

CIA Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 15, 2020
Recorded by Nadine Purvis Schmidt

Present: Benjamin Anderson, Lori Baker, Jeff Bell, Kate Borowske, Lamine Conteh, Scott Crowell, Tony Greenfield, Yumi Lim, Alan Matzner, Raphael Onyeaghala, Lindsay Rohlik, Nadine Schmidt, Aimee Shouse, LeAnne Syring, Ross Wastvedt, Matt Zabka

<p>1. Consent to Agenda – Yes with no revisions</p>
<p>2. Approve 10/1/20 Minutes – Thanks to Lori – Scott moved, Tony seconded. Minutes approved unanimously.</p>
<p>3. Review 2020-2021 Work Plan Prioritization – Jeff reviewed the work plan, what items were high, medium, and low priorities, as well as what is on today’s agenda and what will be coming up in future meetings (such as HERI). Jeff will send out reminder that mini-grants are available. We are close to being able to review RASL reports.</p>
<p>4. Announcement – There will be a CIA Team in Microsoft Teams for internal work, for agendas, minutes, etc., so that items can be shared there vs. emailed out.</p>
<p>5. Update – Assessment “Dashboard” Investigation of Microsoft Teams – Lindsay, Yumi, Jeff, and Kate met with Ben in the TRC. Lindsay gave an update. We have 40+ programs to keep track of. Kate has created a “sandbox”. We can give appropriate access to those who need it. There will be different channels for different programs. Yumi added that Kate created a Team for CIA to use for testing and practicing how to use Teams. Jeff added that the CIA can have access to the Program channels. Teams is more user-friendly than the T drive, and better than having to purchase a separate dashboard-type program.</p> <p>Later in the meeting, we returned to this agenda item (Kate was meeting with student). Kate showed what is in Teams so far. Kate set up channels with Posts and Files. We can customize with other available tools as needed. CIA has its own channel, to post comments and replies, and to keep files. Each department can have its own channel, and we can set it up so only that department and the CIA (or specific CIA members) can access. It’s a good idea to start out simple, as some people find Teams overwhelming. Posts and Files are a good start, and we could probably do everything we need to do with those two tools. Jeff mentioned each program can upload documents and discuss their documents in Teams. We can also ask them to upload their summary to separate channel. Kate noted that Teams avoids the problem of having to remember everyone to include in emails. You can @ the channel or team name to post a comment for everyone in that group.</p>
<p>6. RASL Submissions and Program Self-Evaluation Submissions Update – Jeff reported several RASLs have been submitted in the last few days. We’re still waiting on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accounting – Jeff has spoken with Will Thomas and he is working on completing• Ag Business, Ag Communications & Leadership, and Agronomy – These programs had aimed for 9/30 completion date. Raphael will touch base with Gerry Toland.• Art – Kate has met with Alma Hale.

- PE Coaching of Sport master's program – Jeff has talked with Frankie Albitz and expects the RASL today or by the end of the month.
- PE Recreation and Sports Management – no update
- Social Work – Lindsay met with Rick Robinson on 10/8 and offered help. The program has some work to do, and no specific deadline is set. Lindsay will follow up. Aimee mentioned that Social Work is finalizing work to get approved for an online program from their accrediting body, so that might be taking precedence over the RASL right now.

Question – If follow-up efforts with a program don't yield results, what does Jeff suggest? Jeff said to let him know, and he can send them an email and cc their dean. The preferred approach is encouragement, but sometimes cc'ing the dean helps. Aimee said she could encourage programs.

7. **LEP Assessment Rotation and Plan Update & Next Steps** – Jeff met with the LEC last week on 10/6. The LEC endorsed the framework of the plan that Ben and Lori put together. There was discussion of how we might be able to use the planning year to have LEC do a curriculum review of learning outcomes. Aimee explained that the year prior to doing assessment of a goal is the planning year, and part of the planning would be the curriculum review, to make sure courses are still following the learning outcomes.

There was a small alteration to the plan because the Library is assessing information literacy this year, so that outcome got moved up a year. This year's assessment of information literacy is being done in LEP 101. If we can also get capstone courses involved, we can get some backend data to compare to the LEP 101 data. The next time this outcome comes around, we could add an additional piece, and continue to develop the assessment further over time. Jeff asked about how to identify capstone courses that would be useful for information literacy assessment.

Yumi mentioned her program is revising program SLOs to include information literacy, and will revise rubrics to follow. It would be helpful to know what is being used for LEP 101. It was suggested that Pam could explain in a Chairs meeting how info lit is being assessed in LEP 101. Aimee can share the LEP 101 info with chairs at the next meeting. There was discussion of a possible Assessment Day program on how to assess info lit within programs, and a possible Professional Development Day session on university-level assessment vs. program-level assessment of info lit.

How many capstone courses are happening now in the fall semester? Most are probably in spring. Lori noted that since it's the first time through assessing this outcome, if we don't have complete data from every capstone, we'll have another round before the next HLC visit. Some capstones are in fall due to the Undergraduate Research Conference (URC). Tony observed that it might be good timing to assess info lit in the sciences in the week or so after the URC. Tony reported that they have used work mapped to the approved rubric for their majors.

8. **Funding LEP Assessment?** – Jeff noted that when we do start having direct assessment of artifacts, the time, energy, and effort that requires will take time away from evaluators' other

major roles on campus. Could evaluators get a duty day in line with the contract, or a stipend, or something? How would we fund that in a time of tight budgets? Ross noted the Provost's Office could potentially support, but he would have to look into it.

Jeff thought putting this task into the next strategic plan might give it some priority, and maybe the cost could come from the assessment budget. It costs about \$4.5K-6K for a guest speaker and a normal assessment day (including reception, posters, etc.). That's about half of the assessment budget. Mini-grants have been around \$1K, so usually there are additional funds left in the assessment budget. We could fence off those funds for direct assessment of artifacts.

We would need a fair process for figuring out who gets the duty days. Jeff asked Aimee, Raphael, and Ross how we could do that in regards to the contract from an administrator point of view. Aimee said it would likely need to be a duty day, and for other efforts, we have done some half duty days. There is no mechanism for a stipend, or for anything outside the Faculty Workload Management system.

Jeff asked Lori about assessing the Written Communication outcome, if there were 20 manuscripts to look at and score with the rubric, how long would that take? Lori said it depends on how long the artifacts are, and whether they are double-rated. Lori said that would be a good question for Amanda Bemer. Typically English uses Assessment Day, has 6-7 faculty scoring, and they work from approximately 11 am to 3 pm. As a ballpark, they usually score around 60 papers. They have scaled back how many papers they score, after an HLC person said they don't have to look at them all. Faculty have taken papers home to complete scoring.

Jeff mentioned we are looking to add more discipline specific papers to the capstone assessment. Would 3 people scoring over a full 8 hours work? Lori said maybe 4 people would be better, with faculty representing other areas in addition to English. Evaluators would need an anchoring session, doing a couple of sample papers together so that everyone is on the same page. SAT and GRE essay raters look at a lot of papers in one day. Lori said since the mechanism is in place, the time is for just doing the ratings, not having to create the system, so that's helpful.

There was discussion of whether a ¼-credit would be possible, but since it's a specific day, a duty day may be more appropriate unless it's ongoing work throughout the semester. Aimee pointed out that a ¼-credit costs more than a duty day