Unit Assessment Operations Committee
2011-2012 Report

Committee Members: John Beineke, Mary Jane Bradley (Ex Officio member), Valerie Hilson, Natalie Johnson-Leslie, Dixie Keys (Recorder), Amanda Lambertus (Chair), Dianne Langford, Don Manness.

Attachments: Meeting Minutes from December 8, 2011 and March 14, 2012

Summary: The committee met twice over the year to 1) review and analyze assessment artifacts, 2) review and evaluate the assessment system, 3) generate questions relative to the initial programs and advanced programs surveys, and 4) review and revise the governance survey.

During the fall each committee member was charged with becoming familiar with the assessment artifacts while at the same time looking in depth at a few. The main purpose of this meeting was to have all the committee members become familiar with the assessment artifacts and to discuss questions and issues based on an initial observance. As a result several questions were brought up about the individual artifacts (see Meeting Minutes); these questions were raised in a separate meeting with Mary Jane Bradley and the committee officers.

During the spring each committee member reviewed, evaluated, and created questions for the Professional Education Goverance Evaluation. The March meeting specifically revised the governance survey. The survey was then distributed to the PEF among the different campuses via LiveText.

Additional discussion included the unit surveys and reports. Some of the PEF information on the document summary was still missing, faculty members were also missing. These were to be addressed this Spring. We also discovered that the PEF data input system had intern workloads reported incorrectly.

Summary of Tasks as of May 2012
- o Review of Assessment Artifacts, questions posed to NCATE coordinator and addressed
- o Unit Operations Spreadsheet-started editing already
- o Governance survey revised and distributed via Live Text
- o Recommend that a diversity survey for Advanced Programs be developed.
- o Recommend that the PEF Information Document Summary be updated (Pathwise will be out; AIMS is new)

Unit Operations Assessment Procedure Sheet

Assessment Tools	When data are collected	Who generates the report	When reports are generated	Who analyzes data	When data are analyzed at the unit level	Who is data reported to	How data are used***
Governance Survey	Spring Semester Even Years	1	Spring Semester Even Years	1, 2, 3	Spring Semester Even Years	4, 5, 7, 8	
Strategic Planning Evaluation	Spring Semester	3, 8	Summer	1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 7, 8	
Fund Allocation Reports	Fall Semester	7	Fall Semester	1, 2, 3	Spring Semester	4, 5, 7, 8	
Library Allocations	Fall Semester	9	Fall Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 9	
Facility and Administrative Allocations	Quarterly	3, 11		1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 8, 13	
Professional Education Faculty Title Totals	Fall Semester	3	Fall Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8	
Professional Education Faculty Ethnicity	Fall Semester	3	Fall Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8	
Professional Education Faculty Information Document	Fall Semester	3	Fall Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8	

Professional Education Faculty Workload	Spring Semester	4	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8	
Course/Instructor Evaluations	Fall and Spring Semesters	3, 8	Fall and Spring Semesters	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8, 10	
Professional Education Faculty Advising Loads	Spring Semester	3, 4	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 8	
Facility Inventory	Spring Semester	8	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Spring Semester	4, 5, 8, 12	
Exit Surveys (Initial Programs)****	Fall, Spring	8	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8*	Summer	4, 5, 8, 9**, 14	
Exit Surveys (Advanced Programs)	Fall, Spring, Summer	8	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 8, 9, 14	
Follow up Surveys (Initial Programs)	Spring Semester	8	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 8, 9, 14	
Follow up Surveys (Advanced Programs)	Spring Semester	8	Spring Semester	1, 2, 3, 8	Summer	4, 5, 8, 9, 14	

*8 needs to also analyzed the surveys based on their specific programs
** why 9?
*** This column in the original document did not contain the appropriate information
****recommend that these rows be added to the table to separate the advanced programs from the initial programs.

Attachment: Meeting Notes Dec 8

COE Unit Operations Committee meeting/Dec. 8, 2011, 10 am

Present: Amanda Lambertus (Math), Dixie Keyes (mid-level), Natalie Johnson-Leslie (secondary),

John Beineke (Ed Leadership), Dianne Langford (Counseling), Valerie Hilson

Following are comments, suggestions, or questions from each member, based on designated reading

tasks:

Amanda—

- On the **PEF Information Document Summary**, what are we trying to measure in the ethnicity column?
- How specific do we need/want to get, specifically when it comes to ethnicity of faculty? Why does it say "international" as opposed to a more specific identification?
- What are the criteria for "eligible to teach methods/materials and internship"?
- Individuals were missing (according to some members), so is the report actually correct?
- Updates are needed, so how often will they be updated?

Dianne—

- On the **Course Faculty Evaluations**, the face-to-face evaluations do not record the number of students who filled it out/number of students in the class, yet the online version DOES have this information. Maybe this is evidence that all COE departments should move toward online evaluations for consistency of information?
  - o We discussed a number of ethical issues with student evaluations (from the differences in questions to the methods of the paper evals)
  - o Recommend consistency in the number of students who fill them out
- On the **Governance Evaluation**, we determined that this survey needs revision.
  - o We didn't know what a "curriculum review/approval process sheet" was until we realized it was a bulletin change?
  - o What about confidentiality of respondents? Should off-campus faculty/instructors be made to identify what campus they're from?
  - o Was this given on LIVE TEXT? If so, were all faculty/instructors given the opportunity to participate? Only 30 and 39/84 responded.
  - o We thought each of us could contribute ideas to this survey to make it more effective.

