CIA/LEC Joint Meeting 10/23/18

CIA In attendance: X Alan Matzner, X Kristin Kovar (Agriculture, Culinology, & Hospitality Management), X Kate Borowske (McFarland Library Services), X Dianna Holmes, X Nancyruth Leibold (Nursing) (By phone), X Matt Zabka (Mathematics & Computer Science), X LeAnne Syring (Education) , X Cindy Aamlid (Social Science), X Nadine Schmidt (Fine Arts & Communication), XAbu Haddud (Management & Marketing), X Kathy Schaefer (Management & Marketing), X Maureen Sander-Staudt (English, Philosophy, Spanish, & Humanities), X Lamine Conteh (Accounting, Finance, & Legal Studies), X Aimee Shouse, X Provost Watson

LEP: Mark Fokken, Pam Gladys, Sang Jung, Jeff Kolnick, Michael Kurowski, Maureen Sander-Staudt, Aimee Shouse, Tom Williford, Will Thomas

1. Consent to agenda—agenda accepted.
2. Liaison team restructuring—the last update will be sent. It was revised to avoid double duty to LEC members. We will move KB to the 1st group (marketing, accounting, management, finance). If you do not have access to the T Drive please send name to JB, most of the LEC members need it, as well and NancyRuth.
3. JB: Those who have reviewed RASLS, how is it going? MZ: Should the program mission statement be included? A: Some may not have them, some do. They may be in assessment folders/program reviews/annual reports and not all of us have access to these. KS: We have not yet written letters but just answered the questions and checklists. NS: We went through our programs and also answered the questions and met today to compare notes which we compiled in a master document, as well as side comments about the process. A question arose about whether there was a letter template sent. JB: This will be resent. CA: I looked at what was sent in previous years from reviewers, sometimes they were just a copy of the hand-written comments, and sometimes a formal letter. KS: It would be nice to have this information stored somewhere with a drop down format, do not need to draft lengthy process. JB: Maybe a rubric? NS: We discussed that this would be helpful as well as checklist. DW: We have a model rubric that we are looking at in Assessment Academy. But this first time though it makes more sense to have the checklist to assure all items are present. MSS: It would be nice for the programs to also have the checklist to indicate whether the items are present when they submit their RASLs. PG: It is good to have another set of eyes to really assure that all of the items are present. JB: Please send all feedback on the process and how we can improve the RASL and its instructions, accessing T Drive folders. I will read it after the HLC visit. AH: In reading these RASLS they are all constructed quite differently and it is puzzling given that all were given the same directions. If we had one standard format using Google on-line,and then submit electronically, sorting them into appropriate files. I could likely help to set this up. DW: We do have a shared template in Excel. JB: Some moved to word, some to PDF, some had own form. MF: As LEC member and new to process, should I be reading more closely in step 3, and also do step 1 and 2? JB: My assumption is that you would have to do step 1 and 2 to do step 3, but you should focus more closely on step 3. MF: Should this be a separate letter, or one? JK: It should be one. PG: But it should not just be to the program, LEC will also want to see all of the information, which could be done on a singular document. KS: The questions were written such that we check yes, or missing. NS: Sometimes we may want to give more

qualitative feedback, because it could be helpful to program and CIA revisions. In past we were encouraged to use Praise, Questions, Suggestions. MSS: The qualitative feedback can be very valuable and we do not want to squander the opportunity given that we are putting so much time into this.

4. Ben Anderson has made an attempt to aggregate data on communication goal, was it assessed, what was the tool, results, etc. 17 programs--Most use paper (7) , 3 portfolio, etc. Only 3 used approved SMSU communication rubric, 12 self-designed rubric. Because so many are self-designed, we cannot aggregate and compare results. DW: We designed a value rubric, and we said that you can use it or modify it. Maybe we can look at how close the self-designed rubric is to the value rubric. Ben Anderson also did not have rubrics because many were not submitted, so if you use a rubric, please submit it with your reports. But 14 programs submitted quantitative data and 13 recommendations. JK: Why do we need one rubric if we are all making programmatic recommendations? JB: At some point we need to make comparisons and try to assess where students are at, growing, etc. DW: Both can be useful. JK: This is a long term conversation. We can assess LEP outcomes differently than program specific SLOs. JB: We do not want to tell any program that they must adopt a specific rubric to aggregate data. CA: There is a way to do it. If you teach a class on a certain goal, you take a sample of artifacts, and you use a common rubric and team to assess. JK: This labor could be cheap, but not free. CA: This could be part of offering a certain LEP goal. JB: We do not need to do all at once, can rotate yearly. JB: Much on this spread sheet is very positive. We can show that students have grown and met minimum requirements.

5. Brainstorming on moving forward after HLC visit and assessment academy: JK: Is there a budget line for continued assessment? DW: Yes, in assessment academy, we need to discuss whether this should go into the general fund. JK: One question we may be asked is if these efforts is sustainable. These conversations are important and the amount of funds should not be 0. KS: Having a leader helps to organize and motivate. DW: The human resources are still there, many of the same people on AA are on CIA and/or LEP. Maintaining the funding sources is important. JB: I am interested in continuing this work. DW: We have contracted JB for 2 years and we will see if we have JB continue this work. JK: We could also have summer duty days and develop a common rubric to generate usable results. DW: The AA can move forward with a proposal for sustainable assessment. JB: Can the CIA and LEC both come up with a list of item to bring to the AA to help draft this proposal. DW: Does LEC have a workplan like CIA and AA? AS: Not exactly, but there are common items. Returning to the letter—I also did checklist, but also substantive comments. But putting all of this information into another form may be unneeded extra work. We could proceed by using different colored ink, like Kathy and Matt did, to compile comments from each review team member. DW: Better yet, meet in person with the programs. This may be more time intensive but would be more memorable, and mutually educative. AH: But then there will be different feedback because the review teams are different. DW: But in this first round it may be necessary to be more subjective, but the process will become more objective eventually, and our programs are hungry for feedback. MSS: But it would be helpful to have review teams to meet together at least once to calibrate these findings prior to meeting with programs. DW: What is the timeline? JB: We would like to have feedback to programs this semester. I would encourage liaison teams to meet as soon as that is possible, but not

required. DW: So we are not going to capture it in letter form but in conversation? MSS: Do we not want a record of review team feedback? JB: We have a review form. DW: Make comments on the review form and summarize comments. Should we have next steps? AS: It would be good to have a record of recommendations so in the future we can check to see whether the recommendations has been followed up on. KS: The questions do not indicate the need to give feedback. MF: It does say this on the bottom on page 1—"make comments and recommendations based on data gathered on review form. But there are 2 forms, only the latest, Oct. 8 has that line, so be sure to use that form.