Assessment Council
MINUTES
September 25, 2012
3:30 pm, CARR 314D

_In Attendance:_ Bob Willenbrink, Brian Calfano, Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Phil Harsha, Stephanie Hein, Shyang Huang, Joshua Lambert, Diana Piccolo, Arbindra Rimal, Patti Salinas, Kirby Williams, Susan Willingham
_Absent:_ Rachelle Darabi, Lyn Gattis, Cindy Hail, Pete Richardson

I.  **Welcome and Introductions**
All members introduced themselves and shared their roles and experiences with assessment in their departments. Each college has submitted an assessment process summary report, and all are available on the Assessment website at: [http://www.missouristate.edu/assessment/131536.htm](http://www.missouristate.edu/assessment/131536.htm)

II.  **Assessment Institute October 28-30**
Kelly shared information on an Assessment Institute in Indianapolis, October 28-30, 2012. The cost per person is $280. Bob will check with the Provost’s office to see if they could fund some of the costs. Kelly is planning to attend, and anyone else interested should contact her for details.

III.  **Update on Director of Assessment Position Search**
The search committee has scheduled three candidates for on campus interviews the first three weeks of October. Bob will contact the search committee chair to discuss having the candidates meet with the Council.

IV.  **Updated Roles and Duties of the Assessment Council**
Kelly gave an update on recent changes to the Assessment Office and the Assessment Council’s responsibilities. Assessment separated from the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and is now a stand-alone department. The new offices are in Carrington 422.
The charges of the Council, as listed in the Committees Handbook, include:

A.  **Working with the assessment process of the HLC initiative Commission Quality Initiative Project (QIP).** This is a voluntary effort to recognize where MSU is implementing the public affairs mission. Faculty may submit artifacts from their students, and a faculty committee will review the submissions over the summer. The Assessment Office is the repository for all submissions. The Assessment Council will summarize the data from the QIP and make reports for HLC, the University, and individual colleges or other groups as needed. The Council will also make recommendations about the QIP processes and rubric. This project is just now being publicized; no formal requests have been made to individual faculty.

B.  **Review current assessment tools used by MSU to assess university-level goals** such as:
1. ETS Proficiency Profile – the exit exam administered to all graduating seniors
2. NSSE
3. CIRP
4. Major Field Tests

C.  **Planning and implementing assessment training programs for the campus.**
Rachelle Darabi is encouraging the Council to produce a mini assessment conference in January 2013 (either the week before classes begin or the first week of classes would be possible dates). This would be an opportunity for departments to present how they are doing assessment and share resources and ideas. There is also money in the Assessment Office budget to bring in an external speaker for this conference.
D. **Reviewing program-level assessment plans.** The Council’s role in this process is not defined at this point.

E. **Reviewing the General Education program assessments.** The Council will be involved in the process of planning assessments, but this will not occur until sometime in the future.

V. **Meeting Schedule**
The Council will plan to meet once a month, possibly alternating days of the week if one day does not suit everyone’s schedules. Feedback from members will be sought to choose dates.
Assessment Council
MINUTES
November 6, 2012
3:30 pm, CARR 314D

I. Director of Assessment Position Updates
The search committee has recommended a candidate for the position. The Provost will be making an offer soon. Candidate #2, Vicki Schmitt, withdrew her application.

II. Review of November 5 meeting with Tammy Jahnke regarding QIP
- Faculty can submit artifacts in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Submissions are completely voluntary.
- In Summer 2013, reviewers will assess the artifacts using a prepared rubric. Anyone who wishes to apply to be a paid reviewer should contact Tammy Jahnke. Dean Jahnke indicated that Council members could serve as reviewers if they wished to.
- In Fall 2013, the Assessment Council will review the ratings of the reviewers and report on the results.

