2014-2015
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

General Notes
The following structure has been adopted to enhance the readability and flow of the documentation for this set:

1. Documentation for each meeting begins with a copy of the meeting agenda.
2. Copies of additional materials presented in meetings are presented after the agenda.
3. Minutes from each meeting are presented after the agenda OR copies of materials.
4. If materials were revised during meetings, the original version of each document and the revised version of each document are labeled accordingly and presented after the minutes for each meeting.
5. This documentation structure then repeats itself with each subsequent meeting.

All minutes, document revisions, and other materials presented in this set were approved by voting members of this committee.

Notes About This Specific Documentation Set
The meeting notes included in this documentation set feature minutes from all meetings that took place during the Spring 2015 semester only. Although the committee met at least twice during the Fall 2014 semester, minutes from those meetings are unavailable.
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

March 9th, 2015, 10:30am-12:00pm, UC 414 Conference Room

Preliminary Introductions and Logistics (10:30-10:45)
--Need to select Assessment Committee Chair
--Need to discuss/clarify the roles and working relationships between Assessment Committee Chair, Assessment Committee members, Dr. Jenkins, and Dr. Jordan

Core Curriculum Assessment Year 1 Spring Timeline (10:45-11:00)
--Need to review and modify timeline because review of both Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 artifacts can take place simultaneously in May 2015
  --See “Timeline: Core Curriculum Assessment for Year 1, Spring 2015 (Cycle A)” document

Research and Service Outcomes (11:00-11:20)
--Need to review the wording of these outcomes and send to the A3C for a vote
  --See “TAMUT Research and Service” document

CLA+ Testing (11:20-11:40)
--Need to discuss and agree on recruitment methods for CLA+ testing
  --Names and emails of 222 graduating Seniors have already been collected
  --Testing is scheduled for March 30th-April 2nd
    --Testing deadline is Friday, April 17th
  --Marketing/graphic design currently working on physical flyers and email flyers

*Future Meeting Dates (11:40-11:45)
--Determine meeting dates for the rest of the semester
  --Right now, every 2nd/4th Monday from 10am-12pm works for most of the committee
    --Monday, March 23rd, 10-12
    --Monday, April 6th, 10-12
    --Monday, April 20th, 10-12
  --Only plan to meet if clear meeting agenda is set

*Faculty Review Panels (11:45-12:00)
--Assessment committee needs to begin discussions for scheduling a timeline and establishing process for (a) reviewing work submitted from individual colleges, and (b) setting up faculty review panels for the Core Curriculum and the SACSCOC process.

*If time

Sample Future Discussion Points

--Faculty Review Panels (ongoing discussion)
--Taskstream
  --Review ’13-’14 Assessment Plans and Findings
  --Review ’14-’15 Assessment Plans and Findings
--Student Artifact Sampling Approaches
Description of Process
Each fall and spring semester, departments/programs will prepare a Core Curriculum Department Worksheet describing the assignment(s) used to assess the objectives under review for that year. For Year 1, courses meeting the Communication and Critical Thinking objective will be assessed.
Faculty teaching courses under review will submit either results from embedded exams or student artifacts for review by rubrics. Student work is then reviewed by faculty panels and other faculty in related disciplines according to criteria or rubrics approved by the Assessment Committee.

The Associate Provost’s office provides support to the process by coordinating the collection of artifacts, assisting with logistics for faculty review panels, analyzing results, and communicating results. The panels, with the support of the Associate Provost, will then report results to the Academic Assessment Committee. The Academic Assessment Committee will draft a report with analysis and recommendations to the A3C.

*Note: This assessment process is not an assessment of teaching or performance and is expressly not to be considered in evaluation of faculty.*

Preparing Student Work for Review Panels
Faculty will need to submit hard copy or electronic copy of student work to the Associate Provost’s Office for review by the faculty panels. Written samples to be reviewed using rubrics must be clean of student names or instructor’s comments; use only student UIN. *Optional: Instructors may ask students to submit two copies of the assignment—one with only UIN and one with the student’s name for the instructor to use in grading.*

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2015</td>
<td>Deadline for departments/programs to submit results from embedded exam questions to Associate Provost’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.2015</td>
<td>Department worksheets for spring are due to Associate Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16.2015</td>
<td>Faculty teaching Core classes during the spring will receive flash drives and further instructions for submission of electronic or hard copies of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15.2015</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty to submit student work from spring to Associate Provost’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Faculty review panels will review spring artifacts using AAC&amp;U rubrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Mission Outcomes Related to Research & Service (Original)

As a member of The Texas A&M University System, Texas A&M University-Texarkana is a comprehensive regional University that provides students with academically challenging, engaging, and rewarding educational experiences through quality teaching, scholarship, student support services, co-curricular programming, research, and service. Through the personal attention of our faculty and staff, students are afforded the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills to become leaders in their chosen profession and to prepare for the opportunities of serving in a global environment.

