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The Institutional Effectiveness Spring/Fall Series is a series of events and workshops offered to Texas A&M University-Commerce faculty and staff seeking professional development opportunities for continuous self-improvement in their Academic Programs and Support Units.

The data presented in this Event Evaluation Survey Report was collected at the Quality Day Event offered on October 23rd, 2017.

Overarching goals for the event:
1. Participants will be able to communicate the value of implementing quality initiatives in their program.
2. Participates will be able to design and utilize program maps as form of program assessment.
3. Participants will be able to identify, articulate, and execute 3 strategies to elevate the quality of their programs.

A total of 200 faculty, staff and administrators were invited to participate in this full-day event and 126 invitees attended.

The event consisted of the following sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Session</td>
<td>8:45-10:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session A1</td>
<td>11:00-12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session B1</td>
<td>1:00-2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session C1</td>
<td>2:30-4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session A2</td>
<td>11:00-12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session B2</td>
<td>1:00-2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session C2</td>
<td>2:30-4:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Appendix 1 for more details about each session.

A grand total of 242 responses to the session evaluation surveys were collected. The number of survey responses for each individual session is provided on the next page.

Attendees were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goals and purpose of this session were accomplished.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content of this session met my expectations.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The presentation was concise and informative.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The handouts and visual aids referenced in this session were helpful and will serve as a good source for future reference.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This session provided practical information that I can apply to my professional work.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall, this session provided me with support in my efforts related to assessment and continuous improvement.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Agree, and (4) Strongly Disagree
In general, participants agreed that the goals and purpose of the sessions were accomplished and that they were provided with information and resources for the enhancement of a culture of quality at our institution.

### Overall Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Event</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall by Session</th>
<th>Overall Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Session</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session A1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session A2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session B1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session B2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session C1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session C2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A few respondents (9) filled out the survey but did not indicate which session they were evaluating. These ratings were included in the total overall mean but not in the individual sessions mean.

Whether analyzed by individual question or by individual session, the data suggests that participants were satisfied with the event. Responses were mostly positive.

The graph below offers a visual representation of the overall percentage of responses for each question.

### Overall Response Percentage by Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>58.75%</td>
<td>38.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>38.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>45.42%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
<td>48.95%</td>
<td>41.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>42.98%</td>
<td>47.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>48.55%</td>
<td>41.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, participants were asked to indicate if they would recommend this presentation to others (Question #7); 89% of respondents marked Yes, stating that they would recommend the workshop to colleagues.
Open-ended Responses

Question 8

What other topics are you interested in learning more about?

1. Access to me information this would provide us
2. Applying assessment results & simplifying the process
3. Articulating evidence of the methods used to support program goals
4. Assess anything *Validating current push
5. Assessment
6. Breaking out results (and even the surveys) by off-campus students to ensure we are addressing services, offices, accommodations accurately.
7. Changing academic culture to not overthink assessment. American universities teach job. Skills are what is assumed, but not the reality of the students' experience.
8. Comment section to better serve and improve services
9. Communications of good data to large staff and stakeholders
10. Consolidating assessments such that they apply to more than one of my goals
11. creative, innovative, * strategies
12. Curriculum mapping cannot be described, explained, and proctored in an hour. Please focus more, or get a longer session for this
13. Dashboard & Breakdown of *Scerving S
14. Designing and using Rubrics for Assessments
15. Effectively writing learning outcomes from program goals
16. Ensuring goals are on target
17. example of good vs bad rubrics
18. Faculty buy in is an issue, especially since most faculty only teach one course or in some cases no courses that are evaluated.
19. Good Flow - make PowerPoints available
20. Good Overview
21. good to know, would be helpful to discuss in units
22. group assessments > combining assessments for common goal
23. How to determine most appropriate goals to document
25. how to develop simplified & user friendly assessments
26. how to engage faculty who need assistance in a targeted manner - don't punish all with additional training
27. How to ensure that all fac. & adjuncts are following what course coordinator created
28. How to pave down goals without sacrificing departmental expectations
29. How we can better utilize the data to assist with support programs.
30. I would like to learn more about curriculum mapping
31. Implementation
32. implementing new assessment plans
33. Improving quality within constraints- financial, time, priorities
34. Is there an entrance survey to compare the expectations from our incoming students vs the grad exit survey
35. It is too general, "some size fits all" are not valuable to me. I must focus on session considering historical/contextual *focus that affect TAMUC quality development
36. Learning outcomes *? to program objectives
37. more about specific elements, less on generalizations
38. Other campus data sources (&system) to access.
39. Please bring in a "specialist" in Pedagogy to speak to the group
40. QM Sessions
41. Realistic and relevant assessments in my areas
42. Rubrics discussion interesting but I am fairly new to using them. I always worry but it prevents me from using personal judgement when grading
43. Rubrics were good, thanks!
44. Senior Seminars
45. Session lacked focus and presenter was obviously uncomfortable with topic and audience.
46. simplify the process
47. specifically prioritizing it on a staff level
48. specifics *re quality measures
49. strategic planning
50. strategy to develop Ad-hoc reports
51. Support Units!
52. Topics regarding Pedagogy.
53. Tough topic - good job.
54. translating info *bdcy *iou - IEP Plans
55. transparency in assignments
56. What all can we have access to?
57. without being arrogant, his was at a level that I knew already
58. Working more 1:1 - coaching on mapping my programs AACU rubrics available. Match handout with additional resources available
Question 9

