

Appendix E: OATF Minutes

Outcomes and Assessment Task Force

Meeting Notes

Thursday, September 22, 2011 2-4 pm

Members in attendance: Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart.

Members absent: Darlene Andert, Collin Ramdeen

Representing Faculty Senate leadership: Doug Harrison, Howard Smith

Agenda Item 1:

Harrison convened the meeting by summarizing the information in the White Paper that was sent to all members (background and context, the group's charge, schedule). All members at the table introduced themselves and stated their reasons for being a part of the task force.

Agenda Item 2:

Wilkerson led a thought exercise to help members envision their own "competent student" to keep in mind throughout our discussions for the year. We looked at an example of a medical student's evaluation to think about universal outcomes that span the curriculum over the years. Attendees marked outcomes they heard, using a list of current FGCU outcomes. There was consensus that members heard the first six outcomes (Communication, Critical Thinking, Content Knowledge, Quantitative Reasoning, Culturally Diverse Perspective, Information Literacy). A few others were noted, but members agreed that it was easy to spot these six. A few others were marked by a few members. Wilkerson noted that not all outcomes will show in every assessment and this kind of activity helps people to think about whether outcomes are important and assessable. Having a personal mascot throughout our journey should help us meet our goals, and Wilkerson encouraged each member to think of a personal mascot like this student. Members also looked at an example of a student who showed deficits, and Wilkerson encouraged members to keep both kinds of students in mind to maintain a focus on student success.

Agenda Item 3:

Slides shown are available on ANGEL. There are five universal or commonly used outcomes that are frequently used, and she shared a similar set from another school. Wilkerson asked if the group is interested in seeing something similar in our work. The general response was positive about these outcomes with the possibility of some additions.

A couple of members expressed some concerns at this point. One said that she worried that looking at what can be easily assessed will outweigh the consideration of what outcomes are important to us or valued in our students. Another member said that he was concerned that new plans for institutional

assessment would add to faculty workload, especially if we enumerate too many SLOs. Wilkerson noted that these are important concerns that we will need to carefully consider as the work progresses.

Agenda Item 6:

Harrison suggested that the group move to a later item, since he needed to leave early for another meeting. He asked members to identify their main individual concerns and values. Members were asked: What one or two things do you most care about? What do you want to guard against?

Carlin: Would like to protect information literacy as an SLO.

Wang: Wants to know the final outcome of this taskforce and how the work will be used.

Wohlpart: Cares most about student learning; we need robust and meaningful SLOs. We need to support faculty. Want to guard against- overburdening ourselves. If we decide not to retain something as an outcome, it still can remain a value. Also wants to guard against oversimplifying the process.

Komisar: Cares most about retaining critical thinking as an outcome, wants all graduates to be able to look at a situation and identify what is happening and be able to come up with a logical approach. Communication skills reading and writing skills are critical. Wants to guard against: spending too much time on assessment, burden of assessing an outcome will fall on one department/group.

Bevins: We need SLOs that lead to highly performing graduates. Want to guard against: outcomes that are too difficult to assess, losing "FGCU" (Sim asked what that might mean. Ecological perspective is example.) There is no more important activity than assessment. Student need to know if they don't know something.

Roca: Cares most about having SLOs that prepare students for success in their careers. Wants to protect ecological perspective and community involvement SLOs. Wants to guard against diminishing oral communication, closing her own mind, or having a preconceived notion about final product.

Duff: It is important for students to be able to decipher the terminology or hierarchy of knowledge, this is part of critical thinking and disciplinary knowledge. Cares about: what we end up with should be authentic and have value for faculty, students, and institution. Guard against: having something overly complex or unreasonable.

McCulloch: cares about seeing things used across many courses and integrated well. The outcomes and assessment program needs to be clear for students, too. If the students don't understand what we're trying to do, it is pointless. Concerned about lack of resources (human and financial). Wants to know how we will get the lowest level people (example, adjunct instructors) on board with an assessment program.

Wilkerson: cares about building a system that we can and will use. Fears excessive complexity and data that will be insufficient or not useful.

Agenda Item 4: Judy's listening tour: Wilkerson shared her experiences in meeting with four administrators and the Assessment Council, noting how much she learned and how much she supported and understood their needs and concerns. She shared 12 observations in the Power Point.

Agenda Item 5:

What is our purpose? Members looked at a worksheet on purposes and uses of the assessment system. The first four purposes on the sheet (SACS, meet external accreditation requirements, improve student success and retention, identify needs and communicate concerns across units) are agreed upon. Not everyone thought the other two purposes were as relevant for us. Wilkerson indicated that the first four were what she had hoped would achieve consensus.

How will we use these SLOs? There wasn't much of a response from the group about which uses were most relevant to us.

Agenda Item 6: Operating rules

Wilkerson opened discussion for a draft set of operating procedures. Concern was expressed by the ex-officio members about not being able to vote. Wilkerson explained that this was standard operating procedure for Faculty Senate Task committees and that President Harrison had indicated to her that this procedure was to be followed in OATF. Smith, as Senate VP, confirmed that. Some unit representatives supported ex-officio members voting. Wilkerson tabled the discussion, pending a visit to the task force at the next meeting by Harrison so that Senate expectations could be clarified.

