

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2022

Present: Beth O'Neill (Chair), Jennifer Ball, Gloria Dye, Debbie Isaacson, Bobby Tso, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Rhonda Boeckman, Christa Smith, Tara Lindahl, George Burdick (WSGA Rep), Emily Grant, Teresa Clouch, Haley Glover, Josh Huston

- I. Update on Program Assessment Reviews
 - a. O'Neill thanked committee members for their hard work reviewing program assessment materials. The number of programs that submitted materials this year increased from last year. Assessment plans: 2021=49 programs; 2022=66 programs. So far, the committee as a whole has reviewed 116 different items, and there are still some additional items to be reviewed. O'Neill will be reconciling all of the ratings and then the ratings will be released to programs.
 - b. Isaacson discussed that one program she reviewed had some context missing from the assessment plan, so they were rated lower, but then that context was contained in the assessment findings report. O'Neill discussed that through the reconciliation process, the feedback will also be reconciled to ensure that it is most-helpful to the program.
 - c. O'Neill shared that there will be an additional committee member from the new KN/MM division in CAS, and this will help to even out the number of reviews each committee member has to complete.
- II. Update on Fall 2022 Assessment Grant Submissions/Process
 - a. O'Neill thanked Bobby Tso, Tom Hickman, Steve Hageman, and Rhonda Boeckman for their subcommittee work to review and provide feedback and recommendations on the grant submissions.
 - b. There were five assessment grant submissions and three proposals were funded: Muffy Walter, Joseph Kendall-Morwick, and Dixie Copeland. They were not able to be funded at 100%, but close to it, and the funding provided will still enable the individuals/programs to complete their desired activities.
 - c. The next grant due date will be in April, and it will be for the fiscal year starting 7/1/2023.
- III. Update on HERI Faculty Survey
 - a. O'Neill provided an update on the HERI working group, which also includes Schbley and Isaacson from this committee. The survey is done every three years and will go out in Spring. The working group has been finalizing the institutional supplemental questions, and the final unresolved portion is the qualitative question to ask. Previous question: Please list up to three issues or actions you think Washburn should prioritize in the next five years.
 - b. The committee discussed the qualitative question:
 - i. Clouch- Did we utilize the data from three years ago? Jennifer Ball reported that the question was asked to help identify a potential quality

initiative for HLC, and the data was used for that purpose. We don't have to determine a quality initiative again right now.

- ii. Grant- Shared concerns about a really big open-ended question, considering survey fatigue.
- iii. Dye- What do we know about the result? Is there something that we have learned from the question? What were the top three issues? Are these issues still an issue? How have they been prioritized? Christa Smith shared the top priorities had to do with faculty support and DEI. O'Neill shared that one possible use of the question could be to check on faculty perspectives on one particular theme identified, if it was thought that would be helpful. O'Neill also shared that WU will be doing another climate survey focused on DEI soon.
- iv. O'Neill asked committee members to email her about potential open-ended questions, if any ideas arise. O'Neill will share them with the working group at their final meeting.

IV. Update on SAILS (Information Literacy and Technology) Assessment

- a. Will be administered to 300 randomly selected seniors, and each will be provided a \$10 incentive to Walmart at the time of survey completion request. Hope to send out survey emails by the end of the week, or early next week, and will aim to close the survey window before Thanksgiving break.
- b. The committee discussed ideas for how to promote student completion, especially given that it is only targeted towards a random sample of seniors. Comment was specifically sought from George Burdick: 1) Reminders by faculty towards their senior-centric courses will be helpful, and students are most-likely to read an email sent from their instructor; 2) If a student doesn't respond to the survey after three emails, they aren't going to do it no matter how many times you email them; 3) Recommend sending the second email approximately five days after the initial request.
- c. Smith mentioned that it is possible to identify the faculty who have the randomly selected students in their courses, so we could ask those specific faculty to send a general (non-identifying) reminder/encouragement to their courses.

V. Discussion of potential Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity Measure for Spring 2023-Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)

- a. Previously added seven custom questions to Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership that address this USLO. Leadership studies is not doing the MSL again this year (expensive), so this is not an assessment option.
- b. GPI includes eight demographic questions (age, gender, race, international student status, academic standing, major field of study, parents' education, transfer student status), seven questions related to college experience, and 35 core questions that measure three dimensions (Cognitive, Intrapersonal, and Interpersonal) that assess: 1) Recognizing the importance of cultural context in judging what is important to know and value, 2) Understanding and being aware of various cultures and their impact on society, 3) Being aware of and accepting

one's identity and sense of purpose, 4) Respecting and accepting cultural differences and being emotional aware, 5) Being interdependent and having social concern for others, and 6) Engaging with others who are different and being culturally sensitive. <https://www.gpi.hs.iastate.edu/>
https://www.gpi.hs.iastate.edu/documents/GPI_Survey_2018.pdf

- c. GPI would cost \$700 for up to 500 respondents; \$1,000 for 501-1,000 respondents (more options too). Includes survey administration, data preparation, and reporting with national norms.
 - d. Other option: Use AAC&U rubric to evaluate student artifacts. Would need to identify what artifact(s) to use and recruit facilitator/organizer and raters. Stipends and food typically cost \$3,000+
 - e. Committee discussion ensued:
 - i. Grant- Shared that she recently heard people talking very positively about this measure at a conference. She likes the survey option from a cost perspective, but understands the limits of self-report data. She would like to find a way to include law students if we choose to use this survey, and that is her preference.
 - ii. Burdick- Single surveys are easy, but three in a week are annoying. Be aware of whether any other surveys will be released around the same time.
 - iii. Dye- GPI survey has the ability to see across schools, departments, and units to get insights and reflections. Her preference is the GPI.
 - iv. Isaacson- GPI seems broad enough to ask interesting questions, and that is her preference.
 - v. Boeckman- Is this a one-shot deal? Hypothetically, if we don't get enough information then what are our options? O'Neill shared that we will prompt students multiple times, and base our recruitment and messaging decisions on prior experiences (e.g., how does the random sample and incentive work for SAILS). If using the GPI proves to be an unsuccessful, then in three years we can do something different.
 - f. A formal vote was not taken, as the purpose of this discussion is to aid the assessment team in making a recommendation to the VPAA. The consensus of the committee was to move forward with using the GPI in Spring 2023.
- VI. O'Neill asked for member preferences regarding using D2L or SharePoint to manage committee information and communication. The majority preferred D2L. O'Neill will ensure that all committee members have access to D2L site.
- VII. Next Meeting is November 17, 2022 at 10:30 AM