Kelly provided a handout with a list of which programs have submitted assessment plans. She showed the History department assessment plan she received as an example. The Assessment Measures Checklist and Learning Outcomes Checklist are both available on the FCTL Assessment webpage: http://www.missouristate.edu/fctl/87799.htm.

A letter Kelly has created will be sent with feedback to each program after the plan has been reviewed.

Kelly has divided the plans received into categories by completeness: 1) needs a lot of work, 2) needs some work, and 3) needs very little work.

Susan will request a folder on a university server which will be accessible to all the council members. The received plans can be copied into the server folder separated into three categories and all members can review the submissions before the next meeting. Susan will notify the members when the materials are available and provide the path to access them.

Chantal and Kelly will evaluate one submission from each category and send their evaluations to all members. The council will discuss those evaluations at the next meeting. Then the members can be divided into teams and each team will be assigned a group of plans to review.

Members should send Susan their preferred meeting times to try to find a time that will fit everyone’s schedule if possible.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
September 13, 2010

Members Present: Bill Edgar, Don Fischer, Cindy Hail, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Jack Llewellyn, Justin Mellish, Pete Richardson, Lisa Stein, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham (ex-officio)
Absent: Arbindra Rimal

1. Announcements/Updates
   a. Council members introduced themselves for the benefit of members who are new to the council this year.
   b. All assessment functions previously performed by the Center for Assessment are integrated into the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. Susan Willingham previously worked half time as administrative assistant for the Center for Assessment and now is full time with the FCTL. Chantal will continue to be the “face of assessment” to the university.

2. New Assessment Research Coordinator
   Kelly Cara will begin work as the Assessment Research Coordinator for the FCTL on September 27. She will serve as a support for Chantal and the Assessment Council.

3. Assessment Planning for the Upcoming Year
   Chantal provided handouts for council members:
   - Assessment Cycle chart
   - Assessment Process and Cycle-draft 09-06-2010
   - The Assessment Process
   - Learning Outcomes and Checklist
   - Assessment Methods
   - Assessment Report Guidelines: Components of the Assessment Report
   - Constructing Learning Outcomes
   - Assessment Measures Checklist
   - Learning Outcomes Checklist
   - Curriculum Innovation Grants Guidelines

   The council will take a more active role in providing feedback and making recommendations to programs and departments.

   Programs will be requested to submit assessment plans by January 1, 2011. The goal is for all programs to meet or exceed Level 1 objectives at that time. (Level 1 objectives include: Learning outcomes, including Public Affairs learning outcomes, are clearly identified. Appropriate assessment tools associated with each learning outcome are also clearly identified.) Templates, tools, and techniques will be provided to assist programs in setting, measuring, and achieving objectives.

   Council members indicated that there was confusion on whether assessment plans were required from departments or programs. Bob reported that COAL is currently preparing department-level plans. Chantal will clarify with the Provost what is expected. If program-level assessment plans are not possible by January, perhaps departments could submit assessment plans in January and programs within those departments could submit assessment plans by May 2011.

   Assessment plans are being required for undergraduate programs only.
Council members discussed the challenges of defining and measuring the public affairs learning outcomes.

Colleges will create departmental assessment committees. Once committees are in place, when a new Assessment Council member is needed for a college, the departmental assessment committees will recommend one of their members to the college dean as a candidate to serve on the Assessment Council. The dean will submit a person recommended by one of the departmental committees to the Council as the college’s representative.

4. **Council Meeting Schedule**
The council agreed to meet every two weeks for a month and then consider a monthly schedule.

Susan will check on members’ availability before setting the next meetings.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
September 27, 2010

Members Present: Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Don Fischer, Cindy Hail, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Jack Llewellyn, Pete Richardson, Arbindra Rimal, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham (ex-officio)
Guest: Katherine Shellenberg (for Justin Mellish)
Absent: Lisa Stein

5. Announcements/Updates
Chantal introduced new Assessment Research Coordinator Kelly Cara.

6. Upcoming Meetings with Deans & Department Heads
Chantal will be meeting with colleges this week:
   a. CNAS – 09-29-2010
   b. COBA – 09-30-2010
   c. COE – 09-30-2010

7. Communication with Programs, Departments, and Colleges
Chantal is receiving feedback from colleges and departments from her AAA presentation.

8. College Assessment Committees (CAC) /Departmental Assessment Committees (DAC)
The committee discussed what structure would be best for assessment committees. There could be an assessment committee at the college, department, and program level. Each would be responsible for assessing on that level and communicating with the next level up in the hierarchy.