There were many questions about who was responsible for creating SLOs and/or assessment plans that would be determined by the SLOs and whether there was any regulation on this topic. Concern was expressed by members about the ultimate outcome of the work of the task force. Specifically, task force members wanted to know if they were actually creating a new set of SLOs that will be put into use. What would the process be for approving the new SLOs? Will all stakeholders have input? State Board Rule was discussed and will be checked.

Agenda Item 7:

There was consensus that the task force will work with the existing set of SLOGs (undergrad and grad) and outcomes consolidated into a single document by Wilkerson. The set contains the ALCs, General Education competencies, and SLOGs (undergraduate and graduate). The first milestone was met.

Meeting adjourned. Next meeting is October 6, 2-4 pm. Library Room 224.

Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce

Meeting Minutes (Draft)

October 6, 2011, 2-4 pm

Members in attendance: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart.

Members absent: none

Representing Faculty Senate leadership: Doug Harrison, Howard Smith

Guest facilitator: Kathy Hale

Introductions

Including members that were not present last meeting (Ramdeen, Andert and guest Kathy Hale).

Members not present at last meeting were asked to share their values and concerns about the student learning outcomes and assessment (What do you care about and what do you want to guard against?)

Andert: Values progress and wants to have something usable; wants to be sure that new assessment requirements don't constrict freedom to experiment and fail

Ramdeen: Value consensus and strengthening student learning and improvement

Agenda Item 1: Senate President Harrison on revised procedures

The previously drafted operational guidelines (dated September 19) were a result of conversations with many people based on experience from past groups doing big things like this group and it was believed that clear guidelines were helpful for steering the group toward progress. It is now understood that this document was not viewed favorably by the majority of the taskforce, so a new version has been drafted (dated September 28). This new document was created with input from OATF chair, senate executive leadership team and the provost.

Harrison read pertinent portions of the new operational procedures document to explain the role of this taskforce. The taskforce will express the position of the faculty on the student learning outcomes. Ex-officio members provide important input and advice from their areas of expertise. Consensus decisions will be the aim of this group, but when consensus cannot be reached, the elected academic unit representatives will vote. The faculty senate president can't change the rules about voting members on faculty senate groups.

Bevins shared that he met with his unit faculty and discussed the issue of ex-officio members and voting in the group. His constituency reminded him that that faculty must take ownership and responsibility for curricular issues. He rescinded his request to change the operating procedures to allow ex-officio members to vote. This was accepted by the membership.

Wohlpart would like to amend the last sentence of the third paragraph on the first page of the operating principles to read “While not every faculty member will be responsible for every outcome, every program will provide opportunities for its students to acquire and demonstrate the agreed upon set of institutional student learning outcomes...and will commit to regular assessment of these outcomes for the purpose of program improvement.”

Wohlpart would also like to know what will happen once the products of this taskforce are ratified by Faculty Senate. The operating principles say that the Faculty Senate will forward completed statements to the VPAA and the President. Wohlpart’s concern is that the taskforce’s work will get stalled at some approval point. Harrison responded that it is because of this concern that the feedback and input from the ex-officio members from Academic Affairs or others that we might consult as part of the creation process is so important. Wohlpart expressed an interest in better enumerating details of what feedback and input will be gathered along the way in this taskforce’s work.

The membership of the taskforce agreed that the new proposed operating principles were acceptable with Wohlpart’s suggested amendment.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of the minutes from 9/22/11

Minutes were approved with minor edits to mistakes on member names.

Agenda Item 3: Facilitated discussion of task force process and work plan

Hale looked at the minutes from last meeting and pulled out some things for discussion today. She also looked at the whitepaper and identified some procedural issues that we could talk about.

Hale suggested the group talk about a couple of points that were raised in the previous meeting about assessment. One major question that was raised is what level of assessment are we talking about? In this group, are we concerned with program assessment or course level assessment? What is program assessment, and do we need to better define this? An example was given that assessments given in a course, such as a senior capstone project, do not only reflect the efficacy of the course but of the entire program of courses leading up to it. Program assessment may be comprised of course level assessment instruments.

Next steps for this project

Wohlpart suggested that the next step for the taskforce should be to look at the nine existing SLOs and start talking about which ones we think meet the requirements for a superordinate university level student learning outcome.

Wilkerson proposed that we gather information from the various academic units and programs to find out what we are already doing in terms of assessment. This would make clear what outcomes we value most if it is already being assessed. The majority of the membership expressed desire to start with the list of nine existing SLOs and see which of them is supported.

Discussion of SLO: Aesthetic Sensibility

The membership discussed whether we think aesthetic sensibility is a superordinate, university level learning outcome. What does it mean for something to be a university-level SLO? If we take aesthetic sensibility off of the list of SLOs, does this reflect a change in our values, or only a realization that it is not something that will be taught across the curriculum?

McCulloch had a question about what how big or small a SLO should be, for example, is it a quality or characteristic we want students to possess, or a competency.

The group wanted to define what a university-level student learning outcome is. The membership agreed upon this definition: A superordinate university-level student learning outcome should be integrated into each program's instructional curriculum, such that students demonstrate their learning and faculty commit to assess learning.

Having agreed on the definition of a university level SLO, the membership came to a consensus that the existing aesthetic sensibility SLO is not a university level student learning outcome.