More information on the QIP is available at: http://www.missouristate.edu/hlc/qip.htm

III. Gen Ed Assessment Process
- The Assessment Council’s involvement is still not clearly defined.
- New course proposal forms are available at: http://www.missouristate.edu/generaleducation/application.htm
  Council members who are also faculty have access to review the submitted course proposal forms.
- Gen Ed Assessment training will be conducted on November 15, 3:45 PM, in LIBR 101 (Library auditorium). Various faculty members will share examples and experiences. Council members are encouraged to attend.

IV. Spring Assessment Conference - January 23, 2013, 1:00-5:00 PM, PSU
- Kelly distributed a draft schedule. She is researching a possible keynote speaker. Members expressed that they would like to have someone from a similar institution with similar experiences as a speaker.
- Council members are needed to help secure presenters from each college. Sessions can be led by a single speaker or a panel. Council members should give Kelly suggestions for presenters and a description of their presentations before Thanksgiving break.

V. Upcoming Conferences
The Provost’s office has made some funds available for Council members to attend assessment related conferences.
Some possibilities are:
- AAC&U February 28-March 2, Boston
- AAC&U April 4-6, Miami
- HLC April 5-9, Chicago
Anyone interested should contact Kelly.

Next meeting: Monday, December 3, 3:30-5:00, CARR 314D
Present: Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Lyn Gattis, Shyang Huang, Mary Ann Jennings, Pete Richardson, Arbindra Rimal, Patti Salinas, Susan Willingham

VI. Director of Assessment Candidate and Search Process Feedback
Members shared feedback on candidate Keri Franklin and feedback on the search process. Topics of discussion included the merits of having the position as a full time staff position versus part time staff/part time faculty, and who this position should report to in order to be most effective. Individual feedback and comments on the candidate can be sent to search committee chair, Victor Matthews.

VII. Showcase on Assessment - January 23, 2013, 1:00-5:00 PM, PSU
A. College presenters:
   1. COAL –
   2. COB –
   3. COE – Cathy Pearman (definite) and Emmett Sawyer (maybe)
   4. CHHS –
   5. CHPA –
   6. CNAS – Gigi Saunders (definite) and Kathy Shade (maybe)
   7. School of Agriculture –
Kelly offered to contact possible presenters suggested by council members.
B. Keynote presenter Jean Henscheid, faculty member from Portland State University
   Kelly suggested the possibility of having the keynote speaker offer consulting sessions with colleges and/or departments separate from the conference events. Council members suggested she contact deans and department heads to determine if there would be enough interest to justify paying the speaker extra for this option.

VIII. University Exit Exam Data
Kelly gave members two reports of Proficiency Profile exam data.
   • Summary of comparisons of Missouri State to a sample of Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU) who administer the Proficiency Profile. MSU data is very similar to those comparison institutions on all measures and levels.
   • Item analysis which showed MSU and national student percentages by test question and the proficiency level and content of each question for the year 2012. This type of data has only recently become available and provides a greater level of detail than was available previously.
   • One of the council’s charges is to review university-level assessment tools. Because we now have reports available on the Proficiency Profile which will allow more detailed data analysis, the council might choose to evaluate this exam data to determine how it fits into the university goals and how scores could be improved. It was suggested that requesting a review copy of the exam to look at the questions would be useful.
Members present: Jan Atwell, Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Keri Franklin, Lyn Gattis, Cindy Hail, Shyang Huang, Mary Ann Jennings, Joshua Lambert, Diana Piccolo, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink
Absent: Rachelle Darabi, Slone Delong, Phil Harsha, Stephanie Hein, Arbindara Rimal, Patti Salinas

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   New Members
   Jan Atwell is a new representative from CHHS. Members introduced themselves and discussed their backgrounds and experiences with assessment.