   There was some confusion about what the College of Education was suggesting about departmental committees, so when Chantal and Cindy meet with them this week, they will ask the dean for clarification.

   If there is an existing committee or body at the department level in place that could function to facilitate communication between a college and the programs within the department, a departmental assessment committee might not be necessary. Members expressed concern that it could be a problem to have different requirements for different colleges and departments. Consistency is important, and it might be easier to get cooperation if the rules are the same for everyone.

   The Curriculum Map page of the Assessment Plan forms handouts that Chantal provided listed three levels of outcomes to apply to courses: introduce, reinforce, and emphasize. Members wondered if assessment should be done on each level or only at the highest level (emphasize).

9. HLC Assessment Workshop
The Provost requested representatives from each college attend the October 20-22 “Making a Difference in Student Learning: Assessment as a Core Strategy” workshop. The Provost’s office will pay the cost for all attendees. Anyone who is interested in attending should let Chantal know by Friday, October 1.

Next Meeting – Monday, October 11, 10:00 a.m.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
November 8, 2010

Members Present: Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Don Fischer, Cindy Hail, Jack Llewellyn, Justin Mellish, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham (ex-offico)
Absent: Arbindra Rimal
Guest: Ben Foster (for Lisa Stein)

10. Assessment Plan Updated Forms and Documents
The documents required in assessment plans are all available on the FCTL website: http://www.missouristate.edu/fctl/90038.htm.
   a. Assessment Plan Cover Page
   b. Assessment Plan Summary Chart
   c. Curriculum Map

Many programs may have more than the requested three learning objectives. They can use various criteria to choose which three to include in their reports: objectives to focus on in the upcoming year, objectives which are most easily and effectively documented, objectives that are best representative of the program objectives. (Not all outcomes will necessarily be assessed every year.)

Chantal hopes to speak to ALC to remind the deans of the assessment plan deadline.

Council members expressed confusion over the definition of “community” in the public affairs goal of Community Engagement. Members discussed whether community can be defined as either outside or inside of the university campus. There needs to be room for flexibility of interpretation by programs in the way they define their objectives.

There have been requests from colleges for examples of public affairs learning outcomes. Some examples from Stanford University are posted on the FCTL website: http://www.missouristate.edu/fctl/87799.htm.

11. Update on College Meetings
Kelly distributed a list of programs that she and/or Chantal have met with this year. Kelly will follow up with the ones they have already met with and make plans to meet with as many of the others as possible. Chantal will contact the BSEd committee to set up a meeting with the Secondary Education program.

Chantal and Kelly will copy council members on communications with members’ colleges to keep everyone in the loop of their contact with colleges.

Chantal encouraged members to continue to provide feedback discussion within their colleges and departments.

The best way to motivate and encourage compliance is to emphasize that the benefits of assessment are more effective teaching and learning. Continued follow up with reluctant participants will encourage them to complete their plans appropriately. Timely and relevant feedback to programs will encourage better participation.

12. Process For Evaluating Assessment Plans
The deadline for submitting plans is January 1, 2011. Review of plans will begin after January 1.

The evaluation process steps will be:

1. FCTL Assessment staff will sort reports into three categories:
   a. Incomplete
   b. Questionable – need review
   c. Complete

2. Kelly and Chantal will review the reports and develop a rubric for evaluation with input from council members.

3. Council members will meet to discuss the process for evaluation of reports.

4. Council members will review the reports.

It was suggested that the programs could be allowed to submit either electronic or hard copies of reports. Electronic documents can be saved in a shared network folder which all the council members would be given access to. A hard copy file would also be kept in the FCTL office.

All programs will not likely be meeting Level 1 criteria by January. Programs whose plans need modification will be given feedback and opportunity to make corrections during the spring semester. Level 2 (collection of data) can begin after the spring semester.

Next Meeting: December 6, 2010, 4:00 p.m.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
December 6, 2010

*Members Present:* Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Don Fischer, Cindy Hail, Jack Llewellyn, Pete Richardson, Lisa Stein, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

*Guest:* Kate Shellenberg (for Justin Mellish)

1. **Assessment Plan Forms**
   Kelly provided examples of completed assessment plan forms: Assessment Plan Cover Page, Assessment Plan Summary Chart, Curriculum Map, Learning Outcomes Checklist, Assessment Measures Checklist

2. **Meeting with CNAS**
   Chantal reported that she has had positive meetings with CNAS and they are seeing benefits of standardized reporting and forms and analyzing trends over time.

