

Senate Assessment Council Minutes – January 19, 2016

Meeting was called to order at 12:34 p.m.

Committee Members

Present – Ray Schwartz, Kendall Martin, Jane Zeff, Elizabeth Victor, Bahar Ashnai, Jennifer Owlett

Absent/Meeting Conflict – Manina Urgolo Huckvale, Jaehyun Kim

Elizabeth moved to approve the minutes from the October meeting. Ray seconded the motion. No objections; motion passed.

December's minutes will be reviewed by all, modifications may be sent to Ray as needed, and it was requested by Jennifer and Jane to postpone approval of the minutes until everyone has had a chance to review them. Ray agreed; December's minutes added as an action item to February's agenda.

The topics we discussed 1) creation and distribution of a survey to capture assessment education and review needs by College/Department, 2) creation and housing of organizational chart for academic assessment at WPU, 3) Creation/Revision of Assessment Wiki to bring together existing information on assessment practices and tools already available, and 4) clarification of the Spring meeting and workshop schedule.

(1) Elizabeth recommended a survey be developed and sent to the assessment coordinators of the colleges to capture specific needs and requests of the colleges. The survey could ask the assessment coordinator to "check" from a list of possible workshop/tutorial topics their college or specific departments may find helpful. Ray, building on Jennifer's suggestion from the December meeting, recommended including rubric development. Jane made clear that Blue will not be helpful to offer as a rubric design/development software, but other options were available (campus labs).

Bahar and Jane both volunteered to spearhead the survey design and draft questions to be included. Bahar mentioned using an ordinal ranking instead of a "check" list or a likert scale. The ordinal ranking would have the advantage of allowing the Senate Assessment Council to prioritize workshops/tutorials/future action items.

(2) Ray returned to the discussion about the development of an organizational chart for assessment, which carried over from December's meeting (esp. Scott's endorsement of the idea). Kendall clarified that any chart we create should specifically indicate it is the organizational chart for "academic assessment". It was felt that an organization chart of assessment would be very helpful. A chart that would show the college level, provost level, and the IR&A level. Jane volunteered to ask the Deans for the information needed to begin the organizational chart (at "the top"), and will then follow up with the assessment coordinators for each college.

(1, cont.) Bahar requested more information about what the council would like included in the question list. Elizabeth reiterated rubric development be included in the survey along with portfolio assessment. Within the category of rubric development, AAUP rubrics, Quality Matters rubrics, Rubric templates in Blackboard and Turnitin (along with the loopholes in these), were mentioned. Kendall specified sampling practices and assessment overview be included. Jane indicated that an "achieving needs"/UCC tutorial should be included among the options. Kendall, adding to Jane's point, mentioned a tutorial on the different rubrics to evaluate UCC needs for majors vs. non-majors. Kendall mentioned that Biology is about to launch a mapping exercise, indicating that mapping exercises might be another helpful item to list in the questionnaire. Ray mentioned distributing the survey more widely, to include college Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and members of the college assessment committees might capture data to indicate what differences

(if any) there are between reported needs/education at the college, department, committee levels. Jane suspected that there would likely be little difference when accreditation dictates a program/college.

Ray indicated that the survey would likely be shared with the Senate. Bahar and Elizabeth expressed some concerns about confidentiality. Jane mentioned that the reported data would be anonymous. Elizabeth indicated that anonymity might not be possible at some levels, but suggested including language indicated an anonymized version of the results would be shared with the Senate. Bahar indicated that she would use Qualtrix to create the survey as it is user friendly and could deliver anonymous results (just not double blind). Jane indicated that Qualtrix could not be used to gather secure, and truly anonymous (double blind) data; Baseline would be preferable if the survey is going to be distributed to faculty. Software question will be settled after design and question listing is settled.

Bahar asked how long the survey should be (how many multiple choice or ranking questions vs. open-ended questions), and suggested 10 or 15 of each. Jane indicated that the survey should be as short as possible. Elizabeth concurred, indicating that the survey should take no longer than 5 minutes to complete and no more than 10 questions total. Bahar indicated that she would need a full list of the respondents, and Kendall indicated that the request should not be difficult to obtain.

(3) Ray volunteered to look into an assessment wiki. Kendall and Jane both mentioned that one has already been started and information is available at the IR&A website, in the Senate documents. The primary point is that the wiki should pull together already existing resources (rather than start anew), and IT should be able to provide the wiki platform.

(4) Kendall asked if we would be offering any workshops this semester, particularly whether we should offer a demonstration on campus labs. Ray reiterated that the coordinators expressed interest in this during December's meeting. Ray and Jane asked whether we might consider offering workshops on sampling practices. Jane to report on existing tutorials in sections of Campus Labs.

Jennifer asked for clarification on the date of the next meeting (February 16th), and whether we wanted to move the meeting for March as it falls on the Spring Break. March's meeting has been rescheduled for March 29th and Ray will check to see if the regular meeting room is available during Common Hour. Elizabeth asked whether we should keep the May meeting (May 17th) open or cancel it, since the semester would be over. It was decided to keep it open, in case the incoming Senate Assessment Council would like to hold a meeting during that time.

Ray motioned the meeting to adjourn. Elizabeth seconded the motion. No objections; meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Action Items

- Review and Approval of the Senate Assessment Council's December minutes
- Review and Approval of the Senate Assessment Council's January minutes
- Final Review and Approval of Assessment Needs/Education Survey
- Jane to develop draft of organizational chart
- Ray to give update on the wiki development
- Continued discussion of Campus Labs demo for Coordinators (Jane to report on existing tutorials)

/Elizabeth Victor