



The University Assessment Council

Assessment Council Meeting Minutes August 12, 2014

Present: Ginger Bishop, Mary Anne Connors, Mildred Jackson, Kathy Bolland, Jim Bailey, Vivian Abbott, Julie McAdams, Claude Arrington, Lorne Kuffel, Jon Acker, Ray White, Elizabeth Wilson, Mary Kay Meyer, Kevin Whitaker, Beverly Roskos

Announcements

New member, Vivian Abbott, was introduced to the Council. She is Office Assistant for OIE.

Discussion

Ginger first asked Lorne Kuffel for an update on progress of SACS COC. Lorne stated that we were a long way from completed but that it was coming along.

Ginger explained that the reason for no meeting in the month prior (July 2014) was due to the SACS conference in New Orleans, LA.

Dr. Beverly Roskos provided an update on QEP. Beverly stated that the committee was making progress and now had a goal in mind. Beverly stated she felt more confident after discussions with Murray State. Beverly stated that the Assessment Council would serve as a sounding board for the QEP committee. The QEP committee has started meeting every week. Ginger stated that as a body the Assessment Council needed to support the QEP committee. Mary Kay asked what involvement would the college have? Beverly explained that at Murray State the departments have to have an "enriched learning activity". The students will be tested before and after the activity. At Murray State every department gets to define their own activity.

Kevin Whitaker, Associate Provost, reported on his new role and goals.

Long term, are we doing what we want to do? Don't get bogged down in buzz words or nomenclature. This becomes a part of the culture. Everyone wants to do a good job. How do we get to that culture?

Short term is the core curriculum. There are lots of things on his desk regarding core curriculum and he has had a lot of discussion with people in regards to core curriculum. Are we doing what we need to do with these courses?

He needs the expertise of the Assessment Council to help. He looks forward to working with the Assessment Council. Core is going to come up sooner rather than later.

Ray asked if there was a problem with the core? Kevin explained that there was no problem with the core. The core was what attracted students to the University. The concerns with core is are we doing that? We have no document on file that shows we have ever had a "look back" at the core. We have lots of documents that show certain attributes a core has but no "look back". We need to frame this as a positive thing and not a negative one.

Ginger asked if anyone would like to have a workshop in their department using WEAVE after September 10, 2014? No one asked for a workshop but several requests for the new cycle, 14/15, to be made available. WEAVE advises in publication to do this but one on one states that it can be confusing to users. Ginger asked the Committee if they had enough faith in the faculty to be able to use this without being confused? Everyone thought that it would be ok. She asked Julie McAdams to see if that could go ahead and be done? Kathy asked if something could be put on the screen to alert the user to the year? Julie explained that the background color would be different depending on the year and that the cycle shows at the top of the page. Ray asked what was meant by the term "made available"? Ginger explained that it would not be a separate thing. Ray asked if anyone could codify the requirements or if they have been codified? Ginger had previously asked for the requirements and had found them today on a rubric. Ginger would like to see a policy handbook for assessment where everything would be in writing and linked to staff/faculty page. From Thanksgiving to Jan 15, 2015 she will codify as much as possible. She hopes that the transition will be smooth and sweet. She doesn't think it can be written in stone by Oct 1st but if possible it will be.

The group reviewed a detailed assessment report and discussed its weaknesses and the appropriate ways to engage in program assessment.

The University Assessment Council asked for examples of "good" assessment.

The meeting was adjourned.



The University Assessment Council

Meeting Notes
April 8, 2014

Present: Ginger Bishop, Millie Jackson, Kevin Whitaker, Julie McAdams, Donna Keene, Jon Acker, Claude Arrington, Holly Hallmann, Rick Houser for Liza Wilson, Jim Bailey, George Daniels, Kathy Bolland, Stuart Usdan, Ray White, Marsha Adams, Kim Campbell, and Lorne Kuffel

Self-Introductions

Review Mission/Purpose of the UAC:

Ginger Bishop asked for feedback on Mission/Purpose. George Daniels commented that the mission is comprehensive, and with the opportunity to focus on it, there will be tremendous benefits.

Establish goals and priorities for remainder of semester

- SACSCOC

- *The 2014 Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation is July 20 - July 23, 2014*
- *The Compliance Certification Report is due in early September*
- *Ginger reported that Bob Smallwood indicates he does not need assistance from the UAC with initial preparation of the IE Sections of the report. Ginger mentioned that there are additional chances to respond to any shortcomings, or put new initiatives in place, and that assistance from UAC will be needed with this process.*
- *There were questions related to instructions on the 3.3.1. information that is due April 15. In addition, there was a question on what colleges/departments might do to promote the best possible outcome for the Compliance Certification Report, due in September. Bev Roskos prefers for the special 3.3.1 information to be entered into WEAVE for analysis. Currently, she and Bob Smallwood are deciding which sections to highlight in the final report, and they will provide feedback to those groups by the end of April. The second round of feedback will be provided in May. Ginger mentioned that Bob Smallwood will be communicating on the best ways for colleges/departments to assist with the Compliance Certification Report initiative. Lorne Kuffel mentioned that since the SACSCOC reviewers will be able to view all WEAVE assessment reports, it is important for everything to be improved, now.*
- *Bev Roskos mentioned that it is not clear where information on “improvements” should be entered, in WEAVE. Arts & Sciences, in particular, wants a special place to put improvements, other than the action plan area, since they have so many action plans.*

Identify time and topics for UAC Retreat

- *A retreat could be scheduled between May 15 and June 1.*
- *Topics could include planning and professional development.*
- *George Daniels will check the December SACSCOC Annual Meeting agenda for possible speakers*
- *Marsha Adams would like to hear Ginger speak on what will be done at UA, and would prefer a real “working” meeting.*
- *Kim Campbell would like to hear more on the “18 hour rule”.*
- *Ginger mentioned looking at common issues between SACSCOC and program-specific accreditors.*
- *Lorne suggested the faculty roster as a topic, specifically the necessity for special justification in the template’s “4th column”.*

How are the colleges using their assessment plans?

- *Program Review*
- *Nursing: the Curriculum Committee*
- *Arts & Sciences: the Retreat and Annual Report*
- *Student Affairs: they are part of the end of year process, and part of the annual report*
- *Commerce and Business: the plans are not being used to the extent that they could be; they need to be more strategic. One improvement that came about from the assessment plans is the development of a Coordinating Council for the CBA core curriculum, to enhance control.*
- *Education: they are presented during retreats, and they work well for the college.*
- *Engineering: because much of the content of the assessment plans is closely related to the program level, they are not utilized a great deal at the college level.*
- *Social Work: generally, nothing “bad” is discovered in the assessment plan process. As a result, there is not a lot of interest. Ginger suggested that they could consider what they are doing well.*
- *Ginger asked for further information, by email.*

Best practices

- *Using a rubric to evaluate assessment: a rubric, for evaluating administrative assessment plans, previously developed by the UAC, was distributed, and a discussion took place. The rubric lacks qualitative evaluation, and is geared toward counts of assessment plan elements. The one required improvement action (the minimum) might not be related to the most significant outcome for the entity. Ginger would like to have a copy of the rubric to evaluate assessment plans for academic units.*
- *Begin looking for assessment websites to review and model*

Non-academic Assessment Council representatives

- *Email suggestions to Ginger*

Things to think about (and discuss if time allows):

- *Assessment Newsletter: An assessment newsletter is being considered for information sharing. The UAC will later be asked for suggested features.*
- *Next meeting—2 weeks*