Learning Outcome: Research

Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or ability to conduct research appropriate to their discipline.

Learning Objectives:

Students will

1. Articulate a clear research question, formulate a hypothesis, and identify appropriate research methodologies
2. Explain their research to others in their field and to broader audiences
3. Identify and practice research ethics appropriate to their discipline

Learning Outcome: Service

Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or engagement in service to others.

Learning Objectives:

Students will

1. Demonstrate ability to work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.
2. Reflect on their own commitment to service in various community contexts

Draft 2.20.2015
March 9th, 2015, 10:30am-12:00pm, UC 414 Conference Room

Members present: Dr. Walter Casey (interim Chair), Dr. Drew Moore, Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. James Nguyen, Dr. Richard Herrera, Dr. Teri Fowler, Dr. Nancy Jordan, Dr. Jade Jenkins

Members absent: Dr. Yi Su (Dr. Md Kalam in attendance on his behalf.)

Meeting called to order at 10:35am

Preliminary Introductions and Logistics
--Assessment Committee voted to elect Dr. Teri Fowler as Chair

Core Curriculum Assessment Year 1 Spring Timeline
--Assessment Committee voted to approve the new Core Curriculum Assessment Year 1 Spring Timeline, which included the decision to combine faculty review of student artifacts from the fall 2014 semester and the spring 2015 semester in May
   --See “Timeline Core Curriculum Assessment MODIFIED 3.11.15” file

Research and Service Outcomes
--Assessment Committee voted to approve the TAMUT Research and Service Objectives statement with the following changes, including (a) the inclusion of higher-level and lower-level objectives (consistent with Bloom’s taxonomy), (b) increased specificity concerning use of the term “community”, and (c) reference of objectives appropriate to “level of degree”
   --See “TAMUT Research and Service – Revised 3.9.15” file

CLA+ Testing
--Assessment Committee voted to approve plan to have Dr. Jade Jenkins complete in-person CLA+ recruitment of students from various upper-level courses
--Assessment Committee voted to approve plan to send the recommendation that CLA+ be included as a graduation requirement to the A3C

Future Meeting Dates
--Assessment Committee voted to approve the following proposed meeting dates for the rest of the semester, with the understanding that (a) Dr. Teri Fowler and Dr. Jade Jenkins must set the agenda for each meeting, and (b) if no agenda is set, no meeting will take place
   --Monday, March 23rd, 10-12
   --Monday, April 6th, 10-12
   --Monday, April 20th, 10-12

Meeting adjourned at 11:55am
Description of Process

Each fall and spring semester, departments/programs will prepare a Core Curriculum Department Worksheet describing the assignment(s) used to assess the objectives under review for that year. For Year 1, courses meeting the Communication and Critical Thinking objective will be assessed.

Faculty teaching courses under review will submit either results from embedded exams or student artifacts for review by rubrics. Student work is then reviewed by faculty panels and other faculty in related disciplines according to criteria or rubrics approved by the Assessment Committee.

The Associate Provost’s office provides support to the process by coordinating the collection of artifacts, assisting with logistics for faculty review panels, analyzing results, and communicating results. The panels, with the support of the Associate Provost, will then report results to the Academic Assessment Committee. The Academic Assessment Committee will draft a report with analysis and recommendations to the A3C.

Note: This assessment process is not an assessment of teaching or performance and is expressly not to be considered in evaluation of faculty.

Preparing Student Work for Review Panels

Faculty will need to submit hard copy or electronic copy of student work to the Associate Provost’s Office for review by the faculty panels. Written samples to be reviewed using rubrics must be clean of student names or instructor’s comments; use only student UIN. Optional: Instructors may ask students to submit two copies of the assignment—one with only UIN and one with the student’s name for the instructor to use in grading.

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.16.2015</td>
<td>Faculty teaching Core classes during the spring will receive flash drives and further instructions for submission of electronic or hard copies of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15.2015</td>
<td>Deadline for faculty to submit student work from spring to Associate Provost’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Faculty review panels will review both fall artifacts and spring artifacts using AAC&amp;U rubrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared 3.11.15
Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Mission Outcomes Related to Research & Service (Revised)

Rationale
SACSCOC requires institutions to identify expected outcomes, evaluate the extent to which it achieves those outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on assessment results for all areas including research and service related to our mission. We have processes in place for educational programs, administrative support programs, and academic and student support services. We include research and service in our mission, but do not have university outcomes for research and service. These outcomes will be mapped in Taskstream to existing outcomes and assessments in educational programs and academic and student support services.