II. OLD BUSINESS
   Showcase on Assessment, January 23, 1:00-5:00
   • Council members are invited to luncheon with keynote speaker, Jean Henscheid, January 23, 11:30-12:30, Union Club
   • Jean Henscheid will meet with colleges that requested consultations on Thursday.
   • Council members were encouraged to promote the event in their colleges and departments.
   • Members reviewed drafts of the program, and decided the single sheet with insert was the preferred format. Members recommended a one-page flyer with short session descriptions would be helpful. The assessment office staff will create the flyer and deliver it to council members on Friday to pass out in colleges and departments.
   • Anyone can attend any part of the Showcase. Attendance at all sessions is not required. Registration is requested but not required.

III. NEW BUSINESS
   Council Goals and Priorities
   A. Gen Ed Assessment
      The Assessment office will schedule work days for faculty to revise course proposals with the assistance of Assessment staff, CGEIP members, and Council members.

      Diana Piccolo shared an overview of the CGEIP review process. The Council suggested collecting information about the process in order to assist in improving the process. It was suggested that Council members go through the proposal process themselves with the goal of creating an example proposal.

   B. Quality Initiative Project (QIP)
      Calendar/Schedule:
      1. Collect artifacts – through the end of the spring semester. Work from the fall semester can still be submitted.
      2. Reviewers score artifacts – in summer
      3. Assessment office and Council prepare reports on the results of scoring – report completed in September.

      Council members are encouraged to participate and promote the project in their colleges and departments. Keri requested suggestions of faculty who would be willing to submit artifacts and offered to send personal invitations to them.
The goal is to collect artifacts from 25 participants in the first year.

Participating faculty will receive reminders from the Assessment office and staff will collect artifacts when they are complete.

The reviewers will be offered $15 bookstore gift cards as a thank you for their participation.

Reviews will use a scoring guide to place student work on a continuum of public affairs understanding and application. Results will be presented in aggregate format, but individualized reports for participating faculty will be available upon request. It was suggested that a presentation on the results could be offered at the fall Showcase on Teaching and Learning.

Next meeting: January 31, 3:30-5:00
Assessment Council
MINUTES
January 31, 2013
3:30 pm, UNIV 012

Members present: Jan Atwell, Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Keri Franklin, Lyn Gattis, Cindy Hail, Stephanie Hein, Shyang Huang, Mary Ann Jennings, Thomas Lane, Diana Piccolo, Arbindara Rimal, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink
Absent: Brian Calfano, Rachelle Darabi, Slone Delong, Joshua Lambert, Juan Meraz, Patti Salinas

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Administration of the University Exit Exam will be transferred to the Office of Institutional Research.
B. A new undergraduate student Council member is needed because the previous student member has resigned.
C. Thomas Lane (Student Affairs) and Juan Meraz (Diversity & Inclusion) are new Council members.

V. OLD BUSINESS
A. Showcase on Assessment Recap
   Attendance
   - Total number of recorded unique attendees – 59
   - Average number of attendees per concurrent session timeframe – 45
   - Average number of attendees per individual concurrent session – 11
   Feedback
   Response to the sessions was generally positive. Kelly will send an email to all attendees with a link to an online feedback form to offer an additional opportunity to provide feedback. Council members suggested that more direction to the facilitator and colleges on topics for group consultation sessions could help improve productivity of those consultations. Bob Willenbrink also discussed the Showcase on Assessment in his recent COAL blog entry at http://blogs.missouristate.edu/coal/.
   Session Materials
   Videos and materials from selected sessions will be posted on the Office of Assessment website.

B. CGEIP Update
   Diana Piccolo provided information on the new course submission process. She provided materials from two courses as good examples of new proposals.

C. QIP
   Information and forms are posted on the Office of Assessment website. Artifacts from this academic year can be submitted through late May. Council members are encouraged to invite other faculty to submit student work. Council members are invited to apply to be reviewers if they wish to. It was suggested to combine the academic and co-curricular rubrics. Members should review the two documents and the Council will discuss combining the two at the next meeting.

