



Assessment & Academic Improvement Council

Meeting Minutes

Friday, November 4, 2016 • 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. • 460 Student Union

Present: K. Clinkenbeard, J. Comer, L. Cota, B. Davis, C. Edwards, P. Fry, K. Gage, J. Gelder, S. Gordon, C. Johnson, J. Knecht, J. Nalon, S. Ownbey, R. Seitsinger, J. Swinney.

Absent: C. Campbell, C. Hawkins, K. Hickman, C. Ippoliti, B. Masters, K. Neurohr, A. Rauner, T. Wikle.

Guests: A. Witham.

1) Call to Order and Approval of October 7, 2016 Minutes

Dr. Ownbey called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. Dr. Ownbey then introduced Dr. Kathryn Gage, representing Student Affairs, as a new member of AAIC, and she requested feedback on the 10/7/16 meeting minutes. Judy Nalon suggested an edit to page one, section 2 b) of the minutes to replace the phrase “course instructors” with “instructor/course combinations.” Dr. Comer moved to approve the October minutes with that one edit. Dr. Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1) Assessment Updates

- a) **Update on 2016-17 General Education artifact collection (Lisa Cota).** Ms. Cota informed the Council that Assessment is still collecting Written Communication and Critical Thinking artifacts. Out of 555 instructor/course combinations, Ms. Cota received the following breakdown of responses: 10% said yes, they could supply artifacts, 20% replied they do not have an assignment that fits the artifact guidelines, and the remaining 70% gave no response at all. The good news is that approximately 600 artifacts are expected from the Fall 2016 semester. Some senior artifacts are available as well. There will be sufficient numbers of artifacts from Fall 2016 for Gen Ed assessment; however, Spring 2017 artifact collection may be difficult due to the fact that there are not as many 4000-level Gen Ed-designated courses. Ms. Cota suggested that the 90% of instructor/course combinations that said “no” or did not respond should be brought up somewhere—possibly at a future GEAC meeting. Dr. Johnson asked if it is possible to communicate the names of the instructors who did not respond or did not have adequate artifacts to Associate Deans of their respective colleges. Ms. Cota stated she would be very happy to pass that information on to whomever would like it. A list of instructors/courses should be available at the next AAIC meeting. Although there are sufficient artifacts to assess, Dr. Comer stated that he would much rather have small numbers of artifacts from many Gen Ed-designated courses rather than a large number of artifacts from just a few of the total Gen Ed-designated courses. Since there were 4 weeks remaining in the semester, Mr. Knecht suggested that an email from Dr. Comer’s side may motivate artifact creation/submission more effectively than simply Assessment’s attempt at artifact collection.
- b) **Update on 2015-16 Diversity artifact collection (Lisa Cota).** Ms. Cota created a very basic preliminary analysis of the Diversity artifacts for Dr. Gordon prior to Dr. Gordon’s attending the AEA conference. There was no statistically significant difference (using traditional statistics) between freshmen and seniors. Gender, college, GPA, etc., were not considered in this rough draft, but everything will be broken down when the final report is generated in March 2017. In previous years, our inter-rater reliability was not very good. Reliability increased greatly when the AACU rubrics were used, as compared to the rubric we used previously for one of the teams. For the other team, inter-rater reliability was so low that those results were not useable. This supports the idea that we need multiple assessment methods to evaluate Diversity as a learning outcome.
- c) **Update on Fall 2016 Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) (Lisa Cota).** The GPI for Fall 2016 is now complete. The Inventory was given to a new university that did not survey OSU students in the Spring when they were supposed to, so there is no Spring 2016 report. Because the new university was unable to provide a Spring 2016

report, they promised to give OSU one of the administrations this Fall 2016 for free. The inventory will close around the week of Thanksgiving break. Ms. Cota expects all the preliminary data analysis and reports to be completed and back in-house by December, and will be included in the Gen Ed March 2017 Report.

- d) Updated count of Assessment Report submissions (Lisa Cota).** Ms. Cota will provide a final count of missing program outcomes assessment report submissions at the next AAIC meeting.
- e) American Evaluation Association conference presentation report (Sarah Gordon).** Dr. Gordon informed the Council about the diversity presentation written by her and given by a colleague at the AEA conference. Dr. Gordon explained that last year she presented an overview of how OSU as an institution was making changes in our assessment processes for the diversity general education outcome. She was invited back this year to present the data gathered during the new diversity assessment process, but, as she was unable to attend, Dr. Mwarumba Mwavita presented in her place. The presentation included a brief overview of the preliminary GPI and artifact data, along with a synopsis of the Photovoice project. Dr. Gordon's presentation basically highlighted that no one single assessment method is giving us a complete picture of what our students know about the topic of "diversity." The presentation was well attended and well-received.

