

Committee on Institutional Assessment (CIA)
Wednesday, October 5, 2016
8:00 a.m. BA-524

Present: Chris J. Anderson, Jan Loft, Scott Crowell, Linda Nelson, Nadine Schmidt, Cindy Aamlid, Lori Baker, Matt Zabka, Nancyruth Leibold (phone), and Pam Gladis.

Introduction of members. Welcome to the newest members, Chris J., Matt and Lori.

Review of Minutes:

We still need an Assessment Coordinator and in the meantime we need someone to Chair the CIA. It was mentioned that some members will be gone in two weeks for the CAO/Deans annual fall conference. If someone decides to Chair the group please contact the Provost and Chris Anderson.

Status Report from Assessment Committee:

Letters will be sent to each Program via the Department Chairs during the month of October outlining the status of the matrices project that was conducted last spring
Chris J. Anderson added his experience from working with Middle States. Measurability is always the focus. Better is possible, good is not enough – that’s what HLC is pushing. Striving towards improvement is the goal of HLC’s communication back to universities.
There was considerable discussion about who is analyzing the evidence.

Mini Grant Applications:

Pam Gladis shared the Level One Assessment Mini-grant application submitted by the Ag Education Program, from the Department of Agriculture, Culinology and Hospitality Management. There was a review of the purpose and intent of the grant. It was explained that these grants can be used for food and supplies. This group plans to meet two to three times to develop goals, and to develop student learning outcomes for identified goals.
Why are more people not responding? There are a number of faculty that do not know what the mini-grant is truly about. The first round of “call for grants” was about a month ago; there will be another call on December 1st and then again in March. We could try to be more explicit in the purpose of the grant and the variety of approved ways the grant can be used.

**** Motion 1 **** Scott Crowell moved to approve the min-grant as submitted.

Lori Baker seconded.

Motion passed.

It was suggested that the min-grant Levels should match the “Loop Cycle,” so that the nomenclature is in alignment. Should faculty talk about the mini-grant opportunities at Assembly? It was thought to be a good idea; maybe plan for this at another meeting. It should be shared with the other bargaining units and also everyone should take the mini-grant opportunities back to their Department.

Minnesota Collaborative Project (MCP) Update:

Cindy Aamlid explained it is part of the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. They are exploring whether the rubrics are viable and actually assessing or demonstrating student learning, what needs to be assessed. We are now in year three of collecting and reviewing data. We collect during the academic year and then in the summer trained reviewers to do the work of evaluation. We need 100 pieces of evidence, 100 per subject; intercultural knowledge, ethical reasoning, quantitative

literacy, and civic engagement. It must be a written piece of work due to how evaluations are done. PowerPoints and other types of student work cannot be used for data. Cindy has quantitative literacy covered, there are 8 volunteers for intercultural knowledge, 8 volunteers for ethical reasoning, and 3 more to complete the civic engagement. It is done per instructor and class although the instructor can submit from two different courses. For example, if Lori taught an ENG-151 and ENG- 251 data could be collected from each course. Cindy explained how she is writing a report on what each instructor did and they in turn can use for their own assessment report. How should she share the evaluation results and who should she share with, and how to move forward? Can we start to share without the national results? Cindy also explained students could opt out of their work being part of the individual report but can be used in the aggregate. Cindy could use the aggregate to share even without the national data.

This is high level assessment and a pilot. This can be used as self-assessment proof for accrediting agencies. What happens at the Program is one level, but there should be another level to take a look at the university as a whole. Maybe Cindy's report on campus level written communication should be shared with the CIA. It has been shared with the LEC and the Provost. Is this AAC&U Project working, is it valid and is it doing what it is supposed to be doing? Cindy thought we would hear more in November.

Question: Can we use these mini-grants for the AAC&U related summer work? To help cover in some way faculty to participate?

Timeline:

10/19 – several will be gone. Those who can will still meet and work on cleaning up the mini-grant application for review.

11/2: Jan thinks there might be an AASA Council on 11/2 so we would have to have a tight meeting.

11/16

11/30, 12/14. We have the **URC on the 30th and the 14th is finals week** and faculty will have exams **and there is an ASA Council that day**, so let's ask the Provost to change from the 30th and 14th and **move to the 7th.**

Respectfully,

Jan Loft

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:35 a.m.