

California State University, Stanislaus
Assessment Leadership Team
Thursday, September 18, 2008, 10:00am – 12:00pm
Faculty Development Center 118

Present: N. Aly, C. Castillo, H. Coughlin, D. Demetrulias, R. Fassinger, S. Fletcher, D. Hamlett, P. Hodge, L. Johnson, S. Marshall, D. Moore, K. Nainby, G. Novak, A. Petrosky, R. Roy, A. Sanchez, C. Stefanco, D. Tavernier, J. Tiemann-Gonzalez,

Excused: C. Bengston, E. Broadwater, S. Davis, S. Gajic-Bruyea, T. Held, A. Janz, R. McNeil, J. Tuedio, C. Whitman, S. Young

Recording: E. Prevette Littlepage

1. Introductions

D. Demetrulias welcomed members to the first ALT meeting of the year, and introductions were made for new members.

2. WASC Site Visit, October 1-3, 2008 (Sept.30, Stockton Center)

The group discussed the WASC Site Visit handout “Top 10 Ways to Prepare” and the distinction between the Capacity and Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review phases. Discussion occurred on whether or not WASC will request disaggregated data in the EER phase of the review. D. Demetrulias noted that the visiting team will most likely ask for aggregate program summaries and look at information that is already being reported, for example, in disciplinary accreditation reports. Disaggregated data for required information, such as retention and graduation rates, is expected to be reported and evidence presented that faculty have reviewed the information.

a. Educational Effectiveness Framework (#23)

The group reviewed the Educational Effectiveness Framework self-assessment rubric. D. Demetrulias explained that WASC has asked team members to use this framework to evaluate the university’s progress. These rubrics allow WASC teams to have transparency and fairness in their team evaluations. As the framework is a guideline for the WASC Site Team, it also serves as a resource for use in the Educational Effectiveness Review phase. D. Demetrulias indicated that a self-assessment rating rows were added to the rubric by the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance to allow users to rate their own progress/status on the different areas.

3. Assessment Action Plan – update and priorities for 2008/09 (#18)

D. Demetrulias discussed the Mary Allen assessment report summary and indicated that a website link would be sent out for the Summary of the Mary Allen Report and will be discussed at the December meeting. It was reported that the ASL subcommittee is currently working to connect and align the Academic Program Review and Program Assessment processes, as suggested in the Allen report.

D. Demetrulias discussed preparations for the WASC Site visit and reported that the team had requested an assessment flow chart which includes ALT and its role in University-Wide Assessment. The flow chart will continue to be refined and will be distributed via email for suggestions and revisions.

4. Assessment Findings – review and actions

a. Distribution List (#19)

D. Demetrulias indicated that a memorandum was sent out with the Distribution of Assessment Methods matrix requesting feedback. The feedback will be returned to Institutional Research and used to determine where information gaps exist.

b. University-wide Assessment Instruments

D. Demetrulias asked if members had comments on the distributed materials. It was noted that “statistical significance” be added in parentheses on the IDEA summary reports (#27).

Materials Distributed:

- Graduating Senior Survey Executive Summary (2005, 2006, and 2007) – (#20)
- Graduate Exit Survey Executive Summary (2007) – (#26)
- Undergraduate Alumni Survey Executive Summary (2006 and 2007) – (#25)
- Graduate Alumni Survey Executive Summary (2006 and 2007) – (#24)
- IDEA Student Evaluations - Comparison of 2004/05 and 2005/06 Findings - (#27)
- Graduate National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): summary report from Graduate Council on graduate surveys (#21)
- Core Indicators of Educational Quality (#22)

5. Spring 2009 Assessment Summit or alternative

The group discussed the possibility of another Assessment Summit for Spring 2009. R. It was suggested that alternatives to a summit be explored – such as webinars catered to discipline-specific issues and presented by nationally known experts. It was suggested to make assessment the focus of Instructional Institute Day – starting out with course-level assessment, tied to program-level assessment.

D. Demetrulias asked the group if discipline-specific clusters for faculty development opportunities had been helpful in the past. It was suggested that it may be more useful now than when the PACs were first initiated and that there may be more buy-in if the workshops were college-specific

D. Demetrulias asked if this summit approach was a good use of resources and time and asked the group if focus should be moved to more specific, ground-level approaches or assessment conferences. It was suggested that the group look into the assessment summits organized by the CSU as well as collecting assessment concerns to determine need before making any decisions.

D. Demetrulias added that we do have modest funding available and want to make the best use of funds and have the most impact. It was suggested that groups explore the possibility of partnering with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs or the Faculty Development Center noting that these kinds of collaborations would spark faculty interest.

6. Student Involvement in Assessment Activities (#28)

The group discussed the document developed by C. Mercier and noted that it was a good starting point to think about what we can do to involve students in assessment.

It was suggested that the onus was on the committees to help students see their relevance and that work with Student Leadership was needed to ensure student participation in assessment groups. D. Demetrulias suggested the possibility of hiring student assistants to process assessment data, which has been done in the past.

7. Questions for ALT

D. Demetrulias reviewed potential questions for the ALT during the WASC Site Team visit:

a. How well are the stated purposes of ALT being achieved?

The group reviewed and discussed the ALT charge. It was suggested that language in the charge should be changed from "recommends" to "shares information with" other groups.

Discussion occurred on the uses of data at the program and university-wide levels. A. Sanchez noted that an entire cycle of distribution has not been completed yet, but that the university-wide data distribution and feedback loop is an important management tool that will keep the campus informed about the trends/signals that the data are saying about our programs and students.

The group agreed that it was not within the scope of the group's responsibilities to review all of the available data, but should instead receive information from the Student Success Committee and others.

D. Demetrulias indicated that revisions to the charge would be made and brought forward in the December meeting for review.

The following questions will be discussed at the December meeting:

- b. From among the Assessment Action Plan, what are ALT's priorities for 2008/09?*
- c. Please provide an example of actions ALT has taken as a result of its review of university-wide assessment?*
- d. What is an example of advice you've given the Vice Provost for improving assessment practices?*
- e. In your evaluation of the university's assessment program, what is working well? What can be improved?*
- f. What actions has ALT taken as a result of the Allen report?*
- g. Where does CSU Stanislaus fall on the Educational Effectiveness Framework?*

Conclusion

D. Demetrulias asked the group if there were any issues to be added to the December agenda and suggested that the group have a summary of the WASC visit and review some of the follow-up items mentioned and suggested setting up a possible meeting in April.

Next Meeting Date and Agenda

- Meeting tentatively scheduled for December 10, 2008 10:00am-Noon in Naraghi 104.

Potential Agenda Items for December meeting

- WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Site Visit and Preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review
- Assessment Leadership Team Charge – revised
- Action Plan and Priorities
- Updates/Reports

Respectfully Submitted,
E. Prevette Littlepage

DD: epl 10/22/08