Mission
As a member of The Texas A&M University System, Texas A&M University-Texarkana is a comprehensive regional University that provides students with academically challenging, engaging, and rewarding educational experiences through quality teaching, scholarship, student support services, co-curricular programming, research, and service. Through the personal attention of our faculty and staff, students are afforded the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills to become leaders in their chosen profession and to prepare for the opportunities of serving in a global environment.

Research
Learning Outcome: Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or ability to conduct research appropriate to their discipline and to the level of their degree.

Learning Objectives: Students will
1. Articulate a clear research question, formulate a hypothesis, and identify appropriate research methodologies
2. Analyze their research and explain it to others in their field and to broader audiences
3. Identify and practice research ethics appropriate to their discipline

Service
Learning Outcome: Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or engagement in service to others.

Learning Objectives: Students will
1. Demonstrate ability to work across and within local to global community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.
2. Reflect/evaluate on their own commitment to service in those community contexts

Draft 3.10.2015
Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Mission Outcomes Related to Research & Service  (Final Revisions Received from A3C)

Rationale
SACSCOC requires institutions to identify expected outcomes, evaluate the extent to which it achieves those outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on assessment results for all areas including research and service related to our mission. We have processes in place for educational programs, administrative support programs, and academic and student support services. We include research and service in our mission, but do not have university outcomes for research and service. These outcomes will be mapped in Taskstream to existing outcomes and assessments in educational programs and academic and student support services.

Mission
As a member of The Texas A&M University System, Texas A&M University-Texarkana is a comprehensive regional University that provides students with academically challenging, engaging, and rewarding educational experiences through quality teaching, scholarship, student support services, co-curricular programming, research, and service. Through the personal attention of our faculty and staff, students are afforded the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills to become leaders in their chosen profession and to prepare for the opportunities of serving in a global environment.

Research
Learning Outcome: Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or ability to conduct research appropriate to their discipline and to the level of their degree.

Learning Objectives: Students will
1. Be able to use research methodologies appropriate to their discipline
2. Analyze their research and explain it to others in their field and to broader audiences
3. Identify and practice research ethics appropriate to their discipline

Service
Learning Outcome: Upon graduation, students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of or engagement in service to others.

Learning Objectives: Students will
1. Demonstrate ability to work across and within local to global community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.
2. Reflect/evaluate on their own commitment to service in those community contexts

Approved 8.26.2015
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

March 23rd, 2015, 10am-12pm, UC 414 Conference Room

Chair Elect Proposal (10:00-10:20)
--Need to discuss proposal to create Chair Elect position for Assessment Committee
  --Chair Elect would be first-year member of Assessment Committee
  --Responsibilities of Chair Elect could include (a) recording and posting minutes from
    each meeting, and (b) committing to being the Assessment Committee Chair during their
    second year of service, among other duties determined by Assessment Committee
--Vote to send approved plan to A3C for approval?

Assessment Discussion Outcome #1: Purpose (10:20-10:40)
--Need to revisit, clarify, and be prepared to clearly articulate:
  (a) The purpose of TAMUT’s assessment activities
  (b) The importance of TAMUT’s assessment activities

Assessment Discussion Outcome #2: Methods (10:40-11:00)
--Need to revisit, clarify, and be prepared to clearly articulate:
  (a) Methodological approaches to assessment consistent with the stated
      purpose/importance of assessment at TAMUT

*Assessment Discussion Outcome #3: Faculty Engagement/Participation (11:00-12:00; ongoing)
--Need to discuss ways in which the purpose/methods of TAMUT assessment align with faculty
  engagement with assessment and participation in assessment activities (e.g., faculty review
  panels). This discussion may include (but is not limited to) discussion of:
  (a) Ways in which faculty may benefit from assessment
  (b) Assessment resources faculty may need to participate in assessment activities
  (c) Ways to recruit faculty for faculty review panels
  (d) Ways to get work done while minimizing disruption of assessment activities to
      faculty’s other plans or duties around that time

*If time

Future Meetings

Monday, April 6th, 10-12 in UC 116 (Texar Room)
Monday, April 20th, 10-12 in UC 116 (Texar Room)

Sample Future Discussion Points

--Taskstream
  --Review ’13-’14 Assessment Plans and Findings
  --Review ’14-’15 Assessment Plans and Findings
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 23rd, 2015, 10am-12pm, UC 414 Conference Room

Members present: Dr. Teri Fowler (Chair), Dr. Drew Moore, Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. James Nguyen, Dr. Richard Herrera, Dr. Nancy Jordan, Dr. Jade Jenkins

Members absent: Dr. Walter Casey

Meeting start and end times not recorded for this meeting.

