



Assessment & Academic Improvement Council

Meeting Minutes

Friday, December 1, 2017 • 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. • 460 SU

Present: R. Chung, P. Fry (via phone), K. Gage, J. Gelder, S. Gordon, K. Hickman, C. Ippoliti, C. Johnson, B. Miller, J. Nalon, S. Ownbey, J. Swinney, T. Wikle

Absent: L. Burns, C. Campbell, J. Comer, B. Masters, J. Sanders, R. Seitsinger, B. Smith, K. Teague

Guests: D. Hightower, K. Hunger, A. Witham

Call to Order. Dr. Ownbey called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. Dr. Johnson moved to approve the minutes as presented at the November 2017 meeting. Dr. Gelder seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Assessment Updates.

2016-2017 State Regent Annual Student Assessment Report – Dr. Chung reported that the report has been submitted to the Board of Regents ahead of the due date. He feels very good about the thoroughness of the report. It will be posted to the UAT website.

2016-2017 Annual program assessment report review update. – Dr. Chung reported that, as part of the State Regents' Report, OSU is required to provide a general assessment in terms of program review. He and his team have created color-coded spread-sheets for each college as a tool for indicating which program reports meet expectations, need revisions or are missing. He handed out these by college to the corresponding AAIC representative (if present) at this meeting. These reports represent both the quality and quantity of assessment plans submitted to UAT for each program. The following is planned to bring all departments into compliance and to facilitate the conversion of assessment information into a future assessment software management system:

- Meetings with associate/assistant deans will be scheduled to go over missing or incorrect information.
- Review letters to chair/director/assessment coordinator will go out as necessary to provide assessment process guidance.
- Program assessment plan reviews are currently being done by UAT staff to ensure plans are in line with reports.

Dr. Ownbey asked if there was a method in place to monitor and update program names on the UAT site.

Qualtrics for institutional account progress update. Darlene Hightower reported that the requisition for enterprise-wide licensing of Qualtrics is being processed through purchasing. No RFP is needed. The IT department is \$22,000 short of being able to purchase the institutional account on their own. Colleges/departments which do have Qualtrics accounts will not see any increase in their cost. CVIs will be billed out from IT to those departments which use the program. Any colleges/departments with program add-ons will be billed directly by Qualtrics. Institutional access to the Qualtrics should be ready with O-Key access by April 2018.

D-Course Survey (pilot) – College of Business. Dr. Johnson stated that the survey will be administered to freshmen during "Dead Week." Although it was too late to list the survey as part of a freshman course requirement, Dr. Johnson expects a response rate of 30%-50% (approx. 300 responses). Seniors will be required to fill out the survey during the spring semester, supplying an additional 500 responses to check the validity of the survey tool. Dr. Fry, Dr. Elmore-Sanders, and Dr. Kirksey will be apprised of the results early next summer after the data has been evaluated.

Discussion Items.

Nuventive Improve (formerly named TracDat) – Assessment Management System. Dr. Ownbey asked for impressions regarding the Nuventive presentation given at the November 2017 AAIC meeting. Discussion followed. Dr. Hickman sees this type of software as a tool to maximize assessment coordinator time, enabling more discussion and concrete thought about what actions need to be taken based on the data. There was some concern voiced by Dr. Gage regarding Student Affairs assessment, but Nuventive representatives said they could copy the Academic Affairs template over to Student Affairs to fill that need. Ms. Nalon mentioned that the HLC (Higher Learning Commission) recommended that OSU have more procedures in place for Student Affairs assessment. Dr. Johnson asked about the cost. Dr. Chung stated the cost would be between \$50,000 and \$55,000. He reiterated that the program is highly customizable and that the total cost includes template customization. Costs will be kept lower due to cloud-based computing versus requiring OSU-purchased servers. The cost will be paid with assessment fees out of UAT's budget. Dr. Chung also assured the Council that UAT will provide training, assistance and one-on-one consultation. Dr. Ownbey asked that Dr. Chung report back to the Council after he meets with Dr. Fry and discusses the cost of the program and how it affects UAT's budget. Dr. Johnson feels that if purchasing the software significantly impacts the amount of assessment money available for assessment awards, the colleges should be made aware of it prior to the purchase. Additionally, Dr. Johnson is concerned about the possibility that the \$22,000 IT needs for Qualtrics may come out of assessment monies. Dr. Ownbey asked Dr. Chung if he knows what the plan is for obtaining the Qualtrics money. Dr. Chung informed the Council that Ms. Hightower has approached approximately 10 different departments/units who do not currently use Qualtrics to see if they would be interested in using Qualtrics. If they agree, the budget deficit would be divided among them. He also stated that the standard cost for one unit to use the program is about \$4,500, and if the \$22,000 is divided among the 9-11 units interested in using Qualtrics, the cost is reasonable. Dr. Chung further stated that UAT

