

## Student Affairs Assessment Council

### Minutes April 4, 2007

**Attendance:** Bob Kerr, Kami Hammerschmith, Ann Robinson, Gina Shellhammer, Michele Riberio, Jessi Long, Jennifer Vina, Eric Hansen, Beth Dyer, Edie Blakley, Melissa K. Yamamoto, Rebecca Sanderson

#### **Summer Retreat**

Forestry Cabin, June 27 from 8:30-5:00.

Committee: Pat, Lisa, Melissa, Beth and Rebecca as needed.

Rebecca announced that the Forestry Cabin is reserved for us and there is a great committee that will be involved in the planning. Other members who wish to also be involved in the planning are welcome. We are always able to take volunteers.

Ideas for the agenda were discussed and included:

Follow-up from November retreat and survey outcomes of discussion, revising the rubric, revising the assessment plan review process to support further relationship development with people who do not attend the Assessment Council but who are doing assessment plans.

#### **Debrief Review Process, etc.**

The group began the debrief of the assessment plan review process and the rubric. There was a great deal of discussion around structuring the review process and the topic areas of assessment for the coming year plan (FY 2007-2008).

It was suggested that we ask every department/unit to design and measure one learning outcome that fit with the themes of: 1) leadership or 2) cultural competency or 3) outcome related to the alignment cluster that the department/unit is in. The emphasis would be on departments/unit opting in to participate in this way with their assessment planning process. Further, we would stress that departments/units would use one outcome, multiple methods to assess that outcome and continue that thread to decisions/recommendations and how the data would be used in their department/unit.

This new expectation of departments/units would be combined with consultations/coaching sessions with departments/units in maybe August or early September so that departments/units could incorporate this into their plans. The group also tossed out the idea that there could be a fall review process for those who wanted their plan actually reviewed in the fall and then a winter term review process for those who preferred their review be during the winter (typically those whose planning cycle is a calendar year instead of a fiscal year). Departments/units could opt for either of the two review times. Eric provided a drawing of this thinking and will duplicate it electronically. Rebecca will send it out as soon as Eric creates it.

Other areas that were discussed in terms of the review process had to do with people not liking (hate) to have their plans reviewed or the level of anxiety that some departments have about it. This feedback seemed to be related to whether or not the unit/department was in attendance at the Assessment Council meetings where relationships have developed. It was suggested that we set a better context for the reviews and that maybe we need to spend some time in developing personal relationships with those departments who do not participate in the Assessment Council. This went along with the idea of having a preliminary consultation with all departments/units in the summer/fall that would serve as a coaching session, information session, and relationship building session(s). The group was asked if they were willing to

commit to the time to develop these kinds of relationships. People were asked to reflect on this and to think about it for the next meeting.

### **Review of Rubric**

Rebecca had attached to the agenda the assessment plan expectations for the academic departments/units as well as a rubric for the review. Rebecca indicated that since she had heard multiple comments throughout the process about some of the difficulty of our rubric that this might be more helpful to us—or is at least another model to review and consider. Gina Shellhammer had developed the rubric and had borrowed from several other sources. Gina indicated that we could use the rubric, borrow from it, etc. She also offered to talk with us about their experiences in using the rubric with academic departments as they review their plans. This too might be a topic for the retreat in June.

### **CIRP Replacement Survey**

Eric provided the group with an update on the CIRP replacement survey that has been under development by an Assessment Council subcommittee for several months. Eric, Pat, and Rebecca met to try to reduce the number of questions so that the survey could fit to four pages. Eric is in conversation with 2 vendors who produce forms for surveys that can be scanned. The thought now is that if we can get a reasonable cost for this, plus cost for the OSU computer center to do the scanning and a cost for the Survey Research Center to do some of the preliminary analysis then we can decide about next steps. Eric estimates that the cost of all this will be around 10K. Rebecca has agreed to talk with Larry about this expense and to see what is possible in terms of funding for this summer. She will get back to Eric and the committee.

**Next Meeting: April 18, 2007 MU Council Room, 9-10:30am**

Likely agenda items:

Continued discussion about review process changes and focus of assessment changes

Update on CIRP replacement survey

Rubric review

And whatever other items folks feel we need to address in the coming meetings for this term.