No formal recommendations or actions taken during this meeting; given the range of committee member experiences with assessment, the committee primarily spent time revisiting and clarifying various assessment topics, timelines, and requirements.
Faculty Participation in May 2015 Review Panels for Core Curriculum (10:00-11:00)
--Need to discuss ways in which the purpose/methods of TAMUT assessment align with faculty engagement with assessment and participation in assessment activities (e.g., faculty review panels). This discussion may include (but is not limited to) discussion of:
(a) Revisiting, clarifying, and being prepared to articulate
   --Purpose/importance of assessment activities at TAMUT
   --Planned assessment process
(b) Assessment resources faculty may need to participate in assessment activities
(c) Ways to get work done while minimizing disruption of assessment activities to faculty’s other plans or duties around that time
(d) Ways to recruit faculty for faculty review panels

Review of Assessment Plans and Findings in Taskstream (11:00-11:40)
--Academic assessment committee needs to review assessment plans/findings and provide feedback in Taskstream. Here is some basic information:
   --Should have received login information via email (or noticed change in existing privileges) around 3/18/15
   --Each committee member will review ~3-4 work spaces total for ’13-’14 (assessment plan + assessment findings) and ’14-’15 (assessment plan only)
   --Reviews can be completed at any time, and are due on or before May 31st, 2015
--Rubrics
   --Need to review and discuss rubric process in Taskstream
   --Jade will provide demonstration of how to use rubrics in Taskstream
   --Also see the “Using Rubrics to Review Assessment Plans/Findings in Taskstream” document
--Proposed assignments
   --Assessment plans/findings randomly assigned using the Research Randomizer
   (http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm):
      - [ ] : Criminal Justice, Drama, Education Leadership Department
      - [ ] : Biology, Leadership, Psychology, Counseling
      - [ ] : Applied Arts and Sciences, Electrical Engineering, General Studies, Minors
      (STEM)
      - [ ] : Education Department, Computer Science, Accounting & Business Administration Department
      - [ ] : BA/BS English, Spanish, Adult and Higher Education, Sociology
      - [ ] : Mass Communication, Mathematics, Political Science, Instructional Technology
      - [ ] : History, MA English, Interdisciplinary Studies, Nursing
*Chair Elect Proposal (11:40-12:00)
--Need to discuss proposal to create Chair Elect position for Assessment Committee
   --Chair Elect would be first-year member of Assessment Committee
   --Responsibilities of Chair Elect could include (a) recording and posting minutes from each meeting; (b) gathering/synthesizing agenda requests from committee members and giving information to Chair; and (c) committing to being the Assessment Committee Chair during their second year of service, among other duties determined by Assessment Committee
   --If desired, vote to send to A3C for approval

*If time

Future Meetings
Monday, April 20th, 10-12 in UC 116 (Texar Room)
### Assessment Plan Rubric (Original)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Measures</strong></td>
<td>Multiple measures are proposed</td>
<td>One measure is proposed</td>
<td>No measure is proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct/Indirect Measures</strong></td>
<td>At least one means of assessment directly measures student learning (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests)</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses only attitudinal surveys (e.g., of employers/internship supervisors, or alumni) or indirect measures (e.g. job placement or graduate school acceptance rates)</td>
<td>Means of assessment use measures of student learning invalid for assessment purposes (e.g., course grades, pass/fail comps, or student attitudinal surveys)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Goals</strong></td>
<td>All target goals are specific, measurable, and represent a reasonable level for success.</td>
<td>Target goals are proposed but not always measurable or reasonable.</td>
<td>Target Goals are missing or inappropriate or set too high or too low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Findings Rubric (Original)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>Findings are reported in adequate detail with supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, itemized reports) to confidently assess the outcomes</td>
<td>Findings are reported, but more data and/or detail would increase confidence in the results</td>
<td>Inadequate data were collected to assess the outcome or findings do not address whether students met the outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Assessment results spark specific program improvements that seem likely to improve student performance or criteria for success were met</td>
<td>Gave specific and logical actions for some, but not all of the outcomes or suggestions for improvement were too general or suggestions focused only on assessment process, not student learning</td>
<td>Recommended improvements were missing or indicated that no changes were needed even though criteria for success were not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING RUBRICS TO REVIEW ASSESSMENT PLANS/FINDINGS IN TASKSTREAM

Step One

Navigate to http://www.taskstream.com, and click “LOGIN” in the top right area of your screen.

You will be brought to the main sign-on page (as seen below).