For next meeting

Wilkerson has created an ANGEL group for taskforce members where we can share documents and ideas.

We will continue this discussion about the list of outcomes. Members should look over the list of the nine existing SLOs and come prepared to discuss each outcome and whether it meets the criteria for a university level outcome.

Meeting adjourned. Next meeting: October 20, 2011, 2-4 pm.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, October 21, 2011
Time	2:02 to 4:00PM
Location	LIB224
Attendees	Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair) Kathy Hale, Guest facilitator
Members Absent	Collin Ramdeen, Jim Wohlpart

Items Discussed and **Actions taken:**

- (1) APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES: Minutes were amended to add “it is the responsibility of faculty to take ownership of curricular issues” to the last paragraph of the first page. Striking “on contrast to administration”. Motion by Andert, second by Bevis.
Actions included: (a) Motion to approve minutes as amended passed. (b) The Chair requested that individuals provide amendments to the meeting minutes at the beginning of the actual committee meeting.

- (2) ADD FOURTH CHARGE: The members discussed the potential need for a fourth committee to include recommendations regarding any learning outcomes not included in the list of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Members decided to place this request on hold in order to determine if there were any SLOs that would not be included in the list of institution-wide, undergraduate, graduate, or General Education outcomes. **No final action taken.**

- (3) LIAISON FOR THE GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL: Discussed the need to have a member of the General Education Council attend meetings in order to coordinate efforts between the committees.
Action taken: The chair will ask Doug Harrison for a liaison from the General Education Council to attend future OATF meetings.

- (4) FORMATTING LEARNING OUTCOMES: Members discussed formatting issues related to the identification and development of the learning outcomes in order to ensure the development of SLOs that could be input effectively into software, allowing for useful data aggregation and analysis. This included the use of a key word format for SLOs augmented by one or two levels of attributes/traits and sub-skills/values. This formatting option will allow for easy alignments between individual program SLOs and institutional SLOs, including accreditation-based SLOs in the Colleges.

The committee reviewed the documents titled: (a) “Possible SLO Formats and Buckets” as a usable template, (b) ‘University SLOs Organized by Content” and (c) “Possible SLO Recording Form”. Members decided to begin the review with the most frequently used outcomes, starting with communication, which is included in all four sets of current University outcomes.

- (5) COMMUNICATION AS A UNIVERSITY-WIDE LEARNING OUTCOME: The committee discussed the use and potential description of communication as the first selected university-wide learning outcome.

Action taken: communication was selected as a university-wide learning outcome.

- (6) CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING AS UNIVERSITY-WIDE OUTCOMES: Discussed the difference between critical thinking and problem solving and how each may serve as a discrete learning outcome. Further discussed if there was a need to review the research to further differentiate problem solving from critical thinking.

Action taken: The committee agreed to select communication, critical thinking and problem solving as three distinct University-wide learning objectives.

- (7) CONTENT DISCIPLINE LEARNING OUTCOME: Discussed the utilization of content discipline learning outcomes and whether or not it may serve as a place holder or true mandated University-wide identified learning outcome. The members explored what the impact may be to individual programs and schools and if it was redundant to include a learning outcome centered on content expertise or specific discipline content. The committee also explored the need to frame such a learning outcome to allow for university-wide data mining. Additional consideration was given to how this may link to the state mandated competencies (ALC) and the ability to create a unified framework. Further consideration was given to the feed forward nature of using a content or disciplinary knowledge to the general education courses.

Action taken: The committee agreed to add “discipline specific knowledge and skills” as an SLO.

- (8) INFORMATION LITERACY AND TECHNOLOGY LITERACY: Members discussed collapsing Information Literacy and Technology Literacy into one over-arching learning outcome. The committee explored including either or both of these categories as a subset of the critical thinking, communications or disciplinary specific content learning outcome (e.g. information technology as part of critical thinking or technology literacy as part of communications). Members explored an addition of a new learning outcome titled ‘media literacy.’

Action taken: The committee decided to hold Information and Technology literacy as individual learning outcomes for now and to revisit the issue when the SLOs are identified and sent to Colleges for input.

Action take: To maintain as an SLO pending further consideration at a future next meeting.

- (9) SOFTWARE: The chair announced that Elspeth McCulloch and her colleagues are currently reviewing learning management systems and that Paul Snyder visited their committee to ensure that they were also looking at assessment as part of the LMS software. The committee discussed the need for compatibility with the LMS.

Action taken: It was requested that Elspeth speak about the work of the LMS task force at an up-coming OAFT meeting.

- (10) SACS MEETING: The chair stated in December there is an SACS annual meeting to be held in Orlando, Florida and that it would be advantageous for all members of the OAFT to attend but especially Elspeth McCulloch to visit all the vendors showcasing LMS and assessment software.

Action taken: A motion was made to request the Provost’s office support Elspeth travel to the December SACS conference. Motion carried.

- (11) DISCUSSION FORUM: The chair polled OATF members concerning their desire to utilize an Angel Discussion Forum as a convenient method of communication.

Action taken: No action taken.

(12) COLLEGE LEARNING OUTCOMES: The chair asked committee members to gather their college's SLOs to share with others at the next meeting and post them in the discussion forum on Angel. This will be helpful later in the process when we work on attributes and how to determine the feasibility of including certain SLOs in the University set.

