Assessment Council, 11/5/13,

Presiding Officer: Keri Franklin

Meeting Called to Order: 3:00 PM

Members Present: Keri Franklin, Dana Frederick, Juan Meraz, Kelly Cara, Sarah Gray, Libby Rozell, Rachelle Darabi, Lisa Hall, Tabitha Haynes, Peter Collins, Mary Ann Jennings, James Sottile, Taylor Mize, Sue Webb, Crystal Gale, Rachel Schober

Members Not Present: Shyang Huang, Jan Atwell, Lyn Gattis, Diana Piccolo, Thomas Lane, Patti Salinas, Bill Edgar, Christi Sudbrock

Guests in Attendance: Kim Dupree, Jacob Mendez (Guests from Student Affairs)

Minutes:

- Rachelle – report of SGA student asking her to submit her public affairs assignment for the QIP
- Update on QIP – revised individual reports were distributed
- Next Steps for QIP based on feedback from previous reviewers
  - Follow-up with reviewers who may now be making changes in their classes
  - Mary Ann Jennings - Toolkit is a good idea to help faculty create PA-related assignments
  - Lisa Hall - What would incentivize students to participate (i.e. could they add this to their resume, C.V., or get some kind of reward?)
  - Sue Webb – include actual assignments in an assessment newsletter or on the website
  - Tabitha Haynes – Student spotlight
- Council members paired up, and then Dr. Franklin distributed a variety of NSSE data reports (one report for each group)
- Discussion on NSSE reports
  - Group 1 (Sue and Tabitha, Career Preparation and Advising)
    - Big Plus – enriching educational experiences. It looks like half or more of the seniors have done this. We are higher than the other schools. First-year students are a little behind here.
    - Concern – institutional environment. Freshmen seemed happy with their support from MSU, but this goes down for seniors (academic and non-academic support).
  - Group 2 (James and Taylor, first gen and deep learning, civic engagement)
    - Civic report - pretty above average as first-years, but by the time they become seniors, we are below average across the board
    - First gen deep learning – decreases from first year to senior year
    - in additional collegiate experiences, we are lower than plains public
    - some areas are close between first year and senior where we should see improvements over time
  - Group 3 (Mary Ann and Guest)
    - deep learning - Try to understand someone else’s views should go up, but it didn’t
Group 4 (Peter and Crystal, Public Affairs)
- Community engagement seemed to be higher across the board
- Diversity was lower across the board
- Developing a personal code of value and ethics goes down from first year to senior year, and our seniors are even lower than first year students at other colleges
- On people of other ethnic backgrounds, we were lower, but we were pretty high on including diverse perspectives
- Perhaps, things are included in the curriculum, but they are not having personal experiences with diverse others

Group 5 (Rachelle and Lisa, diversity and civic engagement)
- Diversity – in the institutional environment, we lost ground from first year to senior year
- In GEP 101, students feel the campus is very diverse (coming from smaller towns, perhaps)
  - maybe they realize that is not the reality once they’ve been here for a while, or perhaps transfer students who are included in the senior group could have had other experiences
  - Once they have had service-learning and other community experiences, they may realize our campus is not that diverse
- Students are attending fewer events as seniors (this trend is similar to other colleges)

Group 6 (Libby and Sarah, benchmark comparisons by college and departments)
- Department sample sizes were low, so these are not that dependable
- In LAC, we do see increases from first-year to senior, but we are a lot lower than other colleges
- In ACL, we do pretty well campus wide with increases over time, and we were even with others
- SFI – we are lower than our peers which is concerning because a part of our brand at the university is this personal touch of student/faculty interactions
- EEE – we are lower than peers
- SCE – lower than peers, and we see decreases from first year to senior

Group 7 (Jacob, Juan, Dana, General Education)
- Overall, we compared fairly well
  - In writing clearly and effectively, we are lower than peers across the board (same for critical thinking and analytical skills)
  - Speaking clearly and effectively we are okay
  - Overall satisfaction - Significantly lower across the board
- A list of the question and answer choices for the NSSE are in the binders as well as a mean and frequency report
- Discussion regarding open-ended NSSE comments
- Believing Game:
  - It seems that there are advising and financial aid issues
  - There is a difference in perspectives between males and females
There were a lot of technology issues (faculty and staff not being able to run the tech in the classroom)
- Rec Center issues – shouldn’t have it at all / need to get it done
- Students took the survey so they could assert their position about how things could be changed
- There are several positive comments

**Student Perspectives**
- Some of the complaints are valid, but these have not had an impact on students’ overall education
- Many negative comments came out because people saw this as a chance to voice complaints, but people who had good things to say didn’t feel that this was an opportunity to share that (i.e., the NSSE as a vehicle)
- Disagree with a lot of the comments but see how others are relevant

**Doubting game:**
- Poor punctuation and spelling
- They don’t want so many paper assignments, but what we just saw in the numbers says we haven’t taught them to write yet
- It is problematic to ask someone who doesn’t know what is best for them what is best for them (i.e., their perspective may not be whole – they may not know yet what they need)

**What are our next steps with this NSSE information?**
- Take some of these perspectives back to our departments to let them know what the students said (”Do you think this is critical?” “If you have money to allocate, are these things you think are worth allocating money toward?”)
- Are there things we can change without the use of financial resources?
- The Marketing Study results are out with recommendations for how to make our brand more well-known and to emphasize what we do well
  - If the “personal touch” issue is going to be our brand, everyone on campus has to be on the same page with this (even people in financial services, woman who works in Blair-Shannon dining hall, the guy in the mail room) – these people sell the brand. If anyone is having these types of negative reactions (NSSE), we don’t want that.
- Have we sent comments about specific departments to those areas?
  - If there are consistent comments, we should share them
  - If there are just one or two comments, we shouldn’t share
  - Looking at the comments as a group is helpful
  - Looking at comparisons of males to females, etc. is important
- Dr. Franklin will send an email asking for additional next steps

**Homework:**
- Look at the Center of Inquiry report and provide feedback

Meeting Adjourned: 4:34 PM