VI. NEW BUSINESS
A. Gen Ed Course Proposal Open Labs
   The labs will provide work time for faculty to prepare or revise course proposals. Office of Assessment staff and CGEIP members will be available to provide support and assistance. 1:00-4:00, Siceluff 126
   Friday, February 1, Thursday, February 7, Friday, February 15, Thursday, February 21
I. Announcements
   A. Gen Ed Course Proposal Open Labs
      Remaining dates: Friday, February 15, 1:00-4:00 and Thursday, February 21, 1:00-4:00
   B. Student Learning Outcomes Update
      New call for proposals includes public issues courses.
   C. Courses in the Current Gen Ed Program That Have Not Been Submitted
      The submission deadline is March 1. Keri provided a list of courses that haven’t been submitted or need to resubmit. Council members should encourage anyone in their colleges who needs resubmit to attend an open lab.
      It was mentioned that some departments have submitted several courses for inclusion in gen ed, and the question was raised as to how many are allowable per department.
   D. University wide assessment activities
      The Council will begin to look at assessment across the university, including key performance indicators, and review college assessment plans.

II. Old Business
   QIP
   • Submissions
     14 faculty have committed to submit student work.
     Keri sent personal invitations to selected faculty inviting them to submit work.
   • Review Process
     The review date has been changed to May 21-24 to better accommodate faculty schedules.
     The number of hours required for reviewing may vary depending on the number of submissions and the number of reviewers.
     Assessment Council members participating in the reviewing process can serve as table leaders.
     Keri and Kelly showed an example of a paper flow draft from The National Writing Project which reviews submitted work as an example of the process the review team would follow.
   • Rubric
     Members looked at the new combined rubric draft and recommended to combine academic and co-curricular rubrics into one.
   • Council members discussed how they have shared QIP information. All are encouraged to continue to share with their colleges and departments, sign up to be a reviewer, and submit their own student work.

III. New Business
   A. Assessment Tool Committee Update and Campus Wide Tools
      Campus departments use different course evaluation tools with different types of questions and collect different data.
      The Assessment Tool Committee could be invited to attend an Assessment Council meeting to present their findings.
   B. AHELO Description and Results
      The AHELO (Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes) feasibility study is an attempt to create a standardized test for higher education that can be used to compare students around the world.
      Kelly shared the background and results of the AHELO test project MSU participated in during spring
2012. MSU was one of nine American schools participating in the study. Costs of the project were paid for by AHELO. Only 66 MSU seniors participated, but their scores were generally good. Incentives such as cash, an iPod and an iPad were given to participating MSU students. The study schools found that larger cash amounts and different types of incentives tied to graduation produced higher participation rates.

Next meeting: Thursday, February 28, 3:30-5:00, Carrington 203
Assessment Council
MINUTES
February 28, 2013
3:30 pm, CARR 203

Present: Jan Atwell, Peter Collins, Rachelle Darabi, Lyn Gattis, Shyang Huang, Thomas Lane, Pete Richardson, Arbindra Rimal, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. Minutes from the February 14 meeting were accepted as presented.
   B. The final Gen Ed Course Proposal Open Lab will be Friday, March 1, 1:00-4:00.
   C. The Council will not meet in two weeks because of Spring Break. The next meeting after that would fall during Spring Holiday; that meeting will be rescheduled – date TBD.

II. OLD BUSINESS
   QIP
      a. 42 submissions have been received to date
      b. The review period will be May 21-24, 2013

III. NEW BUSINESS
   Retention & Student Learning Presentation
   Rachelle Darabi shared a presentation she had prepared on retention. Some highlights from the presentation include:
   MSU’s current retention rate, first semester/first year to second semester/second year is 75%. The goal is 80%. The six-year graduation rate is 55%.
   Retaining current students is more cost effective than recruiting new students.
   A number of students with >3.50 GPA are not being retained.
   Results of a survey done by Tom Kane show that the most important factors influencing retention are mostly emotional: 1) commitment, 2) satisfaction, and 3) homesickness. The results are consistent with other national data.
   Students’ attitudes coming into school are also a big factor.
   Several areas which work with first year students have incorporated these findings into their practices.
   Everyone in all areas can improve retention by striving to engage students.
   The PSY 121 course redesign project has utilized online study plans, student assistants, and peer instruction.
   Posttest scores have improved from 27-35% to 85-86%. DFW rates have not changed.