Action taken: Members asked to post their SLOs in Angel.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00PM

Respectfully submitted, Darlene Andert

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, November 3, 2011
Time	2:00 to 4:00PM
Location	LIB224
Attendees	Members:, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Lenore Benefield (Asst. Director of Assessment PIP), Paul Snyder (Assoc. VP PIP), Howard Smith (Faculty Senate Observer), Hallie St. Hill (General Education Council) Observer, Kathy Hale (Facilitator)
Members Absent:	Darlene Andert, Elspeth McCulloch

1. **Greetings and introductions of visitors.**
2. **SharePoint as Assessment Management tool:** Benefield demonstrated Sharepoint. It is a secure networked “site” to which all faculty members would have access . It would serve as a central location for forms or documents. The example showed how easy it would be to simply add a new year of assessment data to the form and aggregate multiple years in one place. People still have to enter the information into the forms manually (no automatic loading from ANGEL). There is an existing form for program assessment (IPMs) and the Sharepoint instance just replicates it.
 - a. **Action: The task force will wait for more details on the forms used in SharePoint to further discuss the utility of SharePoint as an assessment management tool.**
3. **Review of 10/20/2011 meeting minutes:** Notation of “members absent” will be added. Wilkerson noted that we should all be in attendance whenever possible. Amendment: Under #6 add in “...critical thinking and problem solving as university-wide outcomes”.
 - a. **Action: Minutes approved with changes.**
4. **Discussion about last meeting’s decisions:** The group did decide that Critical Thinking and Problem Solving would remain two separate SLOs for now, but we will probably revisit these in the future. Wilkerson reminded us to upload information from each college about assessment processes, outcomes for representative sample programs.
5. **Review of SLOs continued:** Culturally Diverse Perspective
 - a. First question posed was “Are you teaching this in your college’s programs?” WSE: no, CHP: yes, CAS: not in all programs, CPS: yes, in many programs; COE: yes. Wohlpart thinks a quarter of CAS courses teach and assess it.
 - b. Arguments made for retaining this as an ISLO:
 - Diversity is specifically mentioned in the university’s mission statement, so this SLO should be maintained as integral to university’s mission.
 - Removing diversity as an SLO sends a message to the community that we don’t value it.
 - There are ways to assess things in the affective domain, such as values.

- Many programs already teach and assess diverse perspectives and some programs include prerequisites or gen ed courses that may teach diversity.
- A diversity related SLO does not need to relate only to culture diversity, but diverse perspectives in general.
- We live in a global society, and our graduates will need to be sensitive and aware of cultural differences to be most effective in their careers

c. Arguments made against retaining this as an ISLO:

- There is no mandatory course covering this SLO, and not all programs teach diversity
- How can we measure a perspective?
- Exposing students to something does not mean we are teaching it nor does it make it assessable.
- We can still value diversity without retaining it as an SLO, as long as we make the message clear to the university that it is of high value
- If we do not intentionally teach it in all programs, it could be a red flag to SACS reviewers.

d. Straw poll: should this stay as a university level outcome? 1 neutral , 1 yes, with reservations vote, 5 yes, 3 no.

e. **Action: Culturally Diverse Perspective will remain on the working list of ISLOs.**

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, November 17, 2011
Time	2:00 to 4:00PM
Location	LIB224
Attendees	Members: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council), Kathy Hale (Facilitator), Robert Budnik (VP and Co-Founder of LiveText)
Members Absent:	None

- 1. Greetings and introductions of visitors.**
- 2. Robert Budnik: Experience and Best Practices in Assessment**

Bob shared some things from his experience working with schools implementing assessment programs.

- The most successful schools have the President and Provost truly involved in the process. If they actually attend some meetings, they can quickly respond to needs for resources.
- Don't try to incorporate too many ideas from outside sources and conferences at once.
- Learning outcomes often become too numerous as a result of time passed, varied personal interests, and different committees. He says 6-8 outcomes are manageable.
- Trying to align outcomes to every course and assess them in every course is too hard. An outcome should probably be measured three times over the student's experience (beginning, middle, and end). Example: written communication doesn't need to be assessed in both Comp I and Comp II. You can also use one assessment to measure multiple outcomes. Survey courses or multi-section courses are good places to establish reliability in an assessment because of large volume of submissions.
- The best way to improve program performance is to take the data from assessment and get faculty together to discuss the results.
- Faculty sometimes fear that assessment results will be used against them in evaluation. Some schools have addressed this issue by changing contracts to say that program evaluation will not be used as judgment against the faculty member.
- Encourage more group participation instead relying on individual participation. Example of this is using the AACU rubric for written communication across many courses.

Bob also gave us a demo of LiveText input and reporting. Livetext makes it possible to build reports based on rubrics, outcomes, courses, or individual students.

- 3. Our list of SLOs**

What did Bob say about our SLOs? He took a quick at our list and suggested striking Aesthetic Sensibility, Technological Literacy, Community Awareness and Involvement. He liked Ecological Perspective as something unique to this institution and able to be taught across many programs.

We started talking about our progress on our list of SLOs, with Bob's suggestions of 6-8 outcomes and more measurable outcomes in mind. Many comments came back to who teaches or assesses what outcomes in what programs.

