RSU will be accredited based on the decision of the HLC review team
  - Once accredited, the review team would not re-visit the campus for 10 years. RSU will know if they are Open or Standards Pathways after the IAC renders a final decision.
- ii. **Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule Spring Semester 2015- Zimmermann \*handout\*** Dr. Nancy Deide from the Health Sciences department voiced her concern about Clem Ohman, (EMS program) not being able to attend the February 6, 2015 Health Sciences peer review. The peer review will be moved to Friday, April 3, 2015 as an alternative.
- iii. **Agenda Item: Distance Education Committee- CTL/Housel** The Center for Teaching and Learning will not be migrating from Angel to Blackboard in the fall. The CTL staff is feeling overtaxed and understaffed and meeting the deadline is becoming problematic. They are also considering a learning management system called Jenzibar that may be more suitable to the needs of RSU. Dr. Gary Dotterer emailed four or five schools to receive feedback on the system. Discussion ensued about the system. Dr. Kirk Weller voiced his concern about publishers' textbooks that are equipped with digital supplemental material being supported by Jenzibar. Also to consider is that an Enterprise Resource Planning system (ERP) would be part of the package. This system has the potential to meet the needs of the entire university including assessment and would be significantly less expensive. A change to a new system is not anticipated for another year. Dr. Marla Smith reminded the committee that the helpdesk has been available to students from 7:00 AM – 10:00 PM 7 days/week significantly helping the students with ecampus and Hillcat Hub.
- iv. **Agenda Item: General Education Committee- Ford & Zimmermann** The committee discussed the assessment results underlined by HLC.
- v. **Agenda Item: Faculty Development Committee- Smith** The committee sent an email to faculty to submit their ideas for topics of interest. They discussed:
  - peer review brown bag sessions
  - developing a forum
  - talking to Faculty Senate about including adjunct instructors in the Faculty Excellence Awards
- vi. **Agenda Item: MBA SLOs- Saffarian** The SLOs are with Dr. Bert Tollison.
- vii. **Agenda Item: Spring Convocation (New Strategic Plan)** The strategic planning sessions attended by President Rice did not conclude in the time expected. The timing made it difficult to present the new strategic plan for a January Convocation. It will be completed this spring and will be implemented in the fall. Dr. Millikin stated that administration is looking at key performance indicators to see where RSU wants to be in three years. HLC recommended a

system that is less work and more dynamic. A new self-study team and a strategic plan committee will be formed. Other institutions often combine these two committees. In February, faculty will be asked to serve on these committees.

### Old Business

- A. **Agenda Item: January Convocation?** Time constraints made Convocation in January difficult to organize.
- B. **Agenda Item: New Approach to Peer Review Sessions**
  - i. **Checklist** This was developed as a tool to tell if the peer review form was completed correctly before going to the peer review. It proved beneficial for the peer review team eliminating the need to address SLR form items in the face-to-face thus reducing the amount of time spent in session. It also served as a proofreading task. All checklists were not verified. The UAC should have one delegated person track the checklists moving forward. A spreadsheet with information from beginning to the end of the process would be beneficial.
  - ii. **Review of Document (Details)** Dr. Ford would like to see the numerical ratings reintroduced. Discussion ensued about the review document.
    - The numerical ratings give immediate clues whether the program is meeting the objectives.
    - The lack of comments creates an uncertainty of whether the objectives were met or not.
    - Dr. Weller discussed the fact that the reviewers are leaving the minutia of the checklist then coming to the peer review form and looking at the individual column in the form. Are the reviewers obligated to fill in each box? What do you do if you find a discrepancy?
    - It was suggested that a new review form with a simple narrative might be beneficial. Dr. Housel could have a one page summary by Friday, January 30, 2015.
    - Sarah Clark is a new reviewer. She suggested a narrative/outline would be very helpful especially if she should find herself reviewing without veteran reviewers on the team.
    - Dr. Smith suggested that while the UAC is in the process of changing the environment it might be a good time to get administration involved. She thought that it might be helpful for Dr. Beck to send an email reminding the departments about the purpose of peer reviews and assessment reports.
    - Dr. Zimmermann distributed a **\*handout\*** with discussion questions for peer review. The HLC draft gave the UAC a great Segway for proposing the ideas associated with these questions. The questions will be tested in the upcoming peer review with Drs. Ford, Kirk, and Smith and continuous improvement will commence.
    - The adjunct faculty should have some buy-in.
  - iii. **GEC Expecting Gen Ed Data from SLRs**
  - iv. **Report Form** Dr. Housel will bring a template to the next meeting on Tuesday, February 17, 2015 at 3:30 p.m.
- C. **Agenda Item: Outcomes and Objectives**
- D. **Agenda Item: Review of Tutoring Labs, Advising Services and Co-curricular Activities**

### New Business

- A. **Agenda Item: Self-study Recommendation-Action Plan**
- B. **Agenda Item: Communication**
  - i. **Peer Review Report Format**
    - A. Mini-mic
    - B. Standard Set of Questions
  - ii. **Distribute Minutes or Summary of Minutes**
  - iii. **Semi-annual UAC Summary**
    - a. Peer Reviews Posted
    - b. Year-round Data Collection
    - c. Collecting SLR Data in Tandem with Grade Reporting

Meeting Adjourned at 5:02 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Scribe.

# Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

February 24, 2015

Location: BH Rm. 124

Present: Clark, Sarah; Housel, Steve; Kirk, John; Macpherson, Peter; Millikin, Mary; Oberrieder, Matthew; Saffarian, Massoud; St. John, Evalon; Smith, Marla; Weller, Kirk; Zimmermann, Craig

Absent: Ford, James

Called to Order: 3:35 p.m. by committee chairperson Dr. Steve Housel.

## **I. Approval of the meeting minutes from December 10, 2014 and January 27, 2015.** Changes are as follows for the December 10, 2014 meeting:

- Marla Smith was present
- Page 1, Reports, Agenda Item: HLC Visit amend policies and guidelines and amount of books in library in regards to Pryor campus visit
- Page 1, eighth bullet, add "or at least in the university communication process"
- Page 1, last bullet, omit part on Drs. Housel, Millikin and Marerro
- Page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, change verbiage
- Page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet, add process for assessment of SLOs
- Page 2, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet, change to the President's office
- Page 3, Agenda Item: Peer Review Schedule 2014-2015, ix. Agenda Item: New peer Review Sessions: E&H and Communications, change Dr. John Kirk to Dr. Kirk Weller

Changes are as follows for the January 27, 2015 meeting:

- Page 1, Guest Presentation, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, change strategic plan to assessment SLOs
- Page 1, 7<sup>th</sup> bullet, change office of Accountability and Academics to the UAC, add the handbook in the coming year
- Page 1, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet, change Segway to segue
- Page 2, Reports, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet, add in Assurance section
- Page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet, change to federal regulations
- Page 2, 7<sup>th</sup> bullet, change to the final source
- Page 2, 10<sup>th</sup> bullet, strike however;....change to "RSU will know if they are Open or Standard Pathways after the IAC renders a final decision"
- Page 3, iii. Agenda Item: Distance Education Committee, 7<sup>th</sup> sentence, change to Enterprise Resource Planning
- Page 3, v. Agenda Item: Faculty Development Committee, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet, add brown bag sessions
- Page 3, change form to forum

## **II. Announcements and Reports**

### **C. Announcements**

- ii. **Agenda Item: UAC Chair Position** Dr. Housel shared an email correspondence between him and Dr. Richard Beck in regards to Dr. Housel stepping down from the UAC chair position in the fall before Convocation. Dr. Housel's term is expiring. He feels that his commitments are greater than he would like and he asks the committee to consider a new chair.

### **D. Reports**

- viii. **Agenda Item: General Education Committee** Discussed the HLC report specifically in regards to General Education. Points that need to be addressed:
  - Need to produce a mission statement for the committee



- Hosting a General Education Forum
- The GEC put together a survey asking full-time/part-time faculty open ended questions or concerns about their involvement in GE
- Modifications
- Peer Review MPS faculty were not aware that some of their courses were GE courses (to be assessed) and it was 2010 since they collected assessment data for these GE courses in their department
- A decision has not been met which committee will communicate to the departments how the GE courses will be assessed
- Is there a way to communicate which courses should be assessed to provide clarity
- Who are the GEC members? Drs. Jim Ford, Craig Zimmermann, Juliet Evusa, Gary Marche, and Min Soe. Dr. Min Soe is a member from MPS and he has not been available for the GEC meetings. Do we need a new member from MPS to take his place?
- Fine Arts does not have a representative
- There is concern that this committee could become large scale like that of the UAC
- Any school/department that has a large portion of GE courses should have representation

**ix. Agenda Item: Distance Education Committee** Gary Dotterer from the CTL is in the process of learning more about the Jenzabar system.

- He has been talking to individuals at other institutions that currently use Jenzabar and getting feedback about their experience using it
- The DEC has recorded the sessions (available to all faculty) and are confident they will have a decision by Spring Break if they will move forward with contracting with Jenzabar for use at RSU
- Our current Enterprise Resource Planning program will become defunct in 2020. LMS- Learning Management System (Angel)
- ERP- Enterprise Resource Planning (Hillcat Hub, ADMIN, HR, Account Payable, Payroll)
- Currently, there are only five other institutions using Jenzabar. Should RSU decide to go with this program, Jenzabar is offering a significant discount for being one of the first institutions to use it
- Dr. Kirk Weller voiced his concern about supplemental course material being supported by Jenzabar. Any supplemental material that is supported by BlackBoard will be supported by Jenzabar
- Jenzabar representatives may come for a training program once a contract has been signed. Faculty and staff will have training directly from Jenzabar representatives. The Comptroller and Vice President for Administration and Finance will make a decision by the end of the month
- Dr. Zimmermann is in the process of obtaining an assessment tool for collecting data. Jenzabar would be compatible with the Livetext that is being considered