TO DO LIST - Review COAL assessment plan for discussion at next meeting
Assessment Council
MINUTES
March 21, 2013
3:30 pm, CARR 209

Present: Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Keri Franklin, Lyn Gattis, Cindy Hail, Shyang Huang, Joshua Lambert, Thomas Lane, Juan Meraz, Susan Willingham
Guest: Kathy Coy

I. Announcements
   A. February 28 Meeting Minutes
      The minutes of 2/28 meeting were accepted as presented.

   B. Council Meeting Schedule
      Assessment Council meetings will be the same as scheduled. The remaining meetings of the semester are: April 11, April 25, and May 9.

   C. QIP
      53 commitments to participate in the QIP have been received to date. Two co-curricular submissions have been received. 10 people have committed to be reviewers. An additional five reviewers would be desirable. Ideally, there will be at least one reviewer from each college.
      A question was raised about what will be done with the student work after the review. No plans have yet been made for disposition of the materials after the review. It was suggested that these submissions could also be used to evaluate other things such as critical thinking and writing. Permission would need to be secured from faculty submitters to reuse their materials. In the future submissions could be limited to one part of the public affairs mission each year or a random sample of courses.

   D. Updates from Colleges
      Council members can encourage discussions within departments and programs about assessment. It was suggested having a session at the next Showcase on Assessment presenting and discussing different methods and types of assessment.
      Council members provided updates from their colleges and departments. Some items mentioned included:
      a. Student Affairs, Thomas Lane – Continuing student study conducted by Student Development and Public Affairs and Student Affairs. 1200 responses. If anyone would like access to the data, let Thomas Lane know.
      b. Diversity & Inclusion, Juan Meraz – A diversity climate study is planned for this year. Two companies are being considered as candidates to hire to administer the survey. Survey questions will be customized for MSU. Faculty, staff, students, and the community will be invited to participate. The study will begin in April. The university administration would like to have preliminary data by October.
      c. Library, Bill Edgar – Library Science is updating classes offered through MU. Library Science at MU is preparing for accreditation.
      d. COE, Cindy Hail – PEU members will be meeting to review data collected in the fall. The PEU is looking at different assessment tools related to diversity, competencies and practical skills. The STEPS program that they have been using is limited because it is tied to specific classes and they would like to collect data about things happening outside of classes and co-curricular data. TK20 is an assessment tool being considered. There is a per student cost for the TK20 program. Other programs might be able to use this type of program. Cindy requested and the council agreed that they would like to hear from Blackboard a well. Keri will arrange this at a future meeting. The council members agreed that it would be useful for the Council to attend the presentation by TK20 company representatives.
      e. COAL, Peter Collins – Some music faculty are considering submitting to the QIP. The music is discussing assessment and documentation of student learning in preparation for their 10 year
accreditation visit from NASM. They are working on assessment tools to document students’ progress as performers.

f. CNAS, Shyang Huang – Chemistry deleted two courses that were submitted for Gen Ed. New plans have been submitted to replace those. Shyang has communicated with all CNAS department heads regarding submitting work for QIP soliciting reviewers.

g. COAL, Lyn Gattis – English has been working on Gen Ed course proposals. Lyn expressed that faculty feel there is a need for greater understanding of assessment across disciplines.

II. Old Business

A. COAL Assessment Plan

The Assessment Council is reviewing college assessment plans submitted in June 2012 in order to get an idea of assessment in colleges. Summary plans from all colleges are posted on the Office of Assessment website. Summary plans generally include only goals common to all programs within the college. Council members reviewed the COAL assessment plan and discussed the information reported. No action was taken.

