

Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Meeting

October 26, 2011
8:30 a.m.
Lib 112

Meeting called by: Bob Austin

Type of Meeting: Regular

Facilitator: Bob Austin

Transcriber: Jeremy Mares

Attendees: Mark Hanna, Janet Barton, Kara Larkan-Skinner, Jessica Smith, Bob Austin, Kristin McDonald-Willey, Leslie Shelton, Joe Wyatt, Melissa Wilson

Absentees: Lee Colaw, Steve Chance, Danita McAnally, Daniel Esquivel

Minutes

I. Approval of Minutes

Motion to Approve: Joe
Second: Melissa
Minutes are approved

Presenter:
Bob

II. Update on Program Review

Bob: Everyone has had an opportunity to comment on these questions and as a committee this is one of the best things we have done.

Kristin: Danita was intending to talk about a few additional changes, but from what I remember some close-ended questions were changed to open-ended questions and section C, under publications, was re-added to the document. Questions on Danita's edits can be directed to her.

Leslie: We must be careful to use exact wording in the responses because it will be reviewed.

Mark: It (the Program Review) is a great improvement.

Bob: What wasn't done: Giving the writers or the reviewers the opportunity to identify if the questions are clear. If we had a way to continuously modify the document, it would help things along.

Presenter:
Danita
Action Items:

Agenda Item: Status on PET Forms

Kristin: Status: The plan is to notate the received PET forms and solicit un-received forms. Next time we will discuss how to assess what has been gathered.

Presenter:
Kristin

Agenda Item: Non-Instructional Questionnaire

Why Create an Improvement Questionnaire?

Kristin: The questionnaire will require some discussion: our office (Assessment and Development) will distribute the materials; we need to get a better base for how changes are being made. We can make changes to the form as necessary. It has already been suggested that an introductory paragraph be added so that the message is as non-threatening as possible to the reviewer. The Instructional Committee suggested that forms be handled by a department head. This form can be custom made to capture any information that PET forms don't gather.

Bob: It (PET Forms) forced people to go back into the Strategic Plan. It brought things back to the fore front. If we could integrate the form into the PET process, it could be helpful. People need prompts to think about what they might measure or what has been done in the process. Sometimes you have data that you forgot was there, but a prompting statement can cause you to search for data that is already out there and fits the request.

Risk of Request: People would have a reaction that they haven't done any surveys and would scramble to IR to do a survey in the last minute. Perhaps we could make these changes to PET – at least identify the changes we want to make now, but wait a year (it causes anxiety for some people, so they drop it). Let's not make a big change yet because it can cause confusion.

Kristin: That is a consideration. A lot of the times, blanket statements are made that they (staff/faculty) don't use results. We need feedback on the PET process as well as the information the PET forms provide. Similarly, we want to know if people are using other types of data (e.g. CCSSE). We also don't want anyone to get overwhelmed with the amount of information we are requesting.

Mark: I think a separate piece wouldn't create too much of a burden. It isn't unreasonable to ask if and how the data is used. If it is clear, and known that it is important, people will engage. Feedback needs to be gathered

Bob: If you sent a survey that says it won't take long to fill out, I would fill it out. If a question was specific to CCSSE, and the person isn't using it, we need to prompt them as to whether or not they would like some help using the data. It (finding out what you want to know) isn't going to happen if you ask people to write a narrative.

Kristin: Good point. We definitely don't want to create another PET Form.

Mark: I would use it (the form) to request that more library questions be added to the institutional CCSSE questions. This form might help increase consideration for future staff needs.

Bob: The way it is written, you would stump some people. I would start with "Have you ever looked at CCSSE data?" We need to get people clarified on what everything is. They need to understand everything. They are interested and engaged, but not truly understanding it. Good feedback can be gathered. For example, getting people to look at the Strategic Plan was monumental. We have work to do with prompting people to give the information we need. People are not as in tune with this as they should be.

Kristin: We can start smaller.

Mark: We might tell them what is important and see if we can make it (the data) relate them.

Joe: Here is my new burden—after completing a given form, you often get more work as follow.

Mark: If you have nothing to say (on the form), you have nothing to say, and that is fine.

Bob: We have talked about lots of stuff. What is understood by some is not understood by everyone else. We need to take responsibility for refining the communication so we can share the information with the rest of our peers. There is a gap between what we tell ourselves and what is understood. It could be interactive where you can get your arms around the communication gap; this (the form) assumes that people understand more than they really do. All the initiatives are just another thing out there.

Mark: The question they will ask is “How do these things impact me?”

Kristin: And it (the data) might not directly tie to everything.

Mark: And it needs to be explained that it is okay if the information doesn't directly affect you.

Kristin: Class climate might have options on how to best get this information from the college where we could arrange our questions according to the level of staff/faculty knowledge (e.g. if an individual's never heard of CCSSE, we direct that individual to the CCSSE information).

Bob: If we have a way to look at this and come up with examples, it would get a much wider adoption.

Joe: Joke: We could pay \$.06 per word for a narrative feedback.

Who Should Receive the Form?

Kristin: Assuming a form is made, who should receive it?

Bob: Directors should receive the form. If we all decide this is the path we are going to go, how will we get adoption amongst the departments? We are making progress.

Mark: The departments could work together. Lee Colaw and I have done SACS things together in the SACS compliance report. We co-mingle and get into different information and discuss how it ties into the strategic plan. Lee had some questions and it (our meeting) helped him see ways to relate the Strategic Plan to his division.

Bob: The prompts are clear and help greatly.

	<p>Mark: He (Lee) only had past paperwork to go from on how to use everything. Now he has clarity and a game plan for the most important things. Any of the stuff that we do could have been successes.</p> <p>Joe: Have people been asking for the past PET form?</p> <p>Kristin: Some people send in the old form and I moved the information over to the new template.</p> <p>Bob: I think we are making progress. We are making constant efforts to improve because it is a daily process. It requires us to be internally and externally evaluated. People want to talk about what they are doing. We need to prompt them to get that information in a delicate way so we can get quality information. PET form changes got people to be more reflective. In helping the finance division, they have gotten better because how they think about what they write and measure. Giving hugs help.</p> <p><u>What should the form be called?</u></p> <p>Mark: We need to come up with something</p> <p>Kristin: It will take a while to develop a survey and it will be piloted within the committee so we don't have to decide today.</p> <p>Bob: Anything else?</p> <p>Committee: (No Response)</p> <p>Bob: Go forth!</p>	
Agenda Item:	Next Meeting: November 30, 2011 (Note Meeting Cancelled)	Presenter: Action Items:
Adjournment:	9:50	