2) Discussion Items

- a) Draft CAGE structure description (i) and Gen Ed Facilitator and Reviewer qualifications and offer letters (ii) (Jon Comer and James Knecht).**
 - i) Dr. Comer reported that the subcommittee had completed its charge of expanding the paragraph describing CAGE and presented to the Council a document more closely resembling the basis of the framework of AAIC and GEAC. This document describes CAGE's history, mission statement, duties and responsibilities, and codified the membership, defining and establishing staggered three-year terms for membership so every year 2 of the 6 members are up for replacement if they so choose. The document also recommends that a CAGE member attend all GEAC meetings should GEAC choose to allow it. This duty will rotate annually according to a documented schedule. Dr. Ownbey asked Dr. Fry to make a few comments regarding CAGE and its relationship with AAIC and GEAC. Dr. Fry reiterated the importance of formalizing CAGE's structure. Ultimately, this aids in Gen Ed assessment in a more effective and efficient way. Dr. Comer told the Council the subcommittee assigned to codify the CAGE structure description feels that they have met their goal, unless the Council decides they (the CAGE subcommittee) need to meet a third and final time. The Council was satisfied with the CAGE structure description and adopted it.
 - ii) Dr. Comer then presented the Council with Gen Ed Facilitator and Reviewer qualifications and offer letters (positions for Gen Ed artifact assessment). Payment for the facilitators and reviewers was explained. The reviewers' stipend is based on the number of artifacts each reviewer is responsible for assessing. Discussion followed. Facilitators are going to be identified earlier in the semester (in February) than reviewers in the hope they will help identify potential reviewers. They will have access to artifacts at that time to help determine who will be most appropriate as reviewers regarding subject matter. Facilitators will also lead 1-2 reviewer training sessions. In years in which Critical Thinking and Written Communication artifacts are assessed, each facilitator will lead approximately 4 teams of 2. The years in which Diversity artifacts are assessed, that number drops to approximately 2 teams of 2. The years of NSSE and BCSSE assessment do not have artifact assessment. The Gen Ed Facilitator offer letter included the duties for facilitators, but no stipend amount was given. Dr. Ownbey asked the Council to either approve the Gen Ed assessment process documents as-is or offer changes. Lisa Cota suggested that the phrase "to improve inter-rater reliability" on the Facilitator offer letter and on the Gen Ed Assessment Participant Qualifications, Duties & Responsibilities form be changed to "facilitate quality assessment" in order to eliminate any perception that statistical findings will be manipulated. The response deadlines for the 2017 Critical Thinking and Written Communications artifact reviewer offer letters were also modified. The offers to Gen Ed reviewers are

tentatively scheduled go out on April 14, 2017, and replies are expected by Monday, April 24, 2017. Council members also requested that the date of document modification be indicated somewhere on all these documents for future reference. Dr. Swinney motioned to approve the documents along with the changes. Dr. Gelder seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. As to the remuneration for Gen Ed Facilitators, the Council decided to go with what UAT suggested in their budgeting: a \$5,000.00 stipend.

- b) Reviewing Prior APR Plan/Report Rubric (Lisa Cota).** Due to the fact that every program is reviewed every five years, rubrics can be helpful in analyzing a program's assessment plans and reports and identifying possible adjustments or improvements one year prior to when program review occurs. Two rubrics were presented as tools available to academic programs coming up for an APR. The first rubric was used at OSU through 2011 and presented by Lisa Cota.
- c) Rubric from "Meta-assessment: Evaluating the Quality of Academic Program Assessment" webinar by James Madison University (James Knecht).** This is a broader rubric used by James Madison University every year. It helps map out clear learning objectives and goals. Mr. Knecht presented it to the Council as an example.
- d) APR Plan/Reports Review Committee.** Dr. Ownbey suggested that a subgroup of 3-4 AAIC members with experience in assessment be created to come up with a shortened rubric for program assessment. Judy Nalon, Dr. Johnson, Lisa Cota, and Dr. Gelder volunteered to form the committee. Group discussion followed regarding assessment discrepancies in the same program offered at more than one campus or via different delivery methods. Dr. Gordon suggested inserting a question in the assessment plan and report templates used at the institutional level as a prompt (rather than a requirement) to faculty to think about multiple locations, as well as multiple delivery methods, and how they are addressing the assessment of the different populations. At the end of the report could be questions such as, "Did you make comparisons between Stillwater and Tulsa, or did you make comparisons between the different delivery methods of the course, and what were those findings?"

3) General Reminders. Graduate Certificate assessment plans (standalone or embedded in a Master's or Ph.D. program degree) should be submitted to UAT by Dec. 23, 2016. Dr. Johnson passed around data that she collected regarding recent graduations and Grad Certificates. Mr. Knecht asked that the AAIC members pass along reminders to Grad Certificate coordinators regarding required assessment plans. The Board of Regents wants to see that we are addressing assessment of Grad Certificates, whether they be stand-alone or embedded. The deadline date was chosen for end of the Fall semester so that Grad Certificate assessment can be addressed in the Spring semester prior to programs ending. Lisa Cota said she is willing to meet with any coordinator who may be struggling with certificate assessment. Dr. Johnson asked about thresholds on the number of students completing a Graduate Certificate needed in order to generate reports. As a comparison, Ms. Cota noted that, historically, alumni survey reports are not published on programs with 3 students or less. Assessment Plans are required, but full reports are not in years when only a small number of students complete the certificate—a simple statement that low enrollment precluded adequate assessment data could be issued. Dr. Gordon added that some plans choose to collect data but hold off on creating a report until an extended period of time has passed that meets the threshold of three or more students completing the program or certificate. Ms. Cota added that most graduate certificates can be embedded into a larger program. Assessment coordinators can simply add an outcome number for the graduate certificate in the program plan. Notes about graduate certificates with very small enrollment could then be added to the program report as an indicator that future data is forthcoming.

4) College Updates. None.

5) Adjourn – Dr. Ownbey adjourned the meeting at 2:41 p.m.