3. **Annual Reports & Assessment Plans**
   It was suggested that having both the annual report and assessment plans due at the same time would be beneficial to programs. Consolidating reporting of similar data would simplify reporting and ease frustration of programs and departments. At one time the annual report had an assessment section, but assessment has not been included in recent annual reports.

4. **Assessment Plan Deadline**
   If departments want to meet in January before submitting their assessment plans, they can have some flexibility in the submission deadline. If they prefer to submit materials after January 1, it would be helpful if they would contact Chantal and/or Kelly to notify them that their work is in progress and give an idea of when it will be submitted.

5. **Updates from Colleges/Departments**
   Ways to motivate participation in assessment might be to reward faculty for participating in the assessment process but not tie reward to the outcome of any assessment. Approaching the assessment process as “program development” rather than “program improvement” emphasizes positive proactive changes rather than suggesting the current program has problems that need to be fixed.

The Council will meet again in the Spring semester; the next meeting date will be scheduled at the beginning of the semester. Members are requested to be prepared to give a short update from their colleges. Some assessment plans should be received early in January, and the Council can begin discussing the review process at the next meeting.
Members Present: Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Don Fischer, Cindy Hail, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

Kelly showed examples of assessment plans received in the three categories she has identified. (Needs a Lot of Work, Needs Some Work, Needs Very Little Work)

Kelly and Chantal will work with the “Needs a Lot of Work” plans. They will create their feedback recommendations and solicit input from other council members before sending feedback to the submitters.

Council members will each review the submitted plans from their own college because members are more likely to be familiar with programs from their own colleges. Members should draft a feedback letter and save it in the Assessment Council shared folder.

After the first review is completed, and second council member will review the feedback before sending it to the submitter.

Members agreed to request any suggested revisions be resubmitted within one month of the feedback being sent.

If a program chooses to provide a reference to an attached document in one of their forms, they need to clearly identify what specific part of the attachment they are referring to.

The first group to be evaluated will be the “Needs Some Work” in order to allow the as much time as possible for evaluation and revisions.

Feedback can be sent in batches after the review of several plans is completed.

Members should begin their review work now, and at the end of March, the council will evaluate how much work has been completed.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
April 5, 1:00, LIB 204

Members Present: Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Cindy Hail, Jack Llewellyn, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

Assessment Plans Review
The council discussed the progress of reviewing assessment plans.

Chantal and Kelly are reviewing the plans identified as “Needing a Lot of Work” and council members will review the plans from their colleges “Needing Some Work” and “Needing Very Little Work”.

A second reader will be assigned to look at each colleges’ plans. College representatives, please provide your notes and observations to the second readers so they can add to or comment on your reviews.

Second Readers:
CNAS – Bob
CHHS – Cindy
CHPA – Pete
COAL – Bill
COE – Jack
COBA – Don

All reviews should be completed before the council meets again on April 19th from 3:30-4:30.

After the second review, the primary reviewer can decide whether to send a formal letter to the assessment plan contact person or to meet with the contact person to discuss recommendations.

Data Collection Plans
After learning outcomes and assessment measures are finalized, program assessment committees/groups should begin developing and finalizing their data collection plans. The Council will review data collection plans in August or at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

The type and schedule of assessments will influence when programs will collect data, but in most cases, some data collection should begin during the fall 2011 semester.

The Council needs to decide the format for reporting data collection results and whether or how programs should identify targets for student achievement of learning outcomes.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 19, 3:30-4:30
Members present: Kelly Cara, Cindy Hail, Bill Edgar, Bill Edgar, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

I. Organizational Changes
   A. The Provost has appointed Bob council chair.
   B. The assessment office has separated from the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and will be renamed “Office for The Evaluation of Student Achievement (TESA)” pending the Provost’s approval.
   C. The council positions of representatives from CHHS, CNAS and School of Agriculture are still vacant.

II. New Assessment Structure
    Kelly presented a proposed new structure for assessment which included: changes in the assessment office, new roles for the Assessment Council, CGEIP, colleges, General Education assessment, a summary of the current state of assessment, and preparation for the 2015 HLC review.

III. Issues/Questions Surrounding the Proposed Changes and New Processes
    A. What part will the council play in the Gen Ed revision process? The members see the council being able to view the overall, university-wide perspective while other groups can focus on the course level assessment.
    B. Program reviews include an assessment piece which now incorporates a requirement for reporting outcomes.
    C. Where applicable, program and public affairs goals should be stated on syllabi to make it obvious to students and/or HLC where the goals are being implemented.
    D. Adding the NSSE survey to the University Exit Exam testing go get better participation was suggested.

