

From: Sheffer, Debra
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2007 2:40 PM
To: Droge, Dr. Michael
Subject: RE: Draft docs to review for Monitoring Report
Hi, Mike,

Initial comments on the drafts:

On page 1 of the Post-Evaluation Chronology of Assessment Activity under the second bullet, you have "The UAC Chair along with three (or four?)" As I recall, it was me, Scott, Pete Mc, Ed, and Ann initially, then Dave Fox and Evelyn replaced Pete and Ann, though Dave came on as liaison sooner than Evelyn. I could be wrong about this, but ...

In the Fall of 05, UAC and CAC members had a September and a November faculty workshop to help faculty write CAs, CLOs, and CARs.

Each fall, I have met with new faculty and briefly presented assessment. I will do that again on the 14th.

Summer 2007: UAC chair implemented approval of CAs, CLOs, CARs to meet the May 28 deadline for these items to be posted in the fall syllabi. Lots of items came through, were approved, and were loaded into the system. Also, Scott Hageman, David Fox, Ed Hight, Debra Sheffer, Evelyn Knowles, Larry Ewing, Dr. Droge, and John Tew met to design forms and processes for review of the assessment reports. Forms and processes were constructed, reports were assigned to first and second readers, and a completion schedule was developed.

Debra

From: Droge, Dr. Michael
Sent: Sunday, July 29, 2007 2:42 PM
To: Hight, Ed; Sheffer, Debra; Cowley, Brian; Hageman, Scott
Cc: Tew, John; Droge, Dr. Michael
Subject: Draft docs to review for Monitoring Report

Attached are several documents. Begin with the Outline to see my thinking at this point for the organization of the Monitoring Report (MR). I've already changed it many times, and I'm sure it will continue to evolve. However, there are key elements we know we'll need in the MR. I'll work to pull info together, but I need you to all help review documents for accuracy and completeness. The Chronology draft should be an overview to tell the story since the summer of 2005. Details about the many initiatives can be presented in dedicated sections of the MR and samples of everything can appear as Appendices.

I drafted the Chronology from many different lists of what happened when, and it was a challenge to create one coherent story. So please check it for holes and also for accuracy and consistency. It is probably too redundant at this point, but some repeat is unavoidable. After the reviewer finishes the Chronology, she should be convinced that Park made an all-out effort to turn things around. The hard evidence will come in the details of what data we've actually been able to collect and use to improve

learning.

The good news is that the HLC has agreed that we still have until Oct 2008 to get the MR cleared. That means that even if the reviewer thinks we need something else, we'll be able to come back with another report prior to Oct 2008. Of course, if we're going for this, and the University's decision is that we are, then we need to make this the best possible MR that we can.

Thanks for helping with the review of these materials. There will be more. **Please send me your comments by August 3.** We plan to have a full draft of the MR out to the faculty by September with the target submission date to the HLC of late October. M.

Michael H. Droge, Ph.D.

Provost and Senior Vice President

Park University

8700 N W River Park Drive

Parkville, Mo 64152

816-584-6355

Fax 816-741-5578

email: michael.droge@park.edu

FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM FACULTY MEMBERS REGARDING THE DRAFT MONITORING REPORT

Evelyn Knowles (Interior Design)

Line 1393

Heading about online quality review. The text that should follow is missing. (She can get the missing text if needed)

Line 971

Has “in also” where it should be “is also”.

Line 806

Has “will submitted” instead of “will be submitted”.

Amber Dailey-Hebert (Education)

Line 95-97

You may want to include the actual year pending the statement “Even in it’s first year _____,”

You also may want to check with the archivist, the first graduating class at Park consisted of 4 students (3 of whom were female), and it might be worth mentioning the Japanese exchange program for the multicultural piece as well.

Attached the HLC report requested of CETL’s contributions. It wasn’t included in the complete report I reviewed, and perhaps this information isn’t needed. Just wanted to make sure that Droge did get the report just in case.

Walter Kisthardt (Social Work)

Line 230

In some of the professional degree programs such as the bachelor’s degree in Social Work (BSW) the Department Chair also assumes the role of program coordinator.

Line 1537

In the spring of 2007, the Chairs of the departments in the School of Social Sciences (Social Work, Criminal Justice, Psychology/Sociology, and Social Sciences) began weekly School meetings to enhance collaboration around all issues relative to the curriculum including program assessment. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has attended these meetings on several occasions. This has served to improve open communication and enrich the multidisciplinary perspective in the School.