4. Survey

It was proposed that we could send out a survey to faculty asking for information about whether they currently teach or assess SLOs and gauge the current use of SLOs and faculty's value of the SLOs for the future.

The group agreed to send out a survey to all faculty. The survey will ask for four data points on each SLOs: I teach it, I assess it, I would be willing teach it and assess it in the future, I think someone in my program should teach and assess it. 14 outcomes, including the USLOGs, GSLOs, and Gen Ed Competencies, minus redundancies, will be included.

It was proposed that we collaborate with our Deans to maximize response rates to the survey. Bevins agreed to help craft some language to put on the email that could come from the Deans about the survey. McCulloch, Wang, and Wilkerson agreed to get the survey out in time for data analysis for the next meeting on December 1.

The next OATF meeting is scheduled for Dec. 1, and the task force's timeline had projected that we have the list of outcomes determined by the spring semester. Therefore, it was decided to have the survey out to faculty as soon as possible.

5. Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Thursday, December 1, 2011
Time	2:00 to 4:00PM
Location	LIB224
Attendees	Members: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council), Kathy Hale (Facilitator)
Members Absent:	Elspeth McCulloch

1. Discussion of emails sent since last meeting and concerns of members

Since the last meeting, the survey of faculty concerning the SLOs was sent on behalf of the committee. There were concerns raised from a few task force members via email about how the survey was constructed and how it was disseminated. During this meeting, we discussed some of these concerns.

A major concern was that the survey was sent out too quickly, without sufficient input from the task force members, and not under the circumstances we had previously discussed. The chair explained that it was her understanding that she was charged with getting out the survey to gather responses in time for the next OATF meeting, and that meant it needed to go out on Monday because of the Thanksgiving holiday. Some members had the same recollection as the Chair and supported her actions; others did not. Other task force members thought the agreement was to review the survey instrument itself at today's (12/1) meeting. It was agreed that perceptions of consensus were based on different understandings of the question under discussion. This highlighted a need to have a clearer way to determine whether the group has reached consensus or has a shared understanding of what should happen before the next meeting.

There was also an issue surrounding how communication should happen outside of meetings. The chairperson requests that messages that reflect a personal disagreement with her be sent to her personally, instead of the entire group. Also, task force members discussed how time sensitive tasks should be communicated and when a response can be expected. The Chair agreed to put a response deadline in email subject lines.

Another concern brought to the table today was that we have not had enough time in meetings for substantive discussions. For example, at the last meeting, the visiting "vendor" spoke for almost an hour and a half. The Chair expressed regret at not having held the vendor to his allotted 30 minutes.

2. Resolution of problems

- a) Resolved: When a member has a concern or disagreement with the chairperson, they will contact the chairperson by phone or email and the two of them will attempt to resolve the issue and inform the rest of the group, as needed.
- b) Resolved: When the chairperson needs input from the group, she will include a deadline in the subject of the email, and ask for a response.
- c) Resolved: To ensure understanding and consensus, the task force will allow adequate time for discussion of issues and devote the final 10-15 minutes of the meeting to creating an action plan for members, summarizing resolutions from this meeting, and collecting honest feedback from members about how the meeting went.

3. Meeting Schedule for spring semester

Membership determined that Tuesday mornings from 8:30-10:30 will be the best time for our biweekly meetings next semester. Location is to be determined. The meeting dates will be as follows:

Jan 10, Jan 24, Feb 7, Feb 21, Mar 13, Mar 20, Apr 3, Apr 17

4. Results of survey

Chair shared results of the survey , marked those SLOs with higher support (“I teach/ I assess this SLO” over or near 50%) with highlighted color. See chart below:

	I teach this SLO.	I assess this SLO	I would be willing to teach and assess this SLO in the future.	I think someone else in my program should teach and assess this SLO.
Aesthetic Sensibility	46 (28.40%)	21 (12.96%)	29 (17.90%)	40 (24.69%)
Communication	115 (70.99%)	100 (61.73%)	40 (24.69%)	28 (17.28%)
Community Involvement	57 (35.19%)	31 (19.14%)	37 (22.84%)	41 (25.31%)
Continuous Improvement	75 (46.30%)	58 (35.80%)	21 (12.96%)	24 (14.81%)
Critical Thinking	140 (86.42%)	113 (69.75%)	47 (29.01%)	22 (13.58%)
Disciplinary Knowledge/Skills	129 (79.63%)	112 (69.14%)	37 (22.84%)	18 (11.11%)
Diversity/Multiculturalism	80 (49.38%)	41 (25.31%)	35 (21.60%)	31 (19.14%)
Ecological Perspective	63 (38.89%)	41 (25.31%)	25 (15.43%)	40 (24.69%)
Ethical Responsibility	104 (64.20%)	61 (37.65%)	39 (24.07%)	21 (12.96%)
Information Literacy	100 (61.73%)	76 (46.91%)	32 (19.75%)	25 (15.43%)
Leadership	49 (30.25%)	27 (16.67%)	29 (17.90%)	31 (19.14%)

Problem-solving Abilities	130 (80.25%)	101 (62.35%)	39 (24.07%)	20 (12.35%)
Quantitative Reasoning	66 (40.74%)	53 (32.72%)	26 (16.05%)	44 (27.16%)
Technological Literacy	79 (48.77%)	53 (32.72%)	31 (19.14%)	39 (24.07%)

Another member had completed a similar analysis, and the group found it helpful. The chairperson shared that some of the open responses suggested that we choose a small set of shared outcomes and have some other outcomes be “optional” for programs to choose to add. This suggestion was put on the floor for discussion by task force. No formal resolution was made, but initial response indicated that some members felt this approach would be too complicated. Other members asked the Chair to determine the feasibility of this solution at the SACS annual meeting.