You should login to one of two difference reviewer accounts (depending on which group of assessment plans and findings to plan on reviewing). The login information is as follows:

--Reviewer 1 Account: Username is XXX, Password is XXX
--Reviewer 2 Account: Username is XXX, Password is XXX

NOTE: Because these are shared accounts, you may login and occasionally receive a notice that someone else is logged in. Please do NOT click the orange button that enables you to kick them out of their session (they may lose unsaved work). Instead, please wait and attempt to login again later. To minimize inconveniences, please be communicative with your team members about when you plan on conducting your reviews and when you have logged out.
**Step Two**

After you have signed in, you will be brought to main Taskstream page (as pictured below).

To the left of your screen, you will see a light blue box containing various Review options. You will click the “Items requiring review (!)” link that is inside the blue box.

![Taskstream Page](image)

**Step Three**

After you select the “Items requiring review (!)” link, you will see the Display Preferences page (as pictured at the top of the next page). You can ignore most of this page and focus on the checkbox options at the bottom.

If you will be reviewing assessment plans/findings from academic departments (e.g., Department of Psychology), you will uncheck the “Non-Academic Assessment Workspace” option and click the orange “Continue” button.

If you will be reviewing assessment plans/findings from non-academic departments (e.g., Human Resources), you will uncheck the “Annual Program Assessment” option and click the orange “Continue” button.
Step Four

After you have clicked the orange “Continue” button, you will be directed to the “All Items Requiring Review” page (pictured below). Find the name of the participating area you would like to review while also paying attention to the requirement column (which will help you locate Assessment Plans and Assessment Findings).

Once you have found the Assessment Plan or Assessment Findings requirements for the participating area you are looking for, you should click the orange “Review” button (located in the “Action” column).
Step Five

After you have selected the orange “Review” button, you will be redirected to the Review page (as pictured below). To begin your review, you will need to click the green “Review Work” button in the top left corner of the screen.

When you click the green “Review Work” button, two different pages will automatically launch in separate browser windows (as pictured below).
The window on the left will display the Assessment Plan or Assessment Findings that you are going to review. Please click the blue “Mission Statement” link and the blue “Outcomes and Measures” link to reveal the information you will be reviewing.

The window on the right will display the rubric you will use to review this work.

**Step Six**

Use the rubric window to record your evaluation of the Assessment Plan or Assessment Findings.

The rubric window has three parts:

1) The top part of the window contains the rubric itself. Read the rubric criteria and performance levels. You may indicate your score by using the drop-down “SCORE” menu, or by simply clicking the performance level text instead. Where improvements are needed, you should also insert helpful and specific comments in the “Comments on this criterion” field. You will also have the option to save your draft if you’d like to finish writing your comments at a later time (see the orange “Save Draft” button).

2) In the middle section, you will (a) indicate whether the Assessment Plan or Assessment Findings meet requirements or do not meet requirements (within the black “SCORE” section); and (b) provide general comments on the overall shape of the Assessment Plan or Assessment Findings you reviewed. You will also have the option to save your draft if you’d like to finish writing your comments at a later time (see the orange “Save Draft” button).
3) In the bottom section, you will see three delivery options for your review. Please select the blue option which reads, “Record as final but release review to participating area later.” If you are ready to submit your complete review, you should then click the orange “Submit Review” button at the bottom of the window. Otherwise, you should click the orange “Save Draft” button at the bottom of the window.

**A Final Note**

Reviews of Assessment Plans and Assessment Findings will be released to all departments on May 31st, 2015 (or an earlier date agreed upon by the Assessment Committee). An email will be send to the responsible faculty member from each department notifying them that they have received their reviews.

Faculty will be able to access their reviews in Taskstream by navigating to each of their work spaces and clicking the “Submission & Read Reviews” tab at the top of the screen. Under “Status” column, they will see a “Review Released” tab. They can access the details of their review by clicking the orange “Score/Results Report” button that should appear under the “Results” column.
Research Randomizer Results

1 Set of 26 Unique Numbers Per Set
Range: From 1 to 26 -- Unsorted

Job Status: Finished

Set #1:

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 6th, 2015, 10:00am-12:00pm, UC 116 Texar Room

Members present: Dr. Teri Fowler (Chair), Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. James Nguyen, Dr. Yi Su, Dr. Nancy Jordan, Dr. Jade Jenkins

Members absent: Dr. Walter Casey, Dr. Richard Herrera, Dr. Drew Morton

Meeting called to order at 10:05am

Faculty Participation in May 2015 Review Panels for Core Curriculum

Plans for May 2015
--Committee suggested that Nancy and Jade provide more regular communication pertaining to the current assessment process status and in regard to future planning/upcoming events. This information could be disseminated through emails and town hall meetings. Furthermore, this information should be delivered in individual college meetings with Deans and department leaders. Jade will begin scheduling these meetings.
--Committee suggested that faculty be provided with rubrics training (perhaps as part of an “Assessment Day” training event)
--Committee suggested that faculty be explicitly informed of the specific dates/times that will correspond with their particular contributions to the faculty review panels. Proposed dates were Wednesday, May 20th, and Thursday, May 21st
--Recruitment for faculty review panels will take place when Nancy and Jade meet with Deans and department leaders; will request a specific number of names

