

CIA Meeting Minutes

Date: Friday, November 20, 2015

Time: 9-10:15 a.m.

Room: BA 524

Present: Michelle Beach, Monica Miller, Joyce Hwang, Pam Gladis, Maureen Sander-Staudt, NancyRuth Leibold, Teresa Henning, Cindy Aamlid

Information Items:

- Next meetings—We will be meeting on 12/4 and 12/11 so that we do not have to meet during finals week. The remaining meetings will be at 9 a.m. in BA 524.
- Mini-grants are due 12-1, please announce in departments.
- Assessment academy has met. Teresa has asked for help from a student, Kevin Danielson, to intern for both the assessment academy and CIA. Some money from our committee budget will be used to pay the student intern.

Guest: Cindy Aamlid and MN Collaborative Project:

- Cindy reported on the two year plan for MN Collaborative Project. She has been meeting with faculty committee groups to determine how to collect artifacts. SMSU is in the MN Collaborative project with other schools to collect artifacts as a part of AAC&U's national VALUE rubric project. Participating schools are asked to collect artifacts in 6 areas over the next 2 years. This spring 2016 Cindy hopes to collect artifacts in these areas: written communication, critical thinking, and civic engagement. Next year, fall of 2016, the focus will be on quantitative literacy (no square fit with our learning outcomes), ethical reasoning, and intercultural knowledge (similar to our diversity). We are asked to collect data from 3 different student levels (i.e., first-year students, mid-career students, and end-of-career students) and about 100 artifacts for each outcome. Our MN data will go into a data warehouse. Cindy will be contacting departments, programs, and professors to get artifacts. Instructors of LEP 100 and 400 may also be contacted. The project requires a cross section of student demographics and courses. Faculty do not need to create a new assignment but can use existing assignments should they decide to participate.
- The AAC&U rubrics Cindy referred to are available online under: CIA Committee/MN Collaborative Project/Value Rubrics. Professors who contribute artifacts do not need to use these rubrics to grade student work. Rather, project raters – taken from participating schools – will use the rubrics to assess all artifacts. Rater training will be done in May. SMSU needs to submit names of two raters by March. Rater training and stipends will be paid for by AAC&U.
- In discussing how Cindy can best collect artifacts, Michelle noted that drawing work from LiveText portfolios that Education uses would be a good place to start. Michelle

recommended that Cindy contact Dr. Amy Christensen about what is possible with LiveText. Also, Cindy will still need to get professors' permission to use this work and get copies of assignment descriptions. Michelle recommended that Cindy contact Dr. Sonya Vierstraete to see if she can speak at an Education department meeting. Last time there were few artifacts from Education, and Teresa could have used more from BEPS. While not all Education courses contribute artifacts to LiveText, some courses could have 30-80 artifacts posted. Other courses, such as Michelle's ED 312, have two artifacts required; in those courses, there would be 2 sets of 80 artifacts each.

- Having this big pool would facilitate meeting demographic requirements, but only 10 artifacts can come from any one course. Teresa and Cindy also noted that the collected artifacts could be used by the campus for our own ratings. Education is already doing this with the LiveText artifacts. It is important to note that the VALUE rubrics are likely broader than the LEP rubrics we use on campus.
- Cindy noted that the call for raters from our campus will go out Jan-Feb 2016 and the list is due March 1st. Cindy doesn't know where the national training will be or exactly when. She does know that the training will be in May after school is out. Teresa and Cindy hope this time teaching faculty will participate. Last year was difficult because the training and rating happened during the semester. Teresa pointed out that this work is paid for and good for professional development. Cindy only needs two names this year. Monica will post this information on line. Cindy will have to upload these artifacts, and last year they were mostly final projects. It would help if the artifacts came in sooner, were digital, and not overly long.
- Other questions for Cindy? Joyce noted that the AAC&U rubric for written communication suggests that we would send certain artifacts—what should be included and how many? Cindy would like the whole set of assignments from course; the name and section of the course; a cover sheet that will be provided; and an assignment sheet. Alan Matzner can determine which students fit the needs best and will help Cindy narrow the artifacts down to that group. Information about genre and disciplinary requirements and the assignment prompt would be information included on a cover sheet. There may be rater questions about how to score and assess work across a variety of disciplines—this is one of the things the project is designed to determine.
- Instructors will have a consent form to give students that allows students to “opt out.” but Alan M. will track down identifying demographic data to identify the appropriate pieces.