It was suggested that the responses from the survey be taken back to faculty to look at and that the tool would be useful as a point of discussion with our constituent faculty about their views on this topic. The Chair reiterated that the intent of the survey was data gathering to allow for informed decision-making and that the survey had served its purpose well. We will form a subcommittee that will come up with a common set of data and questions that can be used by all task force members in their meeting with faculty.

5. Action Plan

- a) A subcommittee will create the questions that will be used for each college/unit faculty discussion. This group will meet Dec 16. This subcommittee includes Collin Ramdeen, Sim Komisar, Maria Roca, Jim Wohlpart, and Judy Wilkerson. Judy will meet with the group by telephone, with logistical arrangements made by Jim. The subcommittee will definitely send a draft for review by Jan 6, enough time to read and digest before the OATF meeting scheduled for Jan 10. Earlier drafts may be sent out.
- b) Judy Wilkerson and Cathy Duff are going to compile information about how other Florida SUS institutions have handled their student learning outcomes. They will bring this information to the Jan 10 meeting.
- c) Judy will check at the SACS annual meeting about the feasibility of having required and optional ISLOs, as suggested by some faculty in the survey.
- d) Elected members should start working now on scheduling or getting on the agenda of a faculty meeting or meetings for January. These meetings should include as many faculty members as possible, as well as the assessment coordinators. Members should not wait until January to schedule these meetings. These meetings will serve to share the data we have collected and gather more information from faculty about their support of various SLOs.

6. Items to remember for next meeting’s discussions

*We will need to figure out how we will run these feedback sessions. How will we: record feedback and data, establish roles for discussion leader and/or facilitator.

*Do we agree that we are definitely keeping the communication, critical thinking, and content knowledge SLOs?

*Membership agreed at 12/1 meeting that we want to concentrate on establishing the set of SLOs first before we move on to assessment strategies and parsing attributes for SLOs unless there is a slack time while the SLO discussion is on-going.

7. Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Tuesday, January 10, 2012
Time	2:00 to 4:00PM
Location	AB5 210
Attendees	Members: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council), Kathy Hale (Facilitator)
Members Absent:	none

1. Approved minutes from last meeting (12/1/11) with no changes

2. SACS Annual Meeting Report

- a. Judy (with Elspeth and Cathy) investigated whether we could have required core outcomes for the entire university and optional outcomes that could be chosen by programs that wanted to adopt them. Judy talked with a few SACS VPs about it. One said no (though he may not have been listening closely). Two other SACS VPs said yes, as long as it is well documented.
- b. Cathy shared some results of her SACS conference investigations. If diversity, for example, appears in the mission statement, it needs to appear in lots of other places (hiring, student activities, etc.) but not necessarily in the student learning outcomes.
- c. Cathy also shared that she was personally hesitant to make any SLOs optional because university wide outcomes should mean that everyone does it. Judy reiterated the pitfalls of SACS peer-review and how opinions can vary from person to person can say no. Cathy said that whatever we decided we want, we can run it by our own SACS VP for a better idea.

3. Discussion of the 3 core outcomes (ALCs) and what to do with the others

- a. Collin: examined other SUS ALCs and SLOs and FGCU college outcomes and came to conclusion that we can't make it much more complicated than we are already doing because the faculty colleges simply won't do more than what they are already doing. He wants to know more about what SACS expects/wants as far as outcomes, since we have a good understanding what the State of Florida and independent accreditation bodies require. Cathy shared her understanding of the SACS requirements and that all they want us to do is define who we are and what we teach and assess and provide evidence.
- b. Jim: Assessment Council is in favor of sticking with the 3 ALC-based outcomes (critical thinking, communication, discipline knowledge), with robust outcomes underneath the

discipline knowledge area. These could apply to the graduate level as well. Assessment Council is not in favor of having optional outcomes.

- c. There was roundtable discussion of what we could do about remaining learning outcomes, how to make sure that they are still embedded in the culture of the institution if they are no longer student learning outcomes.
- d. The taskforce agrees that the 3 ALC-based outcomes are a point of consensus and we will present this to our faculty as such. Our second point of consensus is that we need to decide what to do with the other outcomes, which are all of the other items the chart of survey results beside the 3 ALC-based outcomes. How can we evidence the university's support for the other things that we decide are valuable but not SLOs? When we meet with our faculty, we will ask for input about what to do with these outcomes, should we decide to only have 3 SLOs.

