

## Missouri State University – West Plains - Assessment Committee Meeting

February 19, 2016  
12:30PM – 1:20PM Room Lybyer 216

### Minutes

#### **I. Call to Order**

Attending: Jim Hart, Phil Howerton, Michelle Kwon, Jason McCollom, Frank Priest, Brenda Smith, Jerry Trick.

#### **II. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Approved by consent

#### **III. Old Business**

##### **A. Survey results from the last committee meeting**

- The survey results started out strong, but quickly lost the thrill; therefore, the process was abandoned. However, we did glean some really good comments at the beginning that gave direction to our committee. Jerry mentioned the survey link located in MyGrizzlyDen allowed Faculty to vote for the 2016 Granville Vaughn Award was really easy.
- We further discussed the volume of software applications we had to interact with in order to conduct business on campus: MyGrizzlyDen, Blackboard, C&W, SurveyMonkey, etc.

##### **B. Nursing Program Review 2015**

- The Nursing program review is “done.” We discussed Amy Ackerson’s feedback after our program review subcommittee meeting allowed us to further refine the process with intake questions.
- We discussed the status of the Program Review schedule and all degree programs in the Business, Applied Technology and Public Service Division were conducting interdepartmental self-directed program reviews; which is a further refinement of the way of conducting Program Review. We discussed the incredible amount of time invested by Brenda Smith and Alex Graham toward the Nursing Program Review and the effort paved the way for a more efficient way of conducting the Program Reviews through the use of the intake questions. The addition of the Program Description, Mission, and Vision are to be included in the remainder of the Program Reviews.

### C. **iHistory of Assessment**

- Dr. McCollom reported on his iHistory findings through the review of the historical data in Experts; I include the link here: <https://experts.missouristate.edu/display/WP04/Assessment> His goal was to capture the Culture of Assessment in our institution: where we were, and how we got to where we are. He recommended creating a C&W repository beginning with the state of assessment in 2003 and then summarizing all reports into one report; this would enable the interested browser the “at a glance” view of assessment history with the ability to “drill down” to higher resolution. Then to provide a link to C&W from the Assessment content found in Experts. (and vice versa)

## IV. **New Business**

### A. **Committee**

#### 1. **Doing Something**

##### ***a) Plan, Do, Check, Adapt - Deming’s Cycle of Continuous Improvement of Processes***

(1) Check Nursing Program Review. Reiterated the use of the Nursing Program Review as model/prototype and the refinement of the process. We discussed that the Program Review process was underway, we discussed the results, and provided feedback to the Nursing department: a complete loop that may have never been performed at our institution.

(2) iHistory of Assessment Report. Segued into the new from Dr. McCollom’s willingness to continue his research and development of a C&W repository. He was willing to finish before Summer, but I recommended determining the scope of the project during Spring and finishing during the Fall semester

**b) Endeavor**

(1) Teams. We formed an Assessment Report Team; Gary, Jerry and Jim will review the last report and produce a current report based upon the department reports that have been received

(2) Way of Working We discussed the need to continue this progress through processes, like the current program review process, in order to remove obstacles to teaching and learning

**2. Assessment Clear and Simple – A Practical Guide**

**a) Program Review – Best Practices**

**“Program Review**

If the institution has a meaningful program review process, it should include information about student learning as a basis for review and planning.

Here is a logical sequence the review might follow:

1. Mission, vision, aspirations
2. Goals (what the program intends to accomplish) in areas such as research, community service, and student learning. Do not confuse goals with means. “Establish a new language lab” is a means to reach the goals of student learning, so only the learning goals should be listed here: When students complete their course of study, we want them to be able to...
3. Current resources for meeting the goals: demographic information, including numbers of types of students, faculty, staff, physical facilities, reputation, services and programs, and so on.
4. How well are we meeting the goals?
  - a. Department’s methods for gathering information about achievement of the goals, including methods of assessing student learning (see Chapter Three)
  - b. Findings, including strengths and weaknesses in each goal area, including student learning
5. Plans for improvement, including enhancing student learning: Here’s where to put “Establish a new language lab.” The plan or request for the lab is presented as a way to meet learning goals, and the plan must be justified by evidence about how this step will help the department meet its goals for student learning.
6. Resources needed

Bresciani (2006) provides thorough guidelines and many examples of “outcomes-based program review” for academic and co-curricular departments drawn from a study of forty-three good-practice institutions. The current Program Review emulates the above best practices; they were listed in the *Assessment Clear and Simple* (Walvoord, 2010)

## **B. Stakeholders**

1. What Opportunities are on the horizon. The Common Fee will fund a cross-campus Chalk & Wire rollout. The Board of Governors still needs to approve it. When this happens, the ability to obtain granular resolution of assessment data will begin. There was some concern about the “Big Brother”ness of this capability. We further discussed the “closing of the loop” and use of assessment data to inform budgetary decisions, thus providing the ability to ensure accountability within the institution. This argument was used to justify the need to collect institution-wide data in order to make informed decisions about allocation of funds for resources. We were brainstorming...

## **V. Announcements**