III. New Business

A. University Exit Exam

1. Revisions to Process

Institutional Research Director Kathy Coy addressed the Council regarding changes to the administration process. The University Exit Exam (the ETS® Proficiency Profile) is taken during a student’s senior year, and must be taken prior to graduation, following the completion of 90 hours. The ETS® Proficiency Profile is a 36-item multiple-choice examination assessing basic academic skills such as critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics. The University Exit Exam is administered in scheduled sections of GEN 499.

In the past, the exit exam was administered by first the Center for Assessment and then the Assessment division of the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. The Office of Institutional Research will administer the exit exam beginning in Summer 2013.

Kathy proposed that the administration method be changed from a paper-and-pencil proctored exam to an online format. The effect size between proctored and unproctored exam scores is small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proctored</th>
<th>Un-proctored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU Mean</td>
<td>449.84</td>
<td>446.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size of the difference</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proctored</th>
<th>Unproctored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National # of Institutions</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>441.59</td>
<td>439.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size of the difference</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exams scores are highly correlated with ACT scores and high school ranking. Because a minimum passing score is not required, increasing student motivation has always been an issue. Communication with faculty would be beneficial to encourage student motivation.

The following table summarizes the discussion of comparisons between different administration types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proctored paper &amp; pencil</th>
<th>Proctored online</th>
<th>Unproctored online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Advantages
- Ability to monitor test takers
- Can test a large number of students at once
- Less expensive
- More flexibility in test timing
- Individual scores available immediately
- Less expensive
- More convenient for students
- Individual scores available immediately

### Disadvantages
- Labor intensive
- More expensive than online
- Student scores are not available until after all tests are administered
- Difficulty of scheduling computer rooms
- Labor intensive proctoring
- No ability to monitor test takers

2. **Recommendations from Assessment Council**
   The Assessment Council made a recommendation for a pilot in Summer 2013 which would administer an equal number of proctored online and unproctored online exams. The Assessment Council will review the results and determine whether administration will be via online unproctored exams starting in Fall 2013. Kathy will present the recommendation to the Provost. A report of the summer results will be made to Faculty Senate.

### IV. Adjournment
I. Announcements
   A. March 21 Meeting
      The minutes of the 3/21/13 meeting were approved as presented.
   B. QIP Update
      55 commitments to participate have been received from 40 different individuals. It was
      suggested that adding a requested submission deadline would encourage people to respond, but
      also to emphasize that submissions would be accepted after the deadline.
      The review process will use a sample of 300 assignments for each public affairs pillar and 300
      for general public affairs.
      Kelly showed a list of submissions received categorized by college and department. She will
      email the list to council members.
   C. SLOs
      Kelly has reviewed a report showing which SLOs are covered by approved Gen Ed courses. Six
      SLOs are not covered by any courses, some have only a few, and several have a large number.
   D. Council Meeting Schedule
      A request was made to try to avoid scheduling Council meetings on the same days as Faculty
      Senate next semester.

II. Old Business
   A. Assessment Newsletter
      Kelly showed a draft of the Office of Assessment newsletter and requested members’ feedback.
      It was intended to be distributed via the Provost Communique, but it was suggested to also
      distribute it via the Diversity and the Student Affairs areas email lists. Members also suggested
      that disseminating smaller chunks of information more frequently would be as good or better
      than publishing a long newsletter.
   B. Exit Exam Recommendation
      A copy of the recommendation regarding the new administration procedures was distributed to
      members. The Provost has approved the recommendation to pilot online exams in the summer.
      Council members were encouraged to help disseminate this information to their colleges and
      departments.
   C. NSSE
      A copy of NSSE questions was distributed to members. Members were encouraged to take the
      information to their colleges and departments for discussion about how this information could be
      used. A report of content data from any of the questions can be requested from the Office of
      Assessment. Demographic information on survey participants is also available. Due to the low
      response rate, data by department may not be as relevant as total university wide data. Colleges
      and departments can help encourage participation by their students when the survey is
      administered again.
      Some ideas which have been considered for improving NSSE participation for first year students
      are administering it in SOAR or as a part of GEP classes. A possible option for improving
      participation among seniors is to make NSSE a graduation requirement.
III. New Business
   A. HLC Update
      Dean Tammy Jahnke provided an update from the HLC Steering Committee. This is still early in the process, as the visit is not until 2015. The visit team will be on campus in Fall 2015 for 1 ½ days. They will meet with university leadership and key committees and groups and hold open forums.