4. Review proposed questions and process for faculty meetings

- a. We revised point two: open the floor for general discussion ABOUT the definition of university-wide learning outcomes and the implications of the definition
- b. Moved question "What does it mean to integrate a university wide learning outcome into every program" up to go along with the discussion of the definition
- c. We changed some wording to most accurately reflect the 3 state mandated areas of assessment for baccalaureate programs: communication skills, critical thinking skills, and content/discipline knowledge and skills
- d. The taskforce wants present our work and lead these discussions in a genuine way, which means that if we have come to some consensus in this group, we should share this with our faculty. We shouldn't keep asking if which ones that they want to keep as outcomes if we don't think it is feasible. It was decided to ask the question, "If we don't include any other of the existing goals and outcomes as university-wide outcomes, what should we do with them?"

5. Action Plan

- a. Judy will send out the revised draft of the questions and process for faculty meetings today and the taskforce membership will respond with comments or suggestions for before Thursday. Further discussion or responses needed should follow in 24 hours.
- b. Faculty representatives should send the dates and locations of their college meetings via email to the taskforce membership. Each representative should arrange for another person from their college to help take notes or record results from the meeting. Anna will help compile this information.

6. Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Tuesday, January 24, 2012
Time	8:30 to 10:30 AM
Location	AB5 210
Attendees	Members: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council)
Members Absent:	none

1. Reports from faculty discussions in the colleges

College of Business: All business faculty members present felt that the three ALC areas (Communication, Critical Thinking and Discipline Knowledge and Skills) as SLOs fit really well with the four undergraduate SLOs that they already have in COB. The College of Business supported the 3 SLOs at the university level and also supported maintaining some of the existing SLOGs (ethics, global focus/diversity, environmental sustainability) at the program level.

College of Education didn't get to present as planned, as previous items on the meeting agenda ran long. They will reschedule for early February.

College of Health Professions: Faculty in CHP moved to accept the 3 ALC-based SLOs. One dissenter thought that this was an easy way out and was disappointed that we weren't going to do the difficult work of trying to work on incorporating more SLOs into the curriculum. The CHP faculty felt that the other SLOGs could be left as guiding principles and be present in the mission and vision of the university. Many of the additional existing SLOGS are present as CHP program goals already.

College of Engineering: 100% of faculty attended and they agreed that 3 ALC based SLOs are appropriate. There are other existing SLOG s that they teach and assess their programs, but they agreed that the 3 core SLOs would be best for the university. They also want to retain the SLOGs that are unique features of the university as guiding principles or elements of the university's mission and/or vision.

Of the colleges that have met, all were satisfied and supportive of the three ALC based SLOs (Communication, Critical Thinking, Discipline Knowledge/Skills). There is no clear direction on what to do with the existing SLOGs, though all felt that there were some that should be retained as important pieces of the university's identity, and help to give the university a unique "brand."

2. Discussion of the results of the college meetings

One point made was that if we decide to cut the SLOs to the three that we are discussing that it might be good to verbally acknowledge somewhere the fact that that a SLOG like Diverse Perspective still exists at the program level in some programs.

There was quite a bit of discussion about what to do with the existing SLOGs that we may not retain as university level SLOS. How do we make it clear that these other things are still central to the university's culture and mission and give it some "teeth?" In the past, people have used the fact that ecological perspective is a university learning outcome to get grants and to attract new hires. One idea was to offer incentives for programs that practice mission central activities. We discussed whether concepts like "ecological perspective" or "community involvement" are needed as learning outcomes or simply as guiding principles or parts of the university mission. There were opinions on both sides. One opinion was that it doesn't matter what we do with these other outcomes. If we want to teach them or follow them we will do it, and it shouldn't matter what we have on paper. Similar to this, another comment was that something like ecological sustainability/perspective is already so ingrained in the culture of the institution that changing the SLOs won't change behavior with respect to sustainability efforts.

Concern was raised about the quality and usefulness of the information gathered from the discussions with faculty in our colleges. There were different perspectives on what the intent of the discussion sessions is and how much data is to be gathered. The rep from each college should prepare a written report with the results of their faculty meetings. These will become a part of the task force's final report.

3. University-wide assessment initiative

There is a pilot project originating from the Assessment Council that is attempting to embed assessment of communication and critical thinking in senior level courses. Up until now, these ALCs have only been assessed in the Composition classes, and the state requires that the ALCs be assessed at some other point. This pilot will use the AACU VALUE rubrics to assess writing in the partner courses. During this pilot, the rubric won't be changed so that its effectiveness can be tested.

4. Action Plan for next meeting

Before the next meeting, each representative that has already led their faculty meeting should write a report with the responses and discussions that occurred after each question. Other college meetings that occur before the next OATF meeting will have some extra time to prepare their reports.

Reports from college faculty meetings will continue at the next OATF meeting on Feb. 7, 2012.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Tuesday, February 7, 2012
Time	8:30 to 10:30 AM
Location	AB5 309
Attendees	Members: Darlene Andert, Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Elspeth McCulloch, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council)
Members Absent:	none

1. **Approval of minutes from last meeting with amendment:** The College of Business supported the 3 SLOs at the university level *and also supported maintaining some of the existing SLOGs (ethics, global focus/diversity, environmental sustainability) at the program level*

2. **Old Business:** COB rep followed up on concerns with the COB presentation on SLOGs and asked COB faculty for further feedback and got no response. Jim reported that the Associate Dean in the College of Business confirmed that this response was not unusual because they are already aligned with assessment of these three areas.

3. **Reports from faculty discussions in the colleges**
Written reports from each college representative will be posted in ANGEL folder by the representative (Maria will send to Judy to be posted) and everyone will have them posted by the end of this week (Feb 10).