Plans for Future Assessment
--Committee suggested that future assessment activities move away from course-level assessment. Instead, sampling of artifacts will be grouped according to foundation component area clusters
--Committee suggested that future faculty teaching core courses in the future be informed that they are expected to participate in faculty review panels. Similar to the cluster-based sampling approach, review panels will consist of faculty who have taught within those clusters. For example, a review panels may consist of at least two faculty members who have taught within a cluster and at least one additional faculty member who has not taught within that cluster

Review of Assessment Plans in Taskstream
--Committee reviewed rubrics and made suggestions for revisions. Jade will make these revisions and will present revised rubrics at next meeting for final review
--Jade will contact Taskstream about (a) permitting more than one reviewer to review each collection of assessment plans/findings, and (b) anonymity of reviews
--Demonstration of how to use Taskstream will continue into next meeting if needed

Meeting adjourned at 11:55am
### Assessment Plan (Revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct/Indirect Measures</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses at least one direct measure of student learning (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests) and at least one indirect measure (e.g. job placement or graduate school acceptance rates).</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses only direct measures student learning (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests).</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses only attitudinal surveys (e.g., of employers/internship supervisors, or alumni) or indirect measures (e.g. job placement or graduate school acceptance rates).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness/Relevancy of Measures</td>
<td>All measures appear to have excellent &quot;fit&quot; with claims of what they are supposed to be measuring.</td>
<td>All measures appear to &quot;fit&quot; with claims of what they are supposed to be measuring. However, better measurement options are available.</td>
<td>One or more measures do not appear to match claims of what they are supposed to be measuring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Goals</td>
<td>All target goals are specific, measurable, and represent a reasonable level for success.</td>
<td>Target goals are proposed but not always measurable or reasonable.</td>
<td>Target Goals are missing or inappropriate or set too high or too low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Findings (Revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Findings are reported in detail with supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, itemized reports) to confidently assess the outcomes</td>
<td>Findings are reported, but more data and/or detail would increase confidence in the results</td>
<td>Inadequate data were collected to assess the outcome or findings do not address whether students met the outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Improvements</td>
<td>Assessment results spark excellent, specific program improvements in response to each collection of findings. It is highly likely that these recommendations will improve student performance.</td>
<td>Assessment results spark specific program improvements in response to each collection of findings. These recommended improvements have a good chance of improving student performance. However, there may be better ways to improve student performance.</td>
<td>Recommended improvements were missing, or the recommended improvements had significant problems associated with them (e.g., too general, aren't likely to improve student performance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

April 20th, 2015, 10am-12pm, UC 116 Texar Room

Faculty Review Panels for May 2015 Core Curriculum Assessment (10:00-11:15)
--Committee needs to finalize and vote on specific plans for the review panels, particularly in regard to:
  --Vote to approve the “cluster” approach vs. the course-level approach or university-level approach
  --Total number of artifacts sampled vs. cluster-specific artifact sample size
  --Structuring of review panels (e.g., group based on assessment objectives or subject area vs. integrate groups with different objects or subject areas)
--Committee needs to re-examine System/Core timeline and consider modifications to future schedule
  --See color chart sheet

Review of Assessment Plans and Findings in Taskstream (11:15-11:30)
--Committee needs to review assessment plans/findings and provide feedback in Taskstream.
  --To guarantee anonymity of reviews, reviewers should log in to these accounts:
    --Reviewer 1 account: Username is [REDACTED], Password is [REDACTED]
    --Reviewer 2 account: Username is [REDACTED], Password is [REDACTED]
--Review ~7-8 work spaces total for ’13-’14 (assessment plan + assessment findings) and ’14-’15 (assessment plan only)
--Reviews can be completed at any time, and are due on or before May 31st, 2015

--Rubrics
  --Have been revised; committee welcome to conduct final review of revised rubrics
  --See the modified “Using Rubrics to Review Assessment Plans/Findings in Taskstream” document for instructions
--Reviewer assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Plans/Findings to Review</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice, Drama, Education Leadership Department</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Leadership, Psychology, Counseling</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Arts and Sciences, Electrical Engineering, General Studies, Minors (STEM)</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Department, Computer Science, Accounting &amp; Business Administration Department</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS English, Spanish, Adult and Higher Education, Sociology</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication, Mathematics, Political Science, Instructional Technology</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, MA English, Interdisciplinary Studies, Nursing</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLA+ Update (11:30-12:00)
--Update on making CLA+ a graduation requirement
--Committee needs to discuss combining freshmen/senior testing in the fall and, if desired, vote to approve this plan

