

California State University, Stanislaus

Assessment Leadership Team

April 2, 2008, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Present: C. Bengston, H. Coughlin, S. Davis, D. Demetruvias, J. Tiemann-Gonzalez, P. Hodge, L. Phillips, S. Marshall, G. Novak, N. Aly, R. McNeil, C. Mercier, R. Roy, M. Tynan

Excused: C. Brown, M. Crumpton-Winter, S. Fletcher, S. Filling, D. Hamlett, T. Held, L. Johnson, D. Moore, C. Polhemus, C. Stefanco, J. Tuedio, C. Whitman

1. Introductions

D. Demetruvias introduced the new Faculty Director of General Education, Susan Marshall.

2. Mary Allen's report

D. Demetruvias opened with a discussion of the Mary Allen report and actions items. It was noted that data are now available for review that will provide insight on these action items.

Action Items

#9 – Permanent fiscal investment in assigned time for Program Assessment Coordinators and Faculty Coordinator

FCASL is an on-going budget item; PACs have been funded for an additional two years with consideration of continued funding.

#10 – Immediate attention to the assessment of the general education program

S. Marshall discussed the development for assessment plans in each general education area.

#12 - Greater alignment of the Academic Program Review and the Student Learning Assessment processes and reporting.

D. Demetruvias noted that in meetings with the FCASL (R. Roy) and the Faculty Director of the FCETL (A. Schulz) it was suggested that the Office for the Assessment of Student Learning should take a major role in the alignment between the program assessment and Academic Program Review processes. It was noted that there is a need to identify how the annual PAC reports are incorporated into the APR process. R. Roy indicated that, currently, no PACs serve on the ASL subcommittee. S. Davis suggested that the FCASL make a recommendation to the Committee on Committees on this issue. D. Demetruvias noted that the ASL subcommittee will be asked to review the APR process and send it back to ALT for review.

#13 – Greater use of external reviewers, with disciplinary and assessment expertise, in the Academic Program Review process.

D. Demetruvias noted the availability of funds from of the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance for external reviewers for the APR process. C. Bengston noted the difficulty in assessing the impact made on student learning by non-instructional units. G. Novak noted that this would need to be examined within the context of the Support Unit Review process.

#14 – Integration of assessment as an important service component into the recognition and personnel review processes.

D. Demetruvias indicated that assessment has been incorporated into the service component of departmental elaborations for several programs. In addition, the URPT committee encouraged the departments to consider several areas for elaborations, including assessments. R. Roy noted that A. Schulz discussed this issue at two Assessment Council meetings. P. Hodge suggested that this would include programs looking at the non-instructional units that support their programs.

#15 - Increased student involvement and awareness of assessment activities and outcomes

The group agreed that this is an area that they would like to work on. G. Novak indicated that early in the WASC process there was an attempt made to get students involved by meeting with ASI; however, this was met

with mild interest. J. Tiemann-Gonzalez noted that ASI is beginning the process of increased student involvement.

#18 and #19 – More visible leadership of the Department Chairs in involving departmental faculty in assessment activities and outcomes and greater leadership role of the Deans for ensuring on-going assessment support.

D. Demetruvias noted that two meetings had been scheduled with the deans on this issue. R. Roy suggested the need to articulate that PACS are facilitators for assessment and that they are not solely responsible; they need a team behind them. R. Roy will continue meeting with deans.

#29 – Provision of institutional data by the Office of Institutional Research and increased use of institutional research data by faculty governance groups for assessment purposes.

D. Demetruvias noted that the Director of Office of Institutional Research position is currently being filled by a part-time faculty member (Angel Sanchez), and a search is underway for a full-time replacement. The importance of disseminating data annually rather than holding data seven years for the APR process was discussed.

#11 – Revived assessment of student learning goals for graduate education

D. Demetruvias indicated that the Graduate Council continues to provide leadership for student assessment and is reorganizing its assessment plan and reports based on graduate learning goals. It was noted that a graduate student was hired to meet with each coordinator to gather data on graduate assessment. R. Roy is to examine the graduate student learning goals. M. Tynan noted that this should be an annual agenda item.

3. Capacity and Preparatory Review - Site visit scheduled for October 1-3, 2008

Current draft available at <http://www.csustan.edu/wasc/Pages/documents/CPR-7.8.8.pdf>

D. Demetruvias asked the group to be available October 1-3 for the WASC site visit and noted that the visiting team will want to meet with ALT. Assessment of student learning is a key factor in reaccreditation.

4. University-wide Assessment Instruments

a. D. Demetruvias stated that feedback was being requested from governance groups on both findings and format for University-Wide Assessment methods. D. Demetruvias asked for suggestions for the distribution and feedback process in dissemination of university-wide measures and asked the group if a May meeting would be beneficial to review the rest of the data. Group decided on scheduling a September meeting.

b. Undergraduate National Survey of Student Engagement Executive Summary (2003, 2004, and 2006) (#13)

P. Hodge requested information on whether or not these data are available by program. Feedback on instrument and findings included the following suggestions and possible actions:

- 1) Provide longitudinal data on identified elements;
- 2) Add information on the selection of peer institutions;
- 3) Ensure that information is disaggregated by college/program and disseminated (Institutional Research will do so beginning with the 2008/09 NSSE); and
- 4) Ask UEPC to identify salient items.

c. Graduate National Survey of Student Engagement Executive Summary (2007) (#15)

D. Demetruvias indicated that Graduate Council is reviewing the Graduate National Survey of Student Engagement.

e. Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) Executive Summary (2006/07) (#17)

D. Demetruvias noted that drawings and incentives were provided to obtain a sufficient number of student participants. S. Marshall noted that the CLA findings are very similar to what English found when evaluating writing in the major; students do well when asked to make an argument, but struggle with critiquing.

5. Presentations

a. Heather Coughlin, Department of Mathematics

H. Coughlin discussed assessment in the College of Natural Sciences and noted programs in the college primarily use department meetings and assessment committees to discuss assessment findings. H. Coughlin provided updates for program assessment activities in CNS:

1. **Biology** –uses a survey in the senior-level physiology course and working with IR to formalize implementation. Currently developing a pre/post test to be given in freshman and senior year.
2. **Chemistry** – uses a standardized exam as part of their specialized accreditation.
3. **Computer Science** – uses a rubric to evaluate writing assignments.
4. **Geology** – created a field method course and their first evaluation will be on that course.
5. **Mathematics** – focused on communication skills and developed an assessment committee to develop a rubric for use in senior seminar. Mathematics instructors have modified the structure of assignments and are discussing the possibility of infusing more formal essays into other courses. Each student is surveyed via an interview by two department faculty.
6. **Physics** – focused on oral and written communication. Using a rubric, student’s professor and external faculty members evaluate writing. The program is determined to revise their rubric and is considering the development of a bank of test questions to be used to assess student learning in the major.

Next Meeting Date & Agenda

- a. Meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 18, 10:00am-12:00pm., FDC 118

c. Presentations for Next Year:

- Scott Davis, General Education Subcommittee
- Stacey Morgan-Foster and Jill Tiemann-Gonzalez, Student Affairs

Respectfully submitted,
Lori Phillips

DD: llp 4/20/08
Posted: epl 09/12/08