Jeff Glauner (Professor Emeritus)

I tried to read the document as if I were not directly associated with Park (that is, with a certain degree of ignorance about the Park University context). My biggest difficulty as such a reader would be to keep straight all of the acronyms and unique nominal terms and titles representing programs, documents, etc. Thus, I would recommend the following:

--a compact glossary of acronyms, terms, and titles. It should be located near the beginning of the document.

In addition, although all of the needed material is included in the document, it is difficult for the reader to get his/her mind around that material to see it as a coherent whole. Thus, I recommend the following:

--a brief (two or three pages) prospectus stating succinctly in outline/paragraph form the major points of the document. This, too, should be placed near the beginning of the document.

--additionally, a sub-prospectus might be placed at the beginning of each section where a major change of focus takes place (for instance, at the beginning of the section on shared governance).

Kenneth Christopher (Criminal Justice)

1) I believe the document accurately reflects progress made with respect to our program in Criminal Justice (speaking as the Program Coordinator for Criminal Justice); and with respect to recent General Education curricular change efforts (for my part as a member of the 2007-2008 Gen Ed Committee.)

2) I would suggest a slight wording change in the last paragraph of Section 4.4.1 (lines 808-812) to better emphasize the importance of the establishment of a culture of assessment. This is truly a major outcome in any organizational culture -- to get stakeholders to embrace a new way of getting things done, different from the past -- we should herald it: Example: ". . . the major effect of the assessment process in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has been the successful transition to a culture of assessment. Organizational change is never easy, but the College has made great strides towards embracing this concept, which is the most important step in the process. . . ."

From: Sheffer, Debra
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2007 2:40 PM
To: Droge, Dr. Michael
Subject: RE: Draft docs to review for Monitoring Report

Hi, Mike,

Initial comments on the drafts:

On page 1 of the Post-Evaluation Chronology of Assessment Activity under the second bullet, you have "The UAC Chair along with three (or four?)" As I recall, it was me, Scott, Pete Mc, Ed, and Ann initially, then Dave Fox and Evelyn replaced Pete and Ann, though Dave came on as liaison sooner than Evelyn. I could be wrong about this, but ...

In the Fall of 05, UAC and CAC members had a September and a November faculty workshop to help faculty write CAs, CLOs, and CARs.

Each fall, I have met with new faculty and briefly presented assessment. I will do that again on the 14th.

Summer 2007: UAC chair implemented approval of CAs, CLOs, CARs to meet the May 28 deadline for these items to be posted in the fall syllabi. Lots of items came through, were approved, and were loaded into the system. Also, Scott Hageman, David Fox, Ed Hight, Debra Sheffer, Evelyn Knowles, Larry Ewing, Dr. Droge, and John Tew met to design forms and processes for review of the assessment reports. Forms and processes were constructed, reports were assigned to first and second readers, and a completion schedule was developed.

Debra

From: Droge, Dr. Michael
Sent: Sunday, July 29, 2007 2:42 PM
To: Hight, Ed; Sheffer, Debra; Cowley, Brian; Hageman, Scott
Cc: Tew, John; Droge, Dr. Michael
Subject: Draft docs to review for Monitoring Report

Attached are several documents. Begin with the Outline to see my thinking at this point for the organization of the Monitoring Report (MR). I've already changed it many times, and I'm sure it will continue to evolve. However, there are key elements we know we'll need in the MR. I'll work to pull info together, but I need you to all help review documents for accuracy and completeness. The Chronology draft should be an overview to tell the story since the summer of 2005. Details about the many initiatives can be presented in dedicated sections of the MR and samples of everything can appear as Appendices.

I drafted the Chronology from many different lists of what happened when, and it was a challenge to create one coherent story. So please check it for holes and also for accuracy and consistency. It is probably too redundant at this point, but some repeat is unavoidable. After the reviewer finishes the Chronology, she should be convinced that Park made an all-out effort to turn things around. The hard evidence will come in the details of what data we've actually been able to collect and use to improve learning.

The good news is that the HLC has agreed that we still have until Oct 2008 to get the MR cleared. That means that even if the reviewer thinks we need something else, we'll be able to come back with another report prior to Oct 2008. Of course, if we're going for this, and the University's decision is that we are, then we need to make this the best possible MR that we can.

Thanks for helping with the review of these materials. There will be more. **Please send me your comments by August 3.** We plan to have a full draft of the MR out to the faculty by September with the target submission date to the HLC of late October. M.

Michael H. Droge, Ph.D.

Provost and Senior Vice President

Park University

8700 N W River Park Drive

Parkville, Mo 64152

816-584-6355

Fax 816-741-5578

email: michael.droge@park.edu