

Minutes
Senate Assessment Council
December 15, 2016

Present: Kendall Martin, Jane Zeff, Stanley Anozie, Bahar Ashnai, Jae Kim

Excused: Meredith Drew, Cara Berg, Jennifer Owlett, Antoinette Piccolo-Simmons

The meeting was convened at 12:35pm by Kendall Martin in Cheng Library Conference Room 107h

- I. We started the meeting by reviewing the minutes for meeting on November 17th, 2016 and approved it. Kendall Martin read the charges #1, 2, 5 and 6 to review. Kendall was asked to clarify charge #1 (Work with the Academic Standards Council to review documentation and make recommendations in consultation with the Assessment Council to clarify the process of assessment) and he found that the charge was related to Resolution 1 (Faculty Senate Meeting – April 12, 2016). In light of resolution 1, Charge 1 pertains to reviewing documentation related to Program Review and make recommendations on how to better clarify the process
- II. It was discussed that regarding charges 1 and 2 an approach can be incorporating assessment in the program review. Jane stressed that it is important to get Jonathan Lincoln view about the progress of program review and the role of assessment in that, and following that to communicate with the academic standard council (action item).
- III. Training: A decision should be made whether the training should be offered campus-wide or college-specific, furthermore how training should be provided to accredited versus non-accredited parties (action item). We should also find a candidate for instructing assessment (action item). Jane also mentioned possibly we can have an intermediate step in terms of enquiring the college coordinators to get a deeper understanding about the training needs of various colleges. It was suggested that Qualtrics can be used again involving Jonathan Lincoln for Qualtrics-based surveys as a part of assessment for those faculty that it will be useful to them. Jane will look into dates and potions for a possible training (e.g. an introduction to Qualtrics) to discuss at our January meeting. It should be also decided who will be invited to the training (action item).
- IV. There was an in-depth discussion about the possible ways to use and integrate other parties and assessment endeavors; Assessment can involve alumni (i.e. alumni survey), such options should be reviewed; Does the university need an exit survey (e.g. exit interview); how can NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement; every two years) be used and incorporated for assessment (also should it be done by major)? Should there be mid-career surveys/junior surveys? Jane mentioned that there are some surveys going on, for instance in nursing. Do we have an institutional survey as well? The student development carries out the surveys. Does the departments get it too? Jane will ask career services (action item). Student Services can be invited to tell the council what they are doing and share the copies of the surveys (exit surveys, alumni, mid-

- career, etc). This will help having one assessment source rather than each department doing it separately.
- V. The implications of the Middle State PRP approval was also discussed. The next step is to think about what should be done for departments and how it can be achieved. Jane elaborated that the goals and student learning outcomes should be aligned and clear.
- VI. We looked at the NSSE 2014 High-Impact Practices. Jane clarified that such report suggest that there are opportunities to improve the status-quo for instance for senior students in terms of working with a faculty member on a research project. First-years seem to be doing well in comparison to other institutes' undergraduate students (noting for instance the results for Public Master, Large Nonresidential, and Regional Emphasis). These assessments clarify what needs work later.
- VII. We had a discussion about what STARFISH is. Jane explained that it is a software package that is implemented in Provost area for academic support. It is a tool to help advising the students. It automates advising the students. It is a tracking system that helps advising and consequently retention. We discussed that there should be education provided regarding such packages in addition to Campus lab and Qualtrics.
- VIII. Action items summary:

Jane will get Jonathan Lincoln's view about the progress of program review and the role of assessment in that.

To decide whether the training should be offered campus-wide or college-specific, furthermore how training should be provided to accredited versus non-accredited parties.

To find a candidate for instructing assessment.

Jane will look into dates and options for a possible training (e.g. an introduction to Qualtrics) to discuss at our January meeting. It should be also decided who will be invited to the training.

There are some surveys going on for instance in nursing. Do we have an institutional survey as well? The student development carries out the surveys. Does the departments get it too? Jane will ask career services

Next Meetings: January 19th at 12:30pm in the Cheng Library, Conference Room 107h.

- IX. The meeting was adjourned at 1:41pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Bahar Ashnai