



## Assessment & Academic Improvement Council

Friday, December 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes  
1:30 PM 460 Regency Room Student Union

### 1. Introductions and Welcome

Present were: C. Johnson, G. Fox, D. Hobson, B. Davis, T. Wikle, S. Damron, J. Nalon, S. Ownbey, B. Masters, R. Rohrs, K. Neurohr, C. Ippoliti, C. Campbell, S. Haseley, S. Gordon, L. Cota, and J. Comer.

Absent were: J. Gelder, J. Swinney, P. Fry, and C. Hawkins.

Dr. Carol Johnson, AAIC Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

Chris Campbell, Assistant Director of LASSO, was welcomed as a new ex-officio member of the Council. Dr. Gordon explained that Chris Campbell was added to the council because LASSO students are considered a 'group' (like a college) for purposes of data analysis and reporting for general education assessment. Dr. Rick Rohrs, College Assessment Coordinator from CAS & Human Sciences was welcomed as a guest.

After introductions, the suggestion was made of possibly including a representative from NOC-Stillwater as ex-officio member of the Council. Possibly having representatives from several other colleges was also suggested, as was the suggestion to invite these colleges to the joint AAIC/CAGE/GEAC meeting each spring or other annual meetings that are already scheduled with representatives with those institutions. The idea was tabled until the next meeting when Dr. Fry's input could be obtained.

### 2. Assessment Updates

**a. General Education Assessment Process for 2014-2015-Science Reasoning:** The assessment for the general education outcome of Science Reasoning will take place in Summer 2015. UAT has collected ~1300 artifacts from ~50 different course sections, with most of the artifacts coming from SPCH 2713. It is anticipated that there will be about 2500 artifacts collected this year, but it is not clear how many of them will work for the assessment. The assignment prompts for the artifacts will need to be checked by CAGE members before a final count of usable artifacts is known. The faculty rater teams who will conduct the assessment will be put together at the end of the spring 2015 semester.

**b. 2013-2014 General Education Assessment Report Update:** Lisa Cota reminded the group that the general education outcomes of Critical Thinking and Written Communication were assessed in Summer 2014. For the 2013-2014 assessment, artifacts were scored using the AACU VALUE rubrics. Along with the standard comparisons and analyses, the differences between freshmen and seniors were analyzed for VSA reporting. The analyses used for the assessment included traditional NHST analyses (mostly logistic regression) and Observation Oriented Modeling. The joint meeting with CAGE, GEAC, and AAIC will be in March, and the findings from that assessment will be discussed in that meeting. The 2013-2014 report has been approved by CAGE. The report will be emailed to members of AAIC, CAGE, and GEAC two weeks before the March meeting.

**c. Update on BCSSE and NSSE:** UAT conducted the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) in Summer 2014. The National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) will be conducted in Spring 2015. The BCSSE has only been conducted at OSU once before (in 2011); the CIRP was used prior to BCSSE. The preliminary results from the BCSSE have been uploaded to the UAT website. Once the results of the NSSE are in, UAT will disseminate all findings and give presentations to any groups who want to hear about the results.

**d. Final Update on 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Reports & OSRHE Report:** OSU's Annual Assessment Report to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education was turned in on time again this year. We received more program participation this year than years past—last year, approximately 190 of 214 programs turned in assessment reports. This year, 201 out of 222 programs turned in assessment reports. College reports will go out to the college deans soon; these reports will summarize the program participation from each college.

### 3. Discussion Items

**a. Departmental Assessment Budget Requests:** Tom Wikle shared that the subcommittee met several times this semester, and the proposal given to the Council reflects the subcommittee's suggestions.