LEP Focused Projects In Progress:

- Teresa has a new set of projects to talk about. She went to LEC about how to respond to AHA team reports. Given that discussion, two projects have emerged for spring 2016.
- Project 1: Focus groups about the structure of the LEP: Members of the LEC raised concerns about the LEP structure, and students have raised concerns about consistency of LEP 100 and 400 courses. The feeling is that people want to make changes in our LEP courses, but HLC will want to see some evidence supporting why those changes were

made. To generate that evidence, Teresa has suggested the LEC do two types of focus groups in Spring 2016 about the LEP—one with faculty and one with students. Some planning still needs to be done for that project. Some members of the CIA may be asked to help the LEC with this project. It was also mentioned by Maureen that perhaps some of the focus group work could still happen this fall in LEP 100? Maybe instructors could be given focus group questions to add to their course evaluations?

- Project 2: Assessing Spring 2016 LEP 400 Artifacts: Cindy can share some assessment money for this work from the MN Project, but the caveat is that it has to be tied to VALUE rubrics. Teresa will be asking Spring 2016 LEP 400 instructors to submit at least one assignment and one set of artifacts and then she and Cindy will use some grant money to pay SMSU faculty to rate these artifacts using our own rubrics. Some of the artifacts collected will also be submitted to the MN Project so that the grant money can in fact be used in this manner. Artifacts will be stripped of identifying information. Artifacts do not need to be the end of semester work. In the last two weeks, students are often bogged down and the quality of their work can suffer. The rating will occur in the summer. Faculty will have a chance to see and react to data generated from this project at Professional Development Day in Fall 2016. The hope is that when HLC comes back we will have made changes, and we will have some data supporting those changes. Cindy and Teresa will be looking for 8-10 faculty to do this rating work in summer. Faculty will be asked to do about 4 hours of work for a stipend of about \$200. For statistical significance, Teresa and Cindy need about 90% of the 11 LEP 400 Spring 2016 instructors to agree to participate in this project. Any kind of written artifact of at least 3 pages will work. Cindy and Teresa will be meeting with LEP 400 Spring 2016 instructors on December 10 to get their feedback on this project and to see if they will be willing to participate.

Action Item: Reviewing Revision of CIA Work Plans from Last Time:

- Strategy 1: Teresa rewrote to reflect the two LEP projects mentioned above. These address this HLC concern.
- Strategy 2: See document
- Strategy 3: Teresa took some creative license to identify that the assessment academy will be completing this piece. There was much overlap between this strategy and 2 and 6, so just removed all the detail and retained strategies 2 and 6.
- Strategy 5: See document
- Strategy 6: See document
- Teresa made a glossary of terms, and placed links to more information, and could place this glossary online. These terms will need adjustments and careful review before publishing.
- How should we proceed? Go through each point again, or focus on glossary? Glossary needs more work, and we have looked at other document 3 times, so will focus on glossary. For now, the strategies our own strategic plan for this committee and for internal use. Once the glossary is complete we can post the document online.

- Joyce notes that there seems to be no connection between LEP Learning outcomes and program outcomes. Teresa and Pam reported that the assessment academy will be looking to see how they could link and connect. Some think there may be too many outcomes, and it is not always clear how they relate them to courses. Maureen notes that the lack of rubrics on some outcomes makes it difficult to integrate the outcome. AHA teams have drafted some rubrics to address this lack—not all have been approved. This type of feedback is important to bring to both the upcoming spring focus group on LEP and the assessment academy spring 2016 project—tentatively called the LEP mapping project—that the campus will learn more about at January Professional Development Day.
- On Nov. 30, Teresa will be conducting a norming session with Undergraduate Research Judges on using the SmSUFA approved oral communication rubric to judge some of the oral presentations at the Undergraduate Research Conference (URC). This project is being viewed as a pilot project which may suggest how to regularly use the URC as an assessment of oral communication.
- Next meeting's homework: Read the glossary (document attached to meeting invitation in calendar) and come prepared next time to give feedback and suggestions. Teresa will send out ONLY the glossary again for members to review.

Next meeting: Friday, 12/4, 9 a.m., BA 524

Respectfully Submitted by:

Maureen Sander-Staudt