Natalie--

- On the **Diversity Chart**, she had no issues. It was straightforward. But what is the system for the "labels" or ethnic identifications for the university , and should those carry forward to Colleges?
- On the **Facility Inventory**, what exactly are we looking for? Specific items?
- Is there an existing policy for furniture renewal, or is determined by Dean/Chair budgeting in a particular year?

Valerie--

- In the **Budget Academic Support**, she had no issues, but noted the COE was 4th among all colleges.

Dixie--

- Dixie couldn't access **Faculty Workloads** via the TEAMS website, but it began working the day of the meeting; she will report later on this.
- She was able to get the advising data for the Teacher Education department (below), and we discussed methods/recommendations for this department for advising loads that may provide faculty more time for research/writing/service.
- Could Mary Jane get advising loads from our other departments for us?

TEACHER EDUCATION (Jonesboro)

Bacot, Nancy	73	
Bond, Sherris	46	
Choi, Jeonghee	52	
Dewailly, JaneMarie	44	hold
Fiala, Tom	83	
Gao, Minghui	64	
Henley, Joan	58	
Johnson, Michelle	67	
Johnson-Leslie, Natalie	53	
Kelly, Ryan	65	
Keyes, Dixie	71	
Kim, K. Jin	70	
Lawler, Dianne	28	hold until Jan. 2012

Maness, Don	3	hold until Jan. 2012
McJunkin, Mark	62	
Moore, Fara	66	
Murphy, Patricia	66	
Owens, Deborah	66	
Ross, Ann	59	
Wilcox, Cathey	0	
Williams, Diana	67	
Grymes, Joanna	171	
Owens, Lina	37	hold
Towery, Ron	104	

- In regard to **Exit Surveys**, we had the following questions:
  - How is the data used by departments for change? How do we know department chairs have passed the data to faculty teams/groups for analysis and improvement of programs?
  - What is the method for departments to add questions to the surveys?
  - Could someone develop a chart of "all exit surveys" since there are multiple ones? (Diversity, Advanced, program, undergraduate, employer)
  - In the comments, specific names of faculty/programs are included. Is this acceptable? Are the comments screened?
  - Are there legalities in making the comments public?

We decided Wednesdays after 2pm would be the best time for further meetings in the Spring. Further meetings should last no longer than an hour.

We adjourned at 11:10.

Attachment: Meeting Notes March 14

College of Education Unit Operations Committee Meeting Minutes

March 14, 2012

Present: Amanda Lambertus (chair), Dixie Keyes (recorder), Mary Jane Bradley, Dianne

Langford, Valarie Hilson, Don Maness, John Beineke

- Add Dr. Dianne Lawler to committee communications.
- We continued our discussion about the unit surveys and reports.
  - PEF Information document summary—there are still missing items and gaps; missing faculty members
  - Workload Discoveries
    - PEF Data input app—intern workload was entered incorrectly.

- Faculty Workload
  - If faculty teach all graduate courses, their workload is 9 hours. If faculty teach both graduate and undergraduate, payback hours is the common method used by department heads to ensure appropriate time is provided to graduate faculty.

- Monetary Data Table
  - The COE is faring well according to all reports.

- PEF Evaluation on LIVE TEXT
  - Suggestion to revisit directions/communications about this evaluation. Dr. Maness clarified it was sent out twice.
  - Dianne asked how this was used and/or looked at for effectiveness of "governance."
  - Q 5 is value; maybe it's redundant with Q4.
  - Q4—should we add "PEF" before the word governance in Q4? Add a "fill in the blank" to "Other"
  - Q1—issues of anonymity. Maybe not necessary to even ask Q1. We can comfortably eliminate this question.
  - Change "forum" to "program area."
  - Q9—Make "educationAL"   …. "Education"
  - Q6—What is the "Level of Involvement" sheet; Dr. Bradley will check on this.

- Dr. Beineke moved that we request Dean's office run the "revised" governance survey.
    - Send it out each spring (every April)
    - Committee voted all in favor.

- Follow-up Survey
    - Areas of licensure will have to change in the near future (Q5)
    - Dr. Langford had a concern about her program (counseling) evaluation follow-up survey, so she doesn't duplicate or do a separate one.
    - Other follow-up or exit surveys: some programs may have them finish the survey at the end of comprehensive exams.

- Employer Survey
    - Dr. Maness explained it is a generic survey about ALL graduates now teaching from ASU.
    - Dr. Langford needs to look at Employer survey to see if it meets her needs for the counseling program.
    - Dr. Maness likes a common template for the follow-up survey.
    - Maybe send out a follow-up survey AFTER state benchmarks.
    - Discussion about mail-based survey vs. online survey. General consensus to stick with electronic one more year.
    - Usually when graduates are 3 years out, their emails are no longer usable, so the alumni center helps us update email. Seniors put a separate email address on EXIT survey through the PEP office.

- Completed Tasks
    - Unit Operations Spreadsheet-started editing already
    - Is there a diversity survey for Advanced Programs? There needs to be one; we recommend this be developed.
    - PEF Information Document Summary (Pathwise will be out; AIMS is new)

Respectfully submitted, May 21, 2012 by Dixie Keyes