University-Wide Assessment Committee
Student Development
February 18, 2014
9:00 a.m., SNGL 112

Members present: Jennie Cassidy, John Beard, Jean Ann Brakefield, Vivian Ford, Stephen Harrison, Michael Jacobs, Tara Josey, Chris Mee, Caesar Ross, Michael Ruse, Pat Singleton-Young

Members absent: Whitney Comer, Allison Faix, Aggie O’Brien-Gayes, Travis Overton, Geoff Parsons, Charles Whiffen, Tom Woodle

Welcome

Jennie Cassidy, Chair, convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. in SNGL 112 and welcomed all present.

Progress on Previously Made Recommendations

Nothing to report

Reminder – 2014-15 Plans due March 1; All due to be approved March 15 - John Beard sent an email reminder to all concerned that the plans are due in TEAL Online by March 15th. Student Affairs plans are, however, due by March 1st.

Assignment of Review of 2012-13 Reports – Included on the back of the meeting agenda is the group assignments for assessing the 2012-13 reports. Group chairs are asked to pull the groups together to review the plans. It was agreed that results will be discussed at the April committee meeting. For each report a rubric should be completed with combined scores for the entire group.

The rubric used for assessing reports was reviewed and the following changes recommended:

- The Use of Results for Continuous Improvement section of the rubric will be expanded based on the rubric used by Student Learning.
- The rating scales will be modified as follows: Needs Improvement (0-5), Satisfactory (6-8), Exemplary (9-10).

Changes will be made to the rubric and copies distributed to committee members.

Discussion Items

Motivating Student Participation in Assessment – Chris Mee has been in the process of compiling a campus-wide schedule for all survey administrations with the hope that surveys can be spread out and students not bombarded with numerous surveys at one time. She shared that her office does not always hear about surveys until after they have been distributed and completed. Everyone should be encouraged to notify the IRA&A Office of upcoming surveys. In addition, some individuals are still using SurveyMonkey for survey creation and administration. The University adopted SNAP Surveys as the preferred survey tool; however, the IRA&A Office cannot always create and distribute
surveys given the timeframes requested. Another concern is the over-surveying of students enrolled in the FYE classes. When the FYE classes were coordinated through the Advising Center there was better control over the amount of surveys the students were asked to complete. This needs to be addressed with the individual colleges.

Better marketing of upcoming surveys may result in improved participation rates. Emails, word of mouth, poster campaigns, flyers, and incentivizing Resident Assistants for encouraging participation were suggested as marketing tools.

Steve Harrison suggested that student participation in surveys might be improved if students were apprised of how their survey responses make a difference. As an example, other campuses post signs indicating a building is being erected as a result of a student fee. Similarly, Coastal could inform students that changes are being made as a direct result of their input from specific surveys.

**Prioritizing Assessment Time** – Assessment reports are due in October for the previous year's plan. As the data should be collected during the academic year it makes sense the reports could be written as early as July for that year. Due to their other responsibilities, October is a particularly difficult month for department chairs to participate in assessment activities. In addition, as data and results from TEAL Online are going to be used as part of the SACSCOC accreditation documentation, the earlier the reports are available the better. It was recommended that assessment reports be due in August of each year, recognizing that there is not going to be a due date that is convenient for everyone. Chris Mee recommended bringing this deadline change recommendation to the main University-Wide Assessment Committee for discussion.

A discussion occurred regarding making assessment a part of an individual's job. One duty of this individual would be to coordinate the assessment activities within a given unit. Assigning these responsibilities to someone who is not part of the day to day activities of the unit is key as assessment often gets pushed aside when other urgent issues must be dealt with. It was recommended that the assessment responsibilities be added to this individual's EPMS.

**Next Meeting**

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m. with the agreement that Sharing Results With Others will be one of the topics of discussion at the next meeting scheduled for March 18th, 2014 in SNGL 112.