

Henderson State University Assessment Team

Monday, October 22, 2018  
Garrison Center Galloway Room

PRESENT: Nathan Campbell, Chanda Hooten, Debra Coventry, Lacy Wolfe, Brett Serviss, Wrenette Tedder, Nikki Laird, Kenneth Taylor, Deepak Pant, Judi Jenkins, Matthew Sutherlin, Yvonne Saul, Doug Heffington

ABSENT: Scott Freeman, Jennifer Sigman, Lenette Jones, Clayton Alspaw, Brad Patterson, Ginger Otwell, Steve Adkison, Shannon Clardy, Lonnie Jackson

The Henderson State University Assessment Team met for its regular meeting on October 22, 2018. Co-chair Dr. Brett Serviss called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Introductions were made as new member, Dr. Doug Heffington, joined the Assessment Team.

The minutes from the October 8, 2018 Assessment Team meeting were approved.

**CHAIR'S REPORT:**

None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Assessment Team vacancies: Darrel Farmer was approved to fill the vacancy for Ellis College - Fine Arts.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Norming exercise: Going forward three Team members will rate the non-instructional unit operating plans to cut down on variance in the rating.

Eleven Team members submitted ratings for the Simonson Biological Field Station. The overall scores ranged from 20-28.

The Team went over the operating plan and rubric to ensure all Team members have the same understanding of what to look for.

**Annual Operating Plan Norming Exercise:**

Clarity of Unit Outcomes - The outcome needs to be a specifically measurable statement. Ms. Wrenette Tedder instructed members to look for at least three outcomes with at least one measure each. Ideally, each outcome will have two measures. Team members should leave comments on the right side of the rubric under Recommendations/Comments so that they can be given back to units for reevaluation. Members should keep in mind that we are not experts in the different fields/areas, but we can carefully consider the content and look for clarity as it relates to the University's mission. Dr. Serviss encouraged Team members to spell out specifically what we are looking for as this will be more helpful to the unit. Ms. Tedder advised members to make sure and specify what outcome and measure you are referring to in the comment. Furthermore, she encouraged the Team to come to either her or Dr. Serviss, or the department in question, if further details are needed.

A question was posed about rating units that are grant funded. Ms. Tedder reminded the Team that any unit dealing with Henderson students must go through the process.

Quality of Measures and Criteria – should include whatever is sufficient to show that the target of the measure was accomplished — could be a number or a percentage — should specifically show the level at which they met the standard listed in the measure.

Performance and Trends - This element will include a summary from the most recent academic year. The statements in italics on the rubric will be included in the next evaluation.

Challenges and Trends - The element needs to have an action plan based on data collected. A question was posed about the wording in the rubric. It asks for units to address challenges OR opportunities. The Team discussed if it should be changed to challenges AND opportunities in the next iteration of the rubric. Members mentioned that some years a unit may have both challenges and opportunities to discuss, whereas other years the unit may have one or the other. After discussion, the Team determined that this portion of the rubric should be labeled “Challenges AND/OR Opportunities.”

The Team further discussed if this (challenges and trends) would be the area for units to request additional resources. In the past, units have been told there is not much money, so they would not spend time asking for resources. Units are encouraged to complete the performance grant proposal. However, the Assessment Team will not be rating those. The proposal will be given to the Budget and Planning Committee. Last year, some strategic initiatives were funded from the review process. Discussion followed about who received the funding and the desire for that to be communicated university wide.

Planning Goals - The planning goals should be longer term than on an annual basis. This question needs to be revised going forward to stress longer term.

Operating Plans - The operating plan is based on four things that the Budget and Planning Committee felt were the most important for the upcoming year. For most plans, Team members will need to look closely to see that it specifically deals with the University Operating Plan.

Resource Allocation - The Team may score this section, but it will not be included in the final score.

Non-Instructional Unit Annual Operating Plans will be sent out to Team members in the next couple of days to evaluate. Each Team member will receive four to five units to review and rate. The deadline for the scored rubrics is November 5. Ms. Tedder would appreciate the plans to be rated and returned as quickly as possible. If there is too much variance on any of the scores, Ms. Tedder and Dr. Serviss will bring the three Team members together to go over the plan together.

The next Assessment Team meeting is scheduled for November 12.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lacy Wolfe, Secretary