Henderson State University Assessment Team
April 16, 2018

Members Present:
Serviss, Tedder, Gerhold, Sesser, Otwell, Boswell, Campbell, Smithey, Jenkins, Freeman, Jones

Members Absent:
Maxfield, Hooten, Shuster, Clardy, Jackson, Adkison

***

The Henderson State University Assessment Team had its regular meeting on Monday, April 16, 2018. Co-chair Brett Serviss called the meeting to order at 4:00.

The minutes from the March 9, 2018 meeting were approved as presented.

OLD BUSINESS
Co-chairs Tedder and Serviss initiated discussion on the two rubrics for academic assessment that had been distributed at the March 9 meeting. These were the 'Academic Assessment Plan Review' and the 'Closing the Loop Review Summary'. Tedder and Serviss noted that these rubrics will eventually be used for non-academic assessment as well, but for now, the team should just consider their efficacy for assessing academic programs.

Discussion Points:
- Boswell suggested that the title be changed to 'Academic Program Assessment Review' and 'Academic Program Assessment Closing the Loop Review'
- Smithey and Campbell articulated a desire to see some sort of alignment between what TracDat data shows and what these rubrics assess. Such a visual alignment would result in easier scoring/assessment of the efficacy of the rubrics.
- Discussion of the rubric documents:
    - Boswell wondered who stakeholders would be, beyond students – since assessments are meant to grade student learning,
    - She also wished to clarify if the mission statement is for programs, or for students enrolled in programs (or, to distinguish between program goals and learning goals).
    - Tedder noted that the checklist was adapted from administrative assessment, to which Boswell responded that terminology needs to be different for academic programs in order to specifically address Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). To that point, Boswell suggested that the term 'outcomes' be changed to 'SLOs' throughout the rubrics to better relate student learning elements to academic programs missions, and that the term 'stakeholder/s' be changed to 'student/s'
    - The question was raised: Are strategic goals of the University assessed with this rubric, to which Tedder and Serviss responded no.
    - Several team members expressed confusion over the necessity of having an Academic Assessment Plan Review and Program Assessment Plan Summary, and wondered why two roadmaps exist?
    - The question was raised: Is a 'measure' and an 'instrument' the same thing? Tedder replied that this language needs some clarification, but she wants to retain the idea of an instrument.

Serviss asked team members to send feedback on the 'Closing the Loop Review Summary' before the next meeting

Serviss shared feedback that he had received regarding the creation of an assessment rubric for non-instructional programs. Much of this feedback came from team member Hooten.
- Hooten requested that the Assessment Team provide examples of good non-instructional plans that can be used as a template – these could be done on a part-by-part basis.
- She asked for justification on why some groups that are seemingly academic classified as non-instructional (for example, the dean's office, planetarium, field station), and requested clarification about what specific things make a program academic or non-academic? Other team members echoed Hooten's request for clarification, and suggested that criteria for instructional/non-instructional groups need to be better articulated.
- Hooten suggested that two deadlines are needed in the process:
  1. Initial deadline after which feedback from Assessment Team is given
  2. Final deadline for program review
- Serviss and Tedder noted that policies and procedures regarding non-instructional programs were still being formulated, and mentioned that it might be instructive to learn how other universities assess non-academic programs.
- They also noted that benchmarks need to be established for all of the non-academic programs, as some have regional/national standards with which they have to comply (many do not, however).
- Several team members suggested that entire program review process needs clarification in a number of areas, and that the Assessment Team needs to communicate information about, for example, how data should be included and presented in program review documents, and how broad or specific responses should be.

Tedder and Serviss solicited the team for additional feedback on the 'Program Review Form' and the non-instructional program assessment rubric, and suggested that this feedback be brought to the next meeting. They offered some clarification regarding the program review timeline going forward, noting that the first programs that would be required to resubmit program reviews are those who did not submit initially, or who scored between 4 and 6.

A suggestion was made to form a sub-committee to address some of the specifics of the documents under review and the issue of non-instructional programs. It was decided that the sub-committee members would include: Tedder, Serviss, Boswell, Smithey, and Campbell.

The issue of new Assessment Team members was tabled until the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5pm.
***

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gerhold, Secretary