



# Assessment & Academic Improvement Council Agenda

Minutes

Friday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022 • 1:30pm – 3:00pm • Online Zoom Meeting

**Present:** A. Doust, K. Hickman, S. Heragu, A. Sanogo, T. Lightner, M. Bayles, M. Upson, R. Chung

**Absent:** J. Van Delinder, C. Francisco, J. Comer, K. Gage

**Guests:** K. Hunger, K. Holcomb, R. Fitzgerald, L. Burns, R. Pritzlaff, M. Sun

**Call to Order.** Call to order by K. Hickman (on behalf of J. Van Delinder) at 1:32 pm

**Approval of Email Update Minutes:** Motion by M. Bayles / Seconded by A. Doust

## Upcoming AAIC meetings

- I. December 2<sup>nd</sup> (email update)

## Updates from UAT

- I. Annual Program Outcomes Assessment Reporting update
  - i. K. Holcomb provided the POA scores as reported to the Oklahoma State Regents via the OSRHE report. Of the 247 academic programs, 222 turned in a report this year; this was a turn-in rate of 89.9%.
    - o 4.0% of programs received Greatly Exceeded Expectations, 12.1% received Exceeded Expectations, 33.9% received Met Expectations, 31.3% received Somewhat Met Expectations, 5.3% received Minimally Met Expectations, 6.2% received Missing Information, and 7.2% received Not Applicable scores.
  - ii. It was announced that the Nuventive Improvement Platform would be reopening on Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup> for missing reports to be updated and review scores/feedback to be viewed by coordinators. An email blast to all coordinators was sent on Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup>, as well.
- II. Certificate Program Review Rubric and Review Progress update
  - i. R. Fitzgerald provided the POA scores and turn-in rate specific to certificates. Of the 52 certificates in the Nuventive system, 17 certificates had information in Nuventive.
  - ii. Fourteen of the certificate programs completed a report which consisted of the findings, use of findings, and/or annual executive summary sections. Of those turned in, a majority received Somewhat Met Expectations or higher on each component.
- III. POA Five-Year Review update
  - i. K. Hunger updated the committee regarding the follow-up meetings that were held with each AAIC representative during September and October to go over college-level findings for the 5-year review.
- IV. UAT Award of Excellence
  - i. The winners of the 2022 UAT Award of Excellence were chosen in collaboration with the AAIC college representatives. Winners were reported to the Office of the Provost and will be recognized at the December Awards Convocation.
  - ii. UAT proposed that the UAT Award for Excellence be put on hold in 2023 pending the realignment of assessment procedures and expectations based on the new OSU Strategic Plan and new State Regents requirements.
    - o The committee asked for more information regarding the new OSRHE requirements. Those documents were provided to the entire committee via email the following Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup>, with permission from the Office of the Provost.
    - o M. Bayles proposed there be a way for interested programs to see the assessment plans and reports of UAT Award winners to get new ideas for assessment. Assessment plans and reports are available upon request by emailing UAT.
- V. There will be a short presentation of AAIC/UAT for Faculty Council on 12/13

## AAIC Discussion topics for AY 2022-2023

- I. Missing Report Procedures – final discussion and endorsement
  - i. Motion to endorse by M. Bayles / Seconded by A. Sanogo
- II. New Student Satisfaction & Engagement Survey (SSES) – final discussion and endorsement
  - i. The following information was provided to answer questions arising from the October email update:
    - o Color schemes = themes/factors
    - o Number of items (SSS = 28 items; SES = 31 items; SSES = 35 items)
  - ii. A. Doust proposed that some of the items may be too general to fairly capture individual experiences of engagement. K. Hunger expanded upon the intention to capture a snapshot of student engagement and satisfaction per the expectations of the State Regents. The shared dashboard for the prior engagement and satisfaction surveys has been created in collaboration with IRA; the link was shared in the Zoom chat box for all members to view.
  - iii. K. Hickman asked if language on one item be adjusted to specify that any mention of working on faculty research was intending to mean within the faculty's lab rather than their classroom. R. Chung mentioned

there is a survey in development stages being conducted outside of UAT to capture more information on student participation in research.

- iv. Motion to endorse by S. Heragu / Seconded by A. Doust
- III. Process and Procedure on college/department meeting on program outcomes assessment report review, creating a transparent communication/discussion on feedback and strategies on implementing action plan
  - i. K. Hunger walked through follow-up procedures being proposed following the individual college level meetings with AAIC representatives. One of the newly proposed procedures will work to utilize the expertise and experience of UAT Award winners through one-on-one interviews, either on camera or off, to give advice and perspective from a peer standpoint to coordinators.
  - ii. A. Doust suggested that a future initiative could involve assigning mentors or teams of assessment coordinators together to further push for collaboration and sharing of expertise regarding assessment.

#### **Other**

- I. R. Pritzlaff asked for more clarification regarding the newly proposed expectations of the State Regents. R. Chung intended to follow up on whether or not those documents could be shared with the committee. Permission was granted by the Office of the Provost and the documents were sent on to the committee via email on Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup>. A link to OSU's current Institutional Assessment Plan was provided in the Zoom chat box.

#### **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 2:24 pm motioned by A. Sanogo / unanimous