IV. Future Plans
    Members should look at the proposed structure of assessment document and send suggestions to Kelly.

    Cindy will get the input of the Faculty Senate.

    Bob and Kelly plan to meet with the Provost to present the proposed new structure and get clarity on the responsibilities and the charge of the Assessment Council. The Assessment Research Coordinator’s job responsibilities and the responsibilities need to be defined.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
April 27, 1:00, LIB 204

Members Present: Kelly Cara, Bill Edgar, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Cindy Hail, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

Assessment Plans Review

Council members discussed reviews of assessment plans.

107 out of 113 programs have submitted plans. Only 5 were in the “needs a lot of work” category. The goal is to move all programs to the “needs very little work” category.

Targets are not currently a part of the assessment planning documents, but council members discussed how to set targets and consequences for not meeting targets. This will continue to be a topic of discussion as the council learns about current best practices for setting targets.

Kelly is preparing a proposal to revise the review process. She will present this proposal at the next meeting (TBD). The revision will be based on information obtained from this year’s Higher Learning Commission conference. The proposal will include the following elements:

- Schedule for assessment cycle process including annual training and peer review sessions
- Selection or appointment of program representatives by each program
- Membership and roles/duties for program representatives, deans/dept. heads, and Assessment Council
- Expectations for learning outcomes including how many to assess and report on annually
- Resources to provide to those involved in the program assessment planning process

Instructor Evaluations

As per SGA representative, Kate Shellenberg, SGA has proposed that the Assessment Council be the final body to approve questions on the IGrade instructor evaluation survey. This survey fulfills Senate Bill 389 which requires universities to provide students with an opportunity to evaluate instructors and have access to the overall results. In previous years, Faculty Senate has given final approval of changes to the evaluation, but this body’s approval is not a requirement. For good measure, SGA would like a body with representation from all colleges as well as students to be the final approver. Since the Assessment Council is a small group with this type of representation, SGA asked the Council members to consider their proposal. Not enough Council members were present at the end of the meeting to vote on this proposal, but those who were present made recommendations for other groups that might be more appropriate.
Members present: Kelly Cara, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Bill Edgar, Susan Willingham

Kelly and Chantal have finished reviews of all “needs a lot of work” plans.

All programs should be given formal, written feedback, even if council members are meeting with representatives in person.

Next Meeting Agenda:
- Decide how long it will take to finish the this year’s reviews and complete the process
- Discuss the process for next year
- Review the committees handbook before it is updated in June
- Discuss new council members for CNAS & CHHS. Members should be submitted by colleges and approved by the Provost.
- Discuss the timeline for moving to Level 2 in the assessment process
Assessment Council
MINUTES
June 13, 2011

Members present:  Kelly Cara, Cindy Hail, Bill Edgar, Jack Llewellyn, Chantal Levesque-Bristol, Bill Edgar, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

Assessment Plans Reviews
Kelly has put together a spreadsheet showing the results of assessment plans reviews. She will email the document to members so they can update any parts that they know require additions or modification.

Change to Assessment Process
Chantal reported and others confirmed that they have heard the administration has changed the policy for assessment plans and assessment structure. The new process will not require a standardized format or a centralized review. Consultation with the FCTL is available, but not required. Assessment of public affairs learning outcomes is not required. (The long-range plan references assessment of public affairs learning outcomes.)

Council members expressed several concerns regarding the new policy as they understand it:

- No one involved with assessment was consulted or informed prior the announcement of this change.
- HLC requires centralized, coordinated processes with structured, consistent format for reporting; and this policy does not meet those requirements.
- HLC requires assessment of a university’s mission if a university has a strong mission, and this process doesn’t include assessing public affairs learning outcomes.

Council members suggested a meeting with the president and/or the provost to clarify the changes and present the proposed new process that Kelly has outlined for next year. Chantal will talk to Rachelle to discuss the possibility of planning a meeting.

Proposed New Review Process
In the proposed new model, the Assessment Council would move from reviewing all assessment plans to being a coordinator/advisory board. Representatives from programs and departments would be trained in the assessment process and conduct peer reviews while the Council would facilitate the review process. Kelly reported that most large schools are moving to this model. If extra funds are available, they could be distributed to colleges to supplement the assessment process. Outside experts could train council members who could train the colleges’ personnel.

Kelly will send her document outlining the new process and her proposed updates to the Assessment Council description from the committees handbook for members to review.