**x. Agenda Item: Faculty Development Committee \*handout from Dr. Teri Bycroft\***

1. Peer Review form:
  - Dr. Bycroft met with the three deans Wednesday, February 18, 2015 requesting input
  - Each dean is to send out to their faculty for input with a two week deadline for input
  - Have heard from Dr. Elwell's crew at this point
2. Hosting Athletic Director Ryan Erwin on April 17, 2015.
  - The FDC has asked him to speak about the impact athletics has on academics
  - The tentative date is April 22, 2015 with a brown bag lunch in HS room 172 12:05- 1:05 PM.
3. Co-hosting with Brian Andrews, cultural anthropologist, March 11, 2015 at 6:00 PM
4. Topics from the Delphi Study

- Are being addressed to be scheduled
  - What topics are faculty looking for?
- xi. **Agenda Item: HLC Report**
- xii. **Agenda Item: Outcomes vs. Objectives** Need a recommendation. Senate first, then Academic Council. Dr. Housel and Dr. Weller will meet to discuss the differences and come up with a statement.
- Dr. Mary Millikin noted that there is language from The Board of Regents and OSHRE speaking to outcomes and objectives but leave it to the individual institution how they want to address these items. Dr. Zimmermann offered that when creating new a new course one must consider the program outcomes and their assessment. The institution is required to do this when creating the curriculum for a program.
    - Objectives are specific for the individual instructor's course
    - Outcomes would be more general for the course
  - Dr. Matthew Oberreider pointed out that OSHRE's website does not offer clarity. He suggested that the agencies and institutions should work toward a standardized format with common language for objectives and outcomes at the course level and the program level. The program review process needs to be clarified.
  - Dr. Peter Macpherson mentioned that it will get worse with Quality Matters. This is due to the fact that the course objectives must be mapped to the unit objectives (look at the bigger picture)
- xiii. **Agenda Item: Assessment Day \*handout from Dr. Massoud Saffarian from NWOSU\***  
Tabled until the next meeting. The handout offered a great deal of information that the committee members will need more time to review. They will discuss findings at the next meeting.
- xiv. **Agenda Item: Strategic Planning and Ongoing Self-Study**
- xv. **Agenda Item: Assessment Tracking Procedure**

### III. New Business

- A. **Agenda Item: Academic Policies Review Committee Assignment \*handout provided by committee chair, Dr. Clayton\*** Academic Policies Review Committee would like a review of the official function of the committee (found at the very bottom of the UAC handout). Policy- All departments should have a member to represent their respective department, provided they are not already over-burdened. Evalon St. John pointed out that departments are required to have representation on the Faculty Senate, Curriculum, and the UAC. This is unreasonable for the Sports Management department with only one faculty member.

**Dr. Housel Motioned:** Departments with three or more faculty members must have representation on the UAC. They can opt for a proxy representative, but MUST have representation on the UAC. Dr. Kirk Weller seconded. Nine in favor, one opposed.

Dr. Housel asked the committee if they are in favor of keeping the verbiage for the function of the University Assessment Committee. Discussion ensued about the current statement.

**Dr. Zimmermann Motioned:** To change the function statement in the Policies and Procedures Manual to read: Function: Design and implement an academic assessment process that will promote quality instruction and provide accountability. Dr. Weller seconded. All in favor. This motion will require change to the verbiage on the website.

- B. **Agenda Item: Review of New Approach to Peer Review Sessions** Some changes to consider on the SLR
- ratings; don't need them if the comments are right there in the section
  - Adjust to no ratings, asking additional questions, providing feedback, add a narrative at the end
  - move toward every other year Peer Reviews with the SLR submitted every year
  - The departments continue with SLRs every year but the UAC won't do a Peer Review every year

- They can stagger the departments (currently reviewing 13 departments)
- The UAC is currently overloaded with Peer Reviews. Staggering the departments every other year will reduce the workload down significantly
- This was a year of experimentation with the form

**C. Agenda Item: Gen Ed Accountability**

**D. Agenda Item: Fall Convocation**

**E. Agenda Item: Checklist to Track Assessment Process**

**F. Agenda Item: Peer Review Protocols**

- i. **All Members Meet**
- ii. **Questions in Advance**
- iii. **Reports Submitted**
- iv. **Standard Set of Questions**
- v. **Departments Leading Sessions**

**IV. Old Business**

**A. Agenda Item: Assessing All Assessment-Designated Courses**

**B. Agenda Item: Bi-Annual Review of Department SLRs** Discussion ensued. Is the UAC still tasked with reviewing the SLRs every year? Or would they only look at the bi-annual reviews? Representatives from each department are still proofing the SLR before they are submitted. Sarah Clark offered that while capturing the details to the see the whole picture is working well, it is so encompassing and time-consuming for the team member (sometimes falling on one individual of the team) that it could become problematic. Dr. Saffarian sees a potential issue with looking at two years at the same time. Dr. Weller suggested a reference to the process promised and how it was achieved. This item was tabled until the next meeting.

**C. Agenda Item: Business Peer Review Session- MBA Student Learning Outcomes** The MBA faculty are currently collecting data. The SLOs will be available next week from Dr. Saffarian.

**D. Agenda Item: ETS Testing of Seniors**

Meeting Adjourned at 5:19 p.m. These minutes respectfully submitted, Susan Wong, University Assessment Committee Scribe.