      The HLC process has been streamlined. All materials will be submitted to HLC online with a limit of 35,000 words. All supporting materials will be submitted as attached documents. The steering committee has verified that MSU meets the list of assumed practices, which are primarily policies. This will not be submitted to HLC.

      The HLC website has information about preparation for the 2015 site visit with assumed practices, criterion and core components, and feedback from the 2005 visit. (http://www.missouristate.edu/hlc/preparation.htm).

      Council members were encouraged to look at the criteria and core components report and give feedback on any information which they see that needs to be added. The steering committee plans to complete it next year. For every criteria and core concern the team will report whether it was met, met with concerns, or not met.

      The Provost assigned two people to assess the program review process and some changes were made based on their findings. Schedules, program reviews, self study, reviewer comments, and action plans are available online.

      One missing element that needs to be addressed is that there is no policy requiring differences in syllabi and SLOs for undergraduate and graduate students in cross listed graduate/undergraduate classes. Graduate Council will be consulted about this concern.

      The steering committee will be holding open forums next year. This is an opportunity to improve things that need to be better but also to celebrate what MSU is doing well.

   B. Program Review
      Keri suggested a cohort model in which a group of faculty from different departments would meet monthly to discuss assessment different topics and share among members.

      Program review can be a topic for discussion for Assessment Council next year. How does accreditation fit in with the cycle of program review? The Council would like to review the findings of the people who reviewed the program review process.

   C. College Updates
      i. Diversity & Inclusion, Juan Meraz – The company Diversity Works has been selected to administer the diversity climate survey. They will begin this month. University and community members will be invited to participate.

      ii. Student Affairs, Thomas Lane – Keri reported about NSSE to Student Affairs Council.

      iii. COB, Pete Richardson – Pete met with Kathy Coy to share COB experience with online test administration which will provide insights to assist with online Exit Exams administration.

      iv. PEU, Cindy Hail – PEU will be having a data day on April 26 to discuss unit wide professional education data including outcomes, diversity issues, student teaching.

IV. Adjournment
Assessment Council
MINUTES
May 9, 2013
3:30 pm, CARR 203

Present: Jan Atwell, Kelly Cara, Peter Collins, Bill Edgar, Keri Franklin, Shyang Huang, Lyn Gattis, Joshua Lambert, Juan Meraz, Diana Piccolo, Pete Richardson, Bob Willenbrink, Susan Willingham

I. Announcements
   A. Review minutes of April 11, 2013 meeting
      The minutes of the April 11 meeting were accepted as presented.

   B. QIP Update
      The numbers to date are:
      46 faculty and staff participants
      19 reviewers
      76 assignments
      2173 pieces of student work
      Keri suggested that next year’s process include training and reviewing more than once a year.

II. New Business
   A. Member Terms
      Bob expressed that he would like current members to serve one more year. At the end of next year, members can decide whether to serve another two-year term.
      One undergraduate and one graduate student member are needed. Members are encouraged to speak to any students they think would be good candidates for membership.

   B. Recap of Year
      Members were asked to share what they have taken away from their year on Assessment Council which could be used in their other work, what positives they experienced, and any other feedback from the experiences of the year.
      
