



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL
MINUTES
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6TH
1:30 PM
224 REGENCY ROOM, SU**

Present: Comer, Damron, Davis, DeVuyst, Haseley, Miller, Ownbey, Payton, Penn, Rohrs, Sharp, and with COE, Hill

Absent: Swinney, Weiser, Edwards, Gates, Hawkins, Paustenbaugh, Ray, Thompson, Wilber

1. Introductions of Assessment Council Members were made.
2. Minutes from the Oct. 9th, 2009 meeting were reviewed. No corrections were requested.
3. Members discussed updates for the new mission and vision statement and the addition of the structure section. Suggested wording changes:
 - No. 3 of *Instruction* should be worded differently either to “promote or recommend” instead of “directly implement.”
 - No. 6 of *Instruction* should have a line added that states something to the effect of the university collaborating with other schools, to put together projects, such as high schools for comparison of high school students to entering college freshman. It was noted this element was included in the *Outreach* section.
 - A council member recommended inclusion of a representative from NOC to the council.
 - The council discussed the origins of the council and oversight issues. The council discussed the benefits and challenges of having a faculty member chair the council instead of the Director of Assessment and Testing. This issue was tabled and will be discussed again at the next meeting.
 - Council members suggested adding a tenth item (it appears as number 9 in the modified version) to include communication of assessment results with external stakeholders including the residents of Oklahoma.

The new mission and vision statement was approved with changes noted above and with the exception of the declaration of the chair of the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council – this topic will be discussed at a future meeting.

4. The Assessment budget handout was discussed with FY 2010-11 proposed allocations and expenditures. Penn noted the proposed allocations were identified through historical comparisons and used the average scores from the budget survey performed at the last meeting. Penn noted cuts to the Program Outcomes Assessment funds could result in programs not implementing assessment as many programs have come to rely on the funds for key elements of their assessment program. Penn explained that these funds are used heavily for graduate students’ salaries and stipends for faculty and external reviews, and that if funds were not available these activities would probably not occur. Penn suggested maintaining or increasing the funding

available to the *Provost's Improvement Initiative: Focus on General Education* as this element was perceived by the group as the most successful in achieving the mission of assessment. Therefore, to manage the budget Penn suggested cuts to the College Coordinator funds and the General Education Assessment funds.

Attending College Coordinators described their evaluations of the College Coordinator program. Two of the four colleges represented at the meeting reported using the College Coordinator funds to cover a portion of a faculty member's salary, as was the initial plan for the program. However the College Coordinator for one of these two colleges has since left the university and the college has not yet identified a replacement. The third college represented at the meeting was unable to identify a faculty member to serve in this role and instead used the funds to support a graduate assistant who would help alleviate some work from the individual who was serving as the College Coordinator. The fourth college used the college coordinator funds to cover a portion of an assessment professional's salary in the college (a staff position). The other two colleges receiving College Coordinator funds were not represented at the meeting. 3 of 6 written College Coordinator evaluations have been received to date. Penn asked for the other three reports to be submitted as soon as possible.

The council discussed the funding decrease to the College Coordinator program. One element of the change to the funding for the College Coordinator program suggested by Penn (in addition to the decrease in funding allocated) was to use a funding request process similar to the process used to request program outcomes assessment funds on an annual basis. Colleges would not be given an equal amount of funding, as is currently done (with a double share to CAS), but would be asked to submit a plan for the funding needed and a proposed use of the funding for the College Coordinator program. The purpose of such a process would be to develop a fair way to allocate limited funds that allows for increased flexibility in the use of the funds to support the College Coordinator program. Council members suggested multi-year proposals with an appropriate lag period would be a better approach instead of an annual process. Some council members disagreed with a request process in general and suggested a continuation of distribution of funds equally to colleges (with a double share to CAS). Council members suggested approaching the Provost for possible additional funding sources for the College Coordinator program.

The 2010-2011 assessment budget and College Coordinator program will be discussed again at the next meeting.

5. Penn presented a proposal for changing the due dates for assessment reports. Penn found a number of assessment reports did not share how assessment data were used because faculty meetings and discussions about assessment data were typically held at the start of the fall semester, after assessment reports were due. The June due date also did not allow much time between the end of the spring semester and submission of the reports, and was not well aligned with the Academic Program Review process (which led to the perception of double-reporting in the APR year). The proposed change would have assessment reports due on the last Friday in September (in 2010 this is September 24th). Requests for program outcomes assessment funds will be due on the First Friday in June (in 2010 this is June 4th). The fund request form will be modified to provide some additional needed information for allocating funds. Allocation of funds will be made contingent upon receipt of the report from the prior year (if assessment funds

were allocated in the prior year). Historically, reports have been due in June to allow time for inclusion of the reports into the report to the OSRHE. Penn noted receiving reports in September will still allow sufficient time for inclusion in the report to the Regents, as long as reports are received by the due date and they do not trickle into October. A council member noted that colleges would be able to set earlier due dates for assessment reports if desired.

The proposal was enthusiastically approved.

6. NSSE website is finished

(<http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/surveys/student/nsse/2009/index.html>) and NSSE Highlights were available for pickup. There will be a seminar on Wednesday, November 11th at 12 pm to share results and information about NSSE. UAT is working on scheduling individual meetings with colleges to discuss the results and develop plans for responding to results.

Penn thanked the council members for an interesting and productive semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.