

March 18, 2016  
12:30PM – 1:30PM Room Lybyer 216

Minutes

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Roll Call by the Chair**

Amy Ackerson, Alex Graham, Jim Hart, Michelle Kwon, Jason McCollom, Frank Priest, Brenda Smith, Rajiv Thakur, David White, Gary Phillips, Michael Orf, and Jerry Trick in attendance.

**III. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Accepted by consent

**IV. Old Business**

**A. Business Applied Technology and Public Services Program Reviews 2015 – 2016**

Subcommittee to review and provide feedback to CFD. This is available on Chalk and Wire for comment, not editing. The Subcommittee is Jerry Trick, Brenda Smith, Jim Hart and Alexandra Graham. Subcommittee to develop a report based on what we have/possess and what we have done toward assessment rather than rely solely on what has been turned in.

**B. Assessment Report 2014 – 2015**

Discussion revolved around the need to finish this report much earlier in the year and what pieces are needed in order to write the report.

Conversation (again!) about what is a program. Answer to the “Program” question:

- 15.8.1 Definition - "Academic program" means any course of study approved through the curricular process of Missouri State University-West Plains and appearing in the curricular offerings of Missouri State University-West Plains listed in the Program Inventory for Public Institutions published by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education of the State of Missouri

Discussion involved focusing the 2014-2015 Assessment Report on Program Assessment. The Nursing and Respiratory Therapy degrees were the first to be

examined. CFD has just submitted their answers to a set of intake questions, which are currently under review. The Assessment Committee will provide feedback from its review in an attempt to closing the “loop”. Several more AAS degrees are currently in the pipeline, and next year’s assessment report should contain a summary of the Assessment Committee’s efforts.

The Assessment Committee continues to use Chalk & Wire as a tool to assess how the students are performing concerning the campus’ General Education Goals. A major obstacle to the Assessment Committee’s efforts seems to be the confusion created by the deadline dates changing each year as well as the lack of a common assessment rubric/guideline. So, in order to alleviate some of these issues the Assessment Committee discussed the following reminders/recommendations/requests to be presented/sent to Faculty Senate:

- Every faculty member is expected to assess each class they teach.
- The individual course assessments simply needs to examine 1) student performance in relation to stated course objectives/outcomes; 2) what can be done in the future to address/improve any negative outcomes; and 3) any budgetary requests that may help improve student learning. Some faculty members use a rubric – others a more narrative format. Regardless, this information needs to be generated and submitted to the Department Head and/or Division Chair at the conclusion of each semester. Providing supporting data is also very important.
- In departments that have more than one member, all course assessments should be examined and a report should be made concerning 1) overall student performance in relation to stated course and/or department objectives/outcomes; 2) what can be done in the future to address/improve any negative outcomes; and 3) any budgetary requests that may help improve student learning.
- Departments should also use this time to examine their course offerings: Can any courses be deleted? Do any courses need modified? Does any new courses need to be created? Are there budget requests or other campus resources required?
- The department heads should then create an annual assessment report, which will be forwarded to Division Chairs by June 30<sup>th</sup>. This will allow Division Chairs to have their Assessment Reports ready by August 1<sup>st</sup>, which could then be used to implement any new ideas generated by the Assessment Process in the new academic year. However, this process will only work if faculty members submit their individual course assessments in a timely manner. In a perfect world, this would mean within one week of the end of each semester. However, the following deadlines would suffice:

January 5<sup>th</sup> for fall assessment reports and June 1<sup>st</sup> for spring assessment reports.

- The other reason to request faculty to complete their course assessments sooner is so the Assessment Committee can then write its Annual report in a timely manner. Currently, annual Assessment Reports from the Assessment Committee are coming out up to nine months after the conclusion of the year being reported on!!
- The Assessment Committee would like every faculty member to assess Critical Thinking when they prepare their course assessments at the end of this semester. (Spring 2016) Questions to answer in the course assessment: What did you do in your classes concerning Critical Thinking? How did the students perform? What will you do differently next semester? This information should be included in your individual course assessment report and submitted to your Department Head/Division Chair no later than June 1<sup>st</sup>. (Alex's note: If we are asking this, then we need to be the ones (or ask Michael and Dennis, as our local heavyweight bouncer/enforcers) to send this to faculty with the forms at the end of the semester) The Assessment Committee will prepare a specific report to give to Faculty Senate concerning this assessment by the October meeting.
- Amy Ackerson asked if Chalk and Wire can be used to pull a report based on key words, like "Critical Thinking," to start the process of rubric building at the course level in Chalk and Wire show movement towards a full implementation of assessment from course level to program level to college wide assessment. (Alex Query: Could we ask Faculty to do their course assessments in Chalk and Wire? Is there time to convert the current forms into taggable forms for this Spring?)

## V. New Business

### A. Committee

#### 1. Nominations

##### a) *Assessment Committee Chair*

Jim Hart is moving out of the Chair position to be the Chalk and Wire guru. Nominations for Amy Ackerson and Alex Graham for Assessment Committee Chair have been received, and open nominations will be announced at the April 1, 2016 Faculty Senate. Nominations due by April 22, 2016.

Additionally Jim has received an interesting idea of co-chairing to “share the load” of responsibility. Support for this idea as follows:

- i. Faculty Handbook - Membership shall consist of ranked faculty members, serving three-year rotating memberships, as appointed by the chairperson of the Faculty Senate.
- ii. No requirement of committee chair serving time has been found
- iii. 1.5.5 – MSU-WP Committee Structure - ...[appointment is] based on faculty interests, expertise, and recommendations by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or some other duly constituted Senate body designated by the Faculty Senate). These committees report to the appointing academic administrator and also have a duty to keep the Faculty Senate fully informed of their proceedings and the results of those proceedings. (I do this through Chalk & Wire)
- iv. Jim Hart’s thoughts: What happens in the committee stays in the committee unless it is part of our “duty to keep Faculty Senate fully informed”. i.e. our internal structure and operation is directed and organized by the committee and is not required (or desired) by the Faculty Senate unless asked for specifically.

***b) Assessment Committee Secretary***

No nominations have been given as of yet.

**B. Stakeholders**

**2. What Opportunities are on the horizon**

We need to satisfy the Department of Education.

Our charge: *Assessment Committee* shall work with campus constituencies to systematically collect, examine, and interpret qualitative and quantitative data about student learning and use that information to document and improve student learning.

- The general consensus after discussion was the Assessment Committee needs to formulate a framework in order to improve this process with the goal of 100% participation from Faculty.
- Jim Hart’s Agile System Development Framework (already presented to the committee) develops a system capable of completing our charge effectively and efficiently in order to effect sustainable change; this needs to occur regardless of personnel changes or outside influences. Chalk & Wire will be used as the collecting agent of this process.
- Here are “our teeth” from 4.0 Faculty Evaluation – 4.4.5.1.a - Evidence of participation in assessment processes for the entire probationary period for those seeking reappointment and/or

tenure and for the prior three years when promotion is sought;  
e.g. annual assessment report.

**C. Goals for next meeting**

1. **Elections**
2. **Assessment Report 2014 – 2015**  
Due on May 6 at Faculty Senate.

**VI. Announcements**

No announcements.

**VII. Adjournment**

Gary Phillips moves to adjourn. Alexandra Graham seconds.