*Subcommittee recommendations for the management of funds:* The subcommittee's recommendations can be found in Handout 1. After summarizing the recommendations, the Council discussed several of the recommendations in depth. The Council's suggestions for changes to the subcommittee recommendations are as follows:

- Since colleges manage assessment funds differently, there will be no change to existing assessment accounts. Instead, the process by which a department requests assessment budget funds should change so that college-level administrators are aware of what funding has been requested and for what purposes.
- Starting in 2015, departmental budget requests will be submitted to a college administrator (rather than directly to UAT) so the requests can be reviewed for accounting accuracy and to ensure they are complete.
  - The new reporting structure will be presented in a handout at the February AAIC Meeting.
  - The new budget request form, which will be reviewed at the college level before being submitted to UAT, will require the college/department to indicate the account(s) to which funds should be allocated. The account number must be filled on the form (every program needs an account listed, even if it is the same account for every department/program/school in a college).
  - Since the accounts are 'owned' by UAT, UAT does not need extra documentation from the colleges about how the departmental funds were spent because UAT has access to the FBMs; FBM expenditures should match subcodes on the budget request forms.

Some subcommittee recommendations presented in Handout 1 were supported with no changes proposed. The supported recommendations were:

- College-level assessment funds (\$10,000 annually) do not require a budget request. These funds will be awarded automatically in August of each year.
- UAT should continue to work on developing a new budget request form; this form will likely be in Word or Excel.
- If a department is requesting more than \$1000 in funds, then the person requesting funds for each department is required to attend an informational meeting to go over the budget request submission process face-to-face. The meeting will be offered in April of each year, and the same meeting will be offered on several different dates and times so that attendees can choose which date/time works best for their schedules.
- In order to submit a request for assessment budget funds, a department must have a current ( $\leq 5$  years old) assessment plan on file with UAT and must have submitted the previous year's assessment report on time.

One subcommittee recommendation presented in Handout 1 was not supported. The recommendation not supported was:

- Do not fund budget award requests until AFTER the assessment report deadline has passed (e.g., October 1). Moving the date in which funds are awarded will allow UAT to check that departments have turned in an annual assessment report before funding is appropriated to the departmental accounts.
  - The Council determined that this would cause problems for departments that conduct assessment activities in the early part of the fall semester each year, and it seemed to ‘punish’ everyone due to the non-compliance of only a few.

*Subcommittee recommendations for the guidelines for use of assessment funds:* The subcommittee’s recommendations can be found in Handout 2. The Council discussed several of the guidelines, as follows:

- Students and Graduate Students: The Council determined that it is appropriate for graduate students to be involved in some assessment activities because they often are involved in embedded assessments (in courses they teach, for example), in norming rubrics, and in collecting and compiling artifacts and other assessment data. Further, involvement in assessment can be professional development for graduate students, as they will likely go on to conduct assessments in their careers. Graduate student involvement in assessment activities is at the discretion of the department; the role of the graduate student in assessment activities must be articulated in the assessment plan, report, and/or budget request.
  - The Council recommended that following sentence be removed from the “Students and Graduate Students” section of the Campus-Wide Program Outcomes document: *“Graduate students should not generally be reviewing student work unless this is specifically requested and approved by AAIC and your college.”*
  - The Council recommended that following sentence be added to the “Students and Graduate Students” section of the Campus-Wide Program Outcomes document: *“Graduate students may be involved in the assessment of undergraduate student artifacts.”*
- The remainder of the guidelines for use of assessment funds still need to be discussed in the next AAIC meeting. The Council will also need to vote official approval of changes to the guidelines at the next meeting.

**b. Assessment of Diversity:** Dr. Damron mentioned that a subcommittee of three AAIC members (plus Dr. Gordon and Lisa Cota) met throughout the semester to discuss the assessment of the general education outcome of Diversity. The committee is considering three ways of collecting data; they will present their suggestions at the February AAIC meeting.

- 4. Updates:** 1) UAT has a new Assistant Director of Testing and Technology—James Knecht; James also oversees the STAR software system. 2) Dr. Gordon will be sending out contact information soon regarding who can be contacted for assessment questions and issues while she and Lisa Cota are on maternity leave.

**5. Adjourned: 3:00pm**

*Note: The updated assessment report template (item 3c on the agenda), planning for Spring 2015 (item 4a-d on the agenda) were not discussed due to time constraints. These items will be moved to the February 2015 agenda.*