

# University Assessment Council

## Minutes

Friday, September 5, 2008  
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.  
250 Student Union (Oklahoma Room)

Present: Bowers, Comer, Damron, Davis, Edwards, Gates, Haseley, Leising, Ownbey, Payton, Paustenbaugh, Rohrs, Swinney, Thompson.

Absent: Hawkins, Lacy, Mowen, Wilber

Minutes from the April 4, 2008 meeting were reviewed. No corrections were requested. To follow-up on plans reported in the meeting minutes:

- Bowers reported that she, Gates, Strathe and Comer met with the Dean and Executive Committee of every college this summer and discussed the need for more systematic involvement in assessment. Bowers will contact a representative of each college for assistance with identifying courses from which samples of student work may be collected for institutional portfolio assessment.
- The Academic Program Review template is being revised for 2008-09 reviews, and will be modified to include each program's comments about alignment of general education and program learning goals.

Council members agreed to continue with review of outcomes assessment this Fall, and will provide feedback this Fall to programs that will participate in Academic Program Review in 2010. Each college coordinator will review and provide feedback for programs in his/her college; other council members will review assessment materials for two programs.

Members offered several comments about the Collegiate Learning Assessment in general, and OSU results specifically. While there is some distrust of the test, there was general agreement that efforts for improvement of students' skills regarding writing and critical thinking are needed. Following are some comments and suggestions regarding CLA results, the results of the institutional portfolio method, and the 2005 results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

- Although there are some concerns about the CLA test, considering these results alongside institutional portfolio assessment results and NSSE results seem to provide sufficient evidence that action for improvement is needed.
- Expectations about institutional level learning goals need to be more clearly communicated to faculty.
- Reward system for faculty should be tied to student learning improvements. Assessment should be included on promotion and reappointment documents.
- Faculty development efforts related to improvement of teaching should be increased. Offer more, and "deeper" faculty development programs. The workshops offered area good start, but a larger effort is needed.
- Institutional learning goals should be considered by faculty at the program and course levels.
- Course-embedded assessment could provide information about student achievement of general education learning goals.

The college assessment coordinators in attendance (Davis, Leising, Thompson, Rohrs, Ownbey) agreed to work on developing recommendations for action to improve students' achievement of these learning goals.

Council members discussed the desire of some faculty to have course-specific feedback from the general education assessment process. The original intent was to report results only at the institutional level, to avoid faculty feeling that they, or their courses, were the focus of the assessment. The faculty development workshop series will provide opportunities for discussion and collaboration on assignments. The UAT office will work with the general education assessment committee and others to generate ideas about how to assist faculty who would like to have this feedback.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be conducted in Spring 2009. A larger sample will be included, and college associate deans have agreed to participate in actively encouraging student participation.

The CIRP Freshman Survey was conducted online, for the first time, this Fall. The response rate was approximately 30% - less than half of the 70% rate achieved in 2006 when the survey was administered as a paper and pencil survey in freshman orientation courses. A council member who teaches a freshman orientation course indicated that new freshmen do not seem to have the motivation required to participate in a voluntary activity of this nature, when there are so many competing interests for their time. He suggests returning to paper and pencil, or using computer labs to administer the surveys.

Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey was conducted as an online survey this Spring. Graduate students enrolled on Stillwater and Tulsa campuses, excluding students categorized as "special" admissions, and students enrolled in CVM or COM. Surveys were completed by 1,735 students from a population of 3,820 students, for a response rate of 45%. Results will be reported at the program, college and institutional levels.

**Updates:**

- Alumni Survey of Undergraduate Programs (2002 and 2006 graduates) – Reported in June 2008
- Alumni Survey of Graduate Programs (2003 and 2007 graduates)
- 2007-08 Annual Reports and FY09 Budget Requests

**Hand out Materials:**

- Minutes from 4-05-2008 meeting
- Tables from CLA Results
- Tables from 2006 & 2007 General Education Assessment Reports
- NSSE 2005 benchmark scores and contributing items
- HLC Lynn Priddy Presentation Flyer