Additional comments (strengths, suggestions for improvements, etc.)

1. Apply the discussion to TAMUC
2. Awesome presenters
3. Better visuals
4. Clicker for PowerPoint. Handouts will be useful if we get them via email
5. Curriculum mapping was very helpful & informative
6. Do we get a discount is the self-assessment on the minute papers show you did the wrong presentation? =) You were easy to listen to and made the topic simple to understand
7. Don't repeat what we've already heard
8. Elect Chad King
9. enjoyed analogies that get me thinking differently about the same old' terminology
10. Focusing on Quality, assessment and reflective time.
11. Good examples. Helped develop meaningful goals
12. Good job!
13. Good job! Thanks =)
14. Good to obtain faculty input before implementing! Contradicts Dr. Suskiw's message: LESS committees QUALITY, not checklists
15. Great data and control =) Thank You
16. Great data available - good, helpful presentation I do believe that these senior surveys should have an immediate way to separate off-campus students from on-campus (and even online students) because I think this can really change (improve) results. Students who do
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not have access to Rec Center, sorority/fraternity/*greek system, etc. May rate those louder simply because they do not have access to those listed.

17. Great information! It will be very helpful in my process this year
18. great presentation, easy to understand and very helpful
19. handouts prior to lecture
20. I apologize for the rudeness of my colleagues how embarrassing.
21. I enjoy the discussion.
22. I enjoyed listening to the presenter
23. I like the handout.
24. I would like to serve on a committee to work on these initiatives - Tina Lancaster, I teach fully online; BAAS
25. I'm someone who has used rubrics for years & I learned so much from his presentation
26. I'm still feeling like I don't completely understand how I can use this effectively to meet our goals
27. It was great to see a sample assessment. That can help organize what we are already currently doing at our campus.
28. Love the curriculum maps
29. Need to slow down a little bit. Tried taking notes but slides kept changing. Had to capture notes while listening and viewing slides
30. Needs to be much more tailored for TAMUC
31. Raised a bit more questions. Difficult to understand, maybe because so many different kinds of support groups
32. really liked the examples & the map handout
33. She did a good job. But we have done/are doing it.
34. She needs a clicker/presenter so she can forward the slides without going back to the laptop all the time =)
35. Shorten, more clear and concrete examples. Units a *prepared results (basics for *assesc-p.)
36. some of the slides passed too quickly but great tool
37. Speaker has been out of classroom for a long time. Unfamiliar with online course?
38. Specific info - More concrete examples clearer whether it was feedback/action
39. Starnes-Chem Department is willing to serve on QM taskforce
40. Suggest dropping this topic from the agenda
41. tailor the program for programs- *talking then use the same generic PowerPoints
42. Thank you for providing an opportunity for faculty to speak and for listening! It seems the administration does not know what goes on at the department level. Please continue to ask for faculty input. You will have more success with your initiatives. And make less work for everyone.
43. The critical thought is that the university has toredice the urge to be reactionary. We must assess our current progresses and assess where the gaps are FIRST, BEFORE developing new processes.

44. The focus on rubrics was the basic for the audience and some of the comments were too basic and rehashed issues faculty knows already. The comments were not very effective but the info in the presentation was very useful.

