



Assessment and Academic Improvement Council

Friday, October 5, 2012

1:30 PM, Student Union Sequoyah Room

1. Introductions and welcome

2. Approval of minutes from September

-Minutes were approved with no modifications.

3. Overview on results from the 2012 Survey of Alumni from Undergraduate Programs

-Hathcoat and Penn provided a summary on the results from the 2012 Survey of Alumni from Undergraduate Programs. Committee was asked to consider whether or not the current common questions were adequate for the issues and concerns of the group, or whether the items might be up for some revision. Presenters noted that the current items had been slightly modified since 2000 (primarily changes to response categories and the elimination of a few items). The items that were removed asked students about the extent to which the university had prepared them in certain areas, such as written communication and use of computers. These might be examples of what the committee might choose to add as common items.

-After looking through the questions, the committee had several suggestions. First, it was clear that a large portion of the current items are related to employment. Is that a good use of the aspects of this survey? Or would it be better to have questions related to student learning outcomes in place of some (or all) of the employment questions? The committee agreed that it was important to ask the employment questions both for accreditation and accountability purposes. However, are some of these questions duplicated by Career Services? If so, it might be possible to collaborate with Career Services more closely to avoid duplicating items. Penn will visit with Career Services regarding what they currently cover in their surveys and whether or not it might be possible to collaborate on future surveys so that this survey has more room for questions related to learning outcomes. In addition, the employment data would also be of great interest to parents.

-Second, the current items are not closely aligned with the University's focus on community engagement and leadership. Should some items be added to reflect this aspect of the University's mission?

-Penn asked the group if there were any additional analyses or reports desired from the 2012 SAUP. If so, please contact him and he will arrange for a report to be developed as requested.

4. Funding for program outcomes assessment

University Assessment and Testing

107 UAT Building

(405) 744-6687

<http://uat.okstate.edu>

-Penn brought a proposal with some updated language for the use of program outcomes assessment funding. He noted there were two primary purpose for the updated language:

1) clarify the usage of funding over the summer (since the fiscal year ends June 30th, this has been problematic for a number of units who do assessment over the summer), and,

2) add some additional “teeth” to the consequences if a program accepts and uses funding in a year but does not provide a report. This change would require repayment of used funds in addition to disqualification for the following year. Forcing repayment might result in more programs following-through on their commitments.

-Updated language was approved. The new guidelines will be sent to AAIC members and posted on the website.

5. Update: formation of support services assessment council

-Penn provided an update on a discussion from the September meeting regarding the new HLC criteria and assessment of support services. Penn contacted Lynn Priddy from HLC regarding interpretation of the criteria. In short, Priddy stated that all campus units must be involved in assessment. However, units will differ in what they assess. Units with a student learning mission should be involved in assessment of student learning outcomes (like, perhaps, the Writing Center) while units that do not have a student learning mission (like, perhaps, the Bursar) should be involved in assessment of their operational effectiveness. Units with student learning outcomes would be included in Criterion 4 while units without student learning outcome focus would be covered in Criterion 3 and Criterion 5.

-As a result, Penn has started to put together a student support services assessment council. The group is looking at their first meeting date and will include representatives from units that are not currently involved in AAIC.

-Stephen Hasely asked to be included in this new group when they start meeting.

-Penn also invited AAIC members to attend a presentation on Tuesday, October 9th by Brenda Masters and Jeremy Penn regarding the new HLC criteria and implications for assessment and for the institution. Registration should be done through ITLE.

6. Informational updates and updates from colleges and units (if any)

-There were no updates at this meeting.

7. Meeting schedule update and discussion

-Penn will be out of town at a conference for the November meeting. He asked the group if they wanted to meet without him. They decided instead to cancel the November meeting. The next meeting will be in February and will be the joint meeting between AAIC, CAGE, and GEAC to discuss General Education Assessment.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30.