has not been notified as to how much money UAT would be responsible for paying, but he is confident that it would not be \$22,000. Dr. Ownbey would like to wait to proceed with purchasing the Nuventive Improve software until the Council hears back about both the Qualtrics funding and how it may impact further assessment awards. Dr. Chung reiterated that his goal for this particular meeting was to get feedback from the Council regarding the Nuventive presentation and how assessment management software would benefit the University. He assured the Council that both the purchasing process and installation and implementation process will take time. Dr. Johnson asked Dr. Chung if the adoption of the Nuventive system would in any way change staffing needs in UAT. Dr. Chung responded that the staffing issue has not been discussed yet, and he plans on speaking with Dr. Fry about it. In his experience at OU there was no significant need for additional staff. It did require additional work. Dr. Gelder asked if the Nuventive program will replace software that Steve Brown developed and maintains. Dr. Chung explained that Mr. Brown maintains a depository of PDF and Word files with no analytical function and that the new system would be live data linked to institutional data, can be merged with additional documents, and it will have data analytic functionality. Dr. Ownbey asked for clarification that the repository that Mr. Brown created and maintains would no longer be needed. Dr. Chung replied that is correct. Dr. Johnson wanted to know if the program would reduce the time needed to compile the Regents report. Dr. Chung replied that his experience with the program at OU did provide quick access to General Education and program data. Dr. Johnson wanted to know if the program would impact staff costs – specifically the cost of using student workers or other staff needed to input the data. Dr. Chung replied that the cost savings would occur mainly at the faculty level. UAT would still have behind-the-scene operations that need to be done. He stressed that the program would provide a level of cost saving university-wide. Dr. Hickman added that she could see how the program would streamline some of the time required by her staff, but not save any money on the UAT side. Dr. Ownbey said the Council will revisit the topic after Dr. Chung's meeting with Dr. Fry.

OSU Student Satisfaction Survey – pilot (2018 spring). Dr. Ownbey introduced this topic by saying that the State Regents require a standard student satisfaction survey, something also important to the Higher Learning Commission. Dr. Chung then handed out a short, simple student satisfaction survey that he drafted and requested feedback. He would like to pilot the survey in the spring and make adjustments if necessary. His goal is to have more current student engagement and satisfaction data available for the 2017-2018 report cycle. He reported that the current information was gathered via alumni surveys and NSSE (2016). He feels that creating a new satisfaction survey would be a step in that direction. Ms. Nalon asked if this replaces a current survey and asked who it would be sent to and in what time frame. Dr. Chung said that we currently do not have a survey on student satisfaction. Once the validity of the survey has been tested, it will be administered to every student (both undergraduate and graduate) one to two years consecutively to meet the Regents and HLC requirements. At that point, AAIC would make the determination regarding how frequently the survey would be given out. Discussion followed. Dr. Gordon brought up that the graduate college did a student satisfaction survey several years ago, and they were very unhappy with the results. She suggested Dr. Chung confer with the graduate college. Dr. Chung told the Council how OU managed their satisfaction survey. Discussion regarding question wording, survey length and deployment for maximum response rate followed. Dr. Wickle would like a question about facilities added. Dr. Johnson feels that the real feedback from student surveys comes from comments versus number data. She would like to see two open-ended questions added to the survey: 1) What could we do to better serve you? 2) What else should we know? Dr. Gordon suggested that some of the questions may be redundant to what's already being collected by different units. For example, surveys of instruction are already done every semester. Dr. Ownbey told Dr. Chung that a very detailed academic advising survey goes out every year. Dr. Chung asked the Council members to contact him directly with their feedback and said he would like to revisit this topic at the January AAIC meeting.

OSU Alumni Survey discussion. Dr. Chung informed the Council that we will be doing the undergraduate data collection for 2012 and 2016 this upcoming spring semester using the same content and process used in the past. At a future spring-semester AAIC meeting, he will present an alternative method of data collection that is considered to be best-practice across the nation. No action was taken.

Guidelines for Use of Assessment Funds update. Dr. Chung would like to address this issue at a spring AAIC meeting as well. No action was taken.

College Updates. None.

Other. None.

Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.