45. the presenters did a great job

46. The sample tables were good

47. The speaker was great!

48. The workshop was quite good unit the end when the speakers self-assessment of the blue of the session seemed way off base to what we had discussed. The conclusions based on a few comments did not reflect the information we took from the session and the comments about having the wrong session were out of line. Otherwise she was clear and good.

49. This session would be fantastic for someone new to the process

50. This speaker has a different idea on how to approach IE. So are we now changing (again) how we do IE? I’m confused

51. Very good information that I did not know before today.

52. Very helpful info.

53. Very well done- I want your *booll

54. wish you had stood where everyone can see you
Appendix A

Presenters’ Agenda

Thank you for your participation in Quality Day 2017 esteemed presenter! The Department of Institutional Effectiveness and Research sincerely appreciates your efforts in creating a culture of quality at our institution. We look forward to a day full of positive conversation and enriching sessions to better assist our faculty and staff understand the value of quality in their programs.

Our overarching goals for the Quality Day:
1. Participants will be able to communicate the value of implementing quality initiatives in their program.
2. Participants will be able to design and utilize program maps as form of program assessment.
3. Participants will be able to identify, articulate, and execute 3 strategies to elevate the quality of their programs.

Presenter Information:
- Karin Thomas is your point of contact for any of your needs in RSC Ambition Room
- At your podium you will find an agenda and bottle of water
- Before you presentation, please make the following announcement if you have materials for session participants:
  - “Please find related participant materials in the envelop labeled participant materials”
- If you have any materials for the session participants, they will be in the envelope labeled, participant materials
- At the conclusion of your presentation and before participant dismissal we need you to make the following announcements to the session participants:
  - “At each table you will find an envelope labeled blank evaluation forms. After each session, be sure to fill out an evaluation and place it in the envelope labeled completed evaluation forms. Your feedback in critical to our efforts in providing you resources and support”
  - “The next session is [SPEAK NAME OF SESSION] which is located in [SPEAK ROOM LOCATION]”

A full presenter agenda is found on the back of this page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00am-8:30am</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Breakfast &amp; Sign-In</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30am-8:45am</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Dr. Shonda Gibson introduces Dr. Keck/Dr. Humphreys</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45am-10:45am</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Opening Session</td>
<td>Linda Suskie</td>
<td>What is a quality program, and why is it a good idea to examine and improve quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45am-11:00am</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Dr. Shonda Gibson</td>
<td>Raffle for 2 books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am-12:15pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>Academic Programs &amp; Support Units focused on Student Learning</td>
<td>Session A 1</td>
<td>Linda Suskie</td>
<td>Using curriculum maps to understand and improve curriculum design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am-12:15pm</td>
<td>RSC Ambition</td>
<td>Support Units</td>
<td>Session A 2</td>
<td>Dr. Tabetha Adkins, Kristen Neeley, Danielle Davis, &amp; Dr. Ray Green</td>
<td>Curriculum and program mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15pm-1:00pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Dr. Shonda Gibson</td>
<td>Raffle for 3 books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm-2:15pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td>Session B 1</td>
<td>Linda Suskie</td>
<td>Research-based pedagogies and rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm-2:15pm</td>
<td>RSC Ambition</td>
<td>Support Units</td>
<td>Session B 2</td>
<td>Dr. Lee Young &amp; Dr. Dan Su</td>
<td>Rich Data: Graduation Exit Survey and Non-Returning Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15pm-2:30pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Dr. Shonda Gibson</td>
<td>Raffle for 2 books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30pm-4:00pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>Support Units</td>
<td>Session C 1</td>
<td>Linda Suskie</td>
<td>Identifying meaningful goals, strategies, &amp; metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30pm-4:00pm</td>
<td>RSC Ambition</td>
<td>Academic Units</td>
<td>Session C 2</td>
<td>Dr. Justice, Mike Smith, &amp; Jeremy Gamez</td>
<td>Quality Matters &amp; TAMUS Quality Assurance Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00pm-4:30pm</td>
<td>RSC Conference Room</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Closing Session</td>
<td>Raffle: Shonda Gibson Closing Remarks: Dr. Keck/Dr. Humphreys</td>
<td>Closing remarks &amp; raffle for 3 books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>