Next Optional Meeting

Monday, May 4th, 10am-12pm, UC 116 (Texar Room)
### A&M System SLO Schedule*

*Schedule set by A&M System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected from F '12 / SP ’13</td>
<td>Collected from F ’13/ SP ’14</td>
<td>Collected from F ’14/ SP ’15</td>
<td>Collected from F ’15/ SP ’16</td>
<td>Collected from F ’16/ SP ’17</td>
<td>Collected from F ’17/ SP ’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Dec ’13</td>
<td>Submitted Dec ’14</td>
<td>Will Submit Dec ’15</td>
<td>Will Submit Dec ’16</td>
<td>Submitted Dec ’17</td>
<td>Will Submit Dec ’18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Texas Core SLO Schedule*

*Schedule set by TAMUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected from F ’14 / SP ’15</td>
<td>Collected from F ’15/ SP ’16</td>
<td>Collected from F ’16/ SP ’17</td>
<td>Collected from F ’17 / SP ’18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Comprehensive Schedule Modification (A&M System SLOs and Texas Core SLOs)**

*Core schedule follows System schedule to maximize compatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Year 1: Communication, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Core Year 1: Communication, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Core Year 2: Empirical and Quant., Teamwork</td>
<td>Core Year 3: Social Resp., Personal Resp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In June 2015 assessment report</td>
<td>In June 2016 assessment report</td>
<td>In June 2017 assessment report</td>
<td>In June 2018 assessment report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

April 20th, 2015, 10:00am-12:00pm, UC 116 Texar Room

Members present: Dr. Teri Fowler (Chair), Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. Drew Morton, Dr. James Nguyen, Dr. Yi Su, Dr. Nancy Jordan, Dr. Jade Jenkins

Members absent: Dr. Walter Casey, Dr. Richard Herrera

Meeting called to order at 10:05am

Faculty Participation in May 2015 Review Panels for Core Curriculum

Plans for May 2015
--Committee voted to approve plan to sample from and provide results at the foundation component area “cluster” level rather than at the course level
--Committee voted to approve power analysis-informed sampling procedure, which will also include a 15% buffer added to the total artifact count
--Committee voted to structure faculty review panels based on Core/System objectives (e.g., group for Communication, group for Critical Thinking, etc.)
--Nancy will confirm faculty review panel stipend amount at next meeting

Plans for Future Assessment
--Committee voted to approve plan to reschedule Core/System assessment schedule so that Year 1 of Core objectives are repeated next year. Doing so will increase compatibility between Core objectives and System objectives.
--Committee will vote during next meeting (May 4th) on whether instructors teaching in the core curriculum will be required to participate in faculty review panels

Review of Assessment Plans/Findings in Taskstream and CLA+
--Committee ran out of time to adequately discuss review of assessment plans/findings in Taskstream and CLA+. Discussion of these items will be wrapped up at the next meeting. Jade will also bring additional resources (e.g., guidelines) to help committee members prepare for Taskstream review tasks

Meeting adjourned at 12:15pm
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

May 4th, 2015, 10am-12pm, UC 116 Texar Room

Faculty Review Panels for May 2015 Core Curriculum Assessment (10:00-10:15)
--Committee needs to vote on approving expectation for core curriculum instructors to participate in the review panels

Remaining 2014-2015 Issues/Looking Ahead to 2015-2016 (10:15-10:45)
--CLA+
   --Committee needs to discuss combining freshmen/senior testing in the fall and, if desired, vote to approve this plan
   --Assessment of globalization/diversity, decision-making, and social responsibility assessment
      --GPI (Global Perspective Inventory)
   --Please spread word about ’15-’16 artifacts to be collected this next year (communication, critical thinking)

Review of Assessment Plans and Findings in Taskstream (10:45-end of meeting)
--Review ~7-8 work spaces total for ’13-’14 (assessment plan + assessment findings) and ’14-’15 (assessment plan only)
--Reviews can be completed at any time, and are due on or before May 31st, 2015
--Taskstream account login reminder:
   --Reviewer 1 account: Username is [redacted], Password is [redacted]
   --Reviewer 2 account: Username is [redacted], Password is [redacted]
--Reviewing with rubrics
   --See the modified “Using Rubrics to Review Assessment Plans/Findings in Taskstream” document for instructions
--Reviewer assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Plans/Findings to Review</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice, Drama, Education Leadership Department</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Leadership, Psychology, Counseling</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Arts and Sciences, Electrical Engineering, General Studies,</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors (STEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Department, Computer Science, Accounting &amp; Business Administration Department</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS English, Spanish, Adult and Higher Education, Sociology</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication, Mathematics, Political Science, Instructional Technology</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, MA English, Interdisciplinary Studies, Nursing</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--Practice round
   --See copies of examples
   --See “Components of (Good) Assessment Plans and Use of Assessment Findings in Taskstream” document
   --See copies of Taskstream rubrics
Components of (Effective) Assessment Plans and Use of Assessment Findings in Taskstream