      Pete Richardson – trying to make everything we do be goal oriented. We’ve discussed program review, and it would be nice to have systems in place so we don’t have to scramble when accreditation and review comes up – a time saving thing.
      
      Juan Meraz – it has given good ideas for division organization – more intentional processes to understand where scholarship students are going, university-wide understanding through diversity survey, etc.
      
      Diana Piccolo – better understand the 3 pillars of PA in department and across campus – how PA works across campus and aligns with dept and university goals
      
      Pete Richardson – does assessment stop when students are no longer in our classrooms?
      
      Bill Edgar – in teacher ed, a survey looks at alumni
      
      Juan Meraz – students in TRIO are tracked for 6 years after the program (i.e. other schooling, military, etc. for grant fulfillment)
      
      Keri Franklin – Do we have a university-wide alumni survey? Career Center has a graduate survey. Are we all doing the same thing? Is there one survey we could all use to keep from overlapping work? Should we pursue this?
      
      Pete Richardson – if a survey is too large, it won’t be good. MSU used to distribute a graduate survey every five years. It covered more of “what I like and what I didn’t like about my program” which isn’t that useful.
      
      Keri Franklin – some departments do exit interviews, but many of them don’t consider it part of their assessment plan.
Lyn Gattis – engineering depts. Often conduct exit interviews with graduating seniors and also alumni surveys.

Keri Franklin – HRA program has several publications with information based on exit-type information.

Jan Atwell - Nursing does exit survey for accreditation (at graduation, after 1 year, after 5 years).

Bob Willenbrink – It’s important to determine where we are going and what we are doing – need to establish regularity to help determine where we are. Still need to educate people regarding “what is assessment?” Everyone assesses, it’s just a matter of writing it down and reporting it. We need to organize and standardize what we do and get a schedule on the academic calendar so people know how things are planned for the campus. As a council we will have to provide a university-wide assessment and be able to tell external parties what we are doing (better to plan ahead rather than wait to be asked for this).

Bill Edgar – we have a 7-year cycle for program review, and it would be nice to map everything out so we don’t duplicate work.

Keri Franklin – Program review page on Provost’s website does align review with accreditation visits. Who reads what we write, and who looks at it? What about CGEIP? We should be reviewing their processes with Gen Ed and helping guide decisions there. We need to re-envision the role of our council and decide where we fit and what we do.

Pete Richardson – More of the macro stuff. COB has been doing course-level assessment for a while, but they need to be able to tell the campus what is going on and how COB fits in to university accreditation

Lyn Gattis – this puts a face on assessment and brings faculty out of their separate offices – it makes assessment seem real

Joshua Lambert – reexamined how assessment is used in class so the information can be used to contribute to larger goals (i.e., program)

Jan Atwell – would like to know more about how other departments “do” PA.

Bill Edgar – same idea – it’s been good to see how different levels of the university deal with assessment. It’s nice to actually be a committee again. We have things to do, and that is good.

Shyang Huang – there is still a large gap between what we discuss here and the faculty we try to talk to about assessment. There is a lot that can be done. The QIP is a great process, but student responses are quite varied regarding interest and value. We have missed one program in this Council. The pre-med students are missing, and they are very service-oriented and interested in assessment and could be involved here. These pre-med students submit personal statements at graduation regarding why they want to be pre-med, and we aren’t collecting that for the QIP currently. The feedback process is helpful to emphasize how teachers help students tap into the mission. Not sure if the mission has been emphasized enough in academia (faculty senate?).

C. Misc. Updates

a. Keri gave each Council member a copy of the book Assessment Clear and Simple and encouraged members to read it for possible discussion next year. She will also give a copy to all department heads.

b. Juan passed out copies of the RFP for the upcoming Diversity Climate study. He requested that the Council meet with the company conducting the study next fall. Updates regarding the survey will be provided throughout the process.

III. Adjournment