College of Arts and Sciences

Maria Roca and Eric Otto distributed a survey to CAS faculty at the meeting (almost 80 of about 200 total faculty) asking whether each existing SLOG should or should not be a university wide SLO. Results showed clear support for the three AL-based SLOs. Greatest concern raised was about ecological perspective being eliminated as a SLO and what would happen to things like Colloquium if this happens. Thanks to Maria and Eric for getting the report together so quickly!

Library

6 out of 9 in-unit library faculty and (4 out of unit) attended the meeting. All present approved of the definition of university wide outcome. All present were supportive of the three ALC based SLOs. One person suggested that Ethical Responsibility would be feasible as a university wide outcome. There was also the understanding that information literacy outcomes would still be addressed under the Critical Thinking and/or Communication SLOs. All present agreed that the other existing SLOGs would still be present in the mission, vision, and guiding principles of the university, and that would be sufficient to keep them in the culture of the university.

College of Education

Charles sent out the questions from the OATF crafted document as a survey. People liked the definition of university wide SLO and showed most support for the critical thinking, problem solving, discipline knowledge, communication, and technological literacy SLOGs.

4. Discussion of the results of the college meetings

Should we combine critical thinking and problem solving into one SLO? Many colleges have expressed their interest in keeping problem solving as SLO. Concern was that defining the category as both might cause problems for programs that might only include one or the other in their outcomes.

Can we make some recommendation that programs be strongly encouraged to adopt the other slogs or that administration values programs that teach these slogs? Can we say that each area or SLO is fully articulated within each program? Will further definition be a problem?

We could treat the three ALC based SLOs as areas for assessment which would essentially let the programs put their outcomes into these three categories for reporting.

5. Conclusions of today's discussion (PLEASE REVIEW FOR APPROVAL AT NEXT MEETING)

Three areas of student learning are taught and assessed in every program at FGCU. Programs are required to develop robust assessable student learning outcomes in each area and provide evidence of their attainment by students for the purposes of accountability and program improvement. These areas are communication skills, critical thinking skills, and content/discipline knowledge and skills.

Faculty and administration are encouraged to support efforts to incorporate the founding student learning outcomes and goals (Founding SLOGs) in curricular and extracurricular programs. These Founding SLOGs are (the SLOGs will be listed here for future reference)

6. Actions for next meeting

- Look at language in section 5 above. We will talk about approving this language for inclusion in the final report from this taskforce.
- Read the Academic Learning Compact policy document and other related documents concerning the current structure and strategy for university assessment. Cathy Duff will send links along with some further explanation.
 - Question to keep in mind in this review- should our recommendation be that this assessment strategy be applied to undergraduate and graduate programs?
 - We will probably need a statement about the fact that graduate students will be expected to perform at a higher level than undergrads.

OATF Committee- Meeting Minutes

Date	Tuesday, February 21, 2012
Time	8:30 to 10:30 AM
Location	AB5 309
Attendees	Members: Tom Bevins, Anna Carlin, Cathy Duff, Sim Komisar, Collin Ramdeen, Maria Roca, Charles Xiaoxue Wang, Judy Wilkerson (Chair), Jim Wohlpart Guests: Eric Otto (General Education Council)
Members Absent:	Darlene Andert, Elspeth McCulloch

- 7. Approval of minutes from last meeting with amendment:** Under item 2 on the minutes, Jim Wohlpart asked that a sentence be added that that indicated that the Assistant Dean of the College of Business confirmed that the lack of response from the Business faculty was not unusual.
- 8. Discussion of what language to use in our final report:** At our last meeting we had written two paragraphs about the three new areas for teaching and assessment.
- a. Since the last meeting, Cathy and Judy had made further suggestions on wording for these statements. Judy's version contains more definition of how assessment results will be used for program improvement. We expect that the final report will contain Judy's language, and the group decided to wait until we see the report to decide whether it should be simplified. If there is a reason to create an executive summary of the report, a shorter statement could be used there.
 - b. Our report will contain both the 1997-1998 SLOGs and the 2011-2012 SLOGs, along with the with the Graduate student learning outcomes (unchanged since inception in 1998).
 - c. We added a sentence or two into the original paragraph defining the three areas of teaching and assessment about how graduate level learning should occur at a higher level and that outcomes developed in graduate programs should reflect a greater level or rigor and complexity.
- 9. Review the ALC and Institutional Effectiveness policies:** should we make a recommendation that the ALC policy be the guide for assessing all programs? Jim stated that the ALC policy is currently the policy covering undergraduate programs and we could certainly make a recommendation for it to be used for graduate programs.

Resolved:

The OATF recommends that FGCU Policy 2.005 on Academic Learning Compacts serve as the foundation for continued refinement of our assessment planning and reporting for both undergraduate and graduate programs.

- 10.** Maria shared a personal encounter that prompted us to specifically mention in the report that ecological sustainability, community involvement and diversity are founding SLOGs that were most discussed and valued by faculty and that we think it is important for programs to continue to develop learning outcomes in these areas.

- 11.** The meeting scheduled for March 13 is cancelled. Judy will send out a draft of the OATF report to the group around that date. The next meeting will be on March 20 at which time we will discuss the report.