Assessment Plan

Characteristics of Assessment Plans (in Taskstream):
- Department Mission Statement
- Broad SLOs (in grey) and Specific SLOs (in white)
- Acceptable Performance Targets and Ideal Performance Targets
- Descriptions and Copies of Measures (Direct vs. Indirect)

Description of Assessment Plans should:
- Be clearly understood, specific, realistic, and ambitious
- Reflect diversity of learning activities within department, but does not try to assess "everything about everything"
- Contain SLOs that (a) are measurable; (b) are associated with specific departments and/or faculty; (c) are pursued with both acceptable targets and ideal targets in mind, and (d) have a clear, realistic implementation plan
- Contain measures that (a) “match” each SLO (they provide the right answers to the right question, rather than answering something that isn’t being asked); (b) are not difficult to measure or obtain; and (c) ideally consist of both direct and indirect measures
- Includes copy of all measures (if possible/sensible)

Assessment Findings

Characteristics of Assessment Findings (in Taskstream):
- Summary of Findings
- Results
- Recommended Actions
- Comments/Notes

Description of Assessment Findings (in Taskstream) should:
- Clearly answer the question of whether or not acceptable and ideal targets were not met, met, or exceeded
- Demonstrate correct interpretation of the findings
- Include recommendations that are informed by the reported findings
- Include a copy of all findings (if possible/sensible)
## Assessment Plan Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct/Indirect Measures</strong></td>
<td>Means of assessment uses at least one direct measure of student learning (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests) and at least one indirect measure (e.g. job placement or graduate school acceptance rates).</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses only direct measures student learning (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests).</td>
<td>Means of assessment uses only attitudinal surveys (e.g., of employers/internship supervisors, or alumni) or indirect measures (e.g. job placement or graduate school acceptance rates).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriateness/Relevancy of Measures</strong></td>
<td>All measures appear to have excellent &quot;fit&quot; with claims of what they are supposed to be measuring.</td>
<td>All measures appear to &quot;fit&quot; with claims of what they are supposed to be measuring. However, better measurement options are available.</td>
<td>One or more measures do not appear to match claims of what they are supposed to be measuring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Goals</strong></td>
<td>All target goals are specific, measurable, and represent a reasonable level for success.</td>
<td>Target goals are proposed but not always measurable or reasonable.</td>
<td>Target Goals are missing or inappropriate or set too high or too low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assessment Findings Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>In Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td>Findings are reported in detail with supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, itemized reports) to confidently assess the outcomes</td>
<td>Findings are reported, but more data and/or detail would increase confidence in the results</td>
<td>Inadequate data were collected to assess the outcome or findings do not address whether students met the outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RecommendedImprovements</strong></td>
<td>Assessment results spark excellent, specific program improvements in response to each collection of findings. It is highly likely that these recommendations will improve student performance.</td>
<td>Assessment results spark specific program improvements in response to each collection of findings. These recommended improvements have a good chance of improving student performance. However, there may be better ways to improve student performance.</td>
<td>Recommended improvements were missing, or the recommended improvements had significant problems associated with them (e.g., too general, aren't likely to improve student performance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members present: Dr. Teri Fowler (Chair), Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. Drew Morton, Dr. James Nguyen, Dr. Yi Su, Dr. Richard Herrera, Dr. Nancy Jordan, Dr. Jade Jenkins

Members absent: Dr. Walter Casey

Meeting start time and end time not recorded for this meeting.

Faculty Review Panels for May 2015 Core Curriculum Assessment
--Committee voted to require Core Curriculum Review Panel participation from instructors who teach in the Core Curriculum

--Given that seniors graduate each semester (and not just the spring), the committee thought it was a good idea to recruit graduating seniors for the CLA+ each semester (rather than restricting recruitment efforts to spring semesters only). However, the committee views this as an experiment rather than something that needed to be formally voted on.
--The committee voted to approve use of the Global Perspectives Inventory to assess globalization/diversity, social responsibility, and related constructs

Review of Assessment Plans and Findings in Taskstream
The committee spent time reacquainting themselves with the program review rubrics, discussed the criteria they should keep in mind while completing program reviews, and completed two practice exercises using those rubrics.

Academic program outcomes assessment information from two academic programs were used as examples for the practice exercises. This content is not included in this documentation set in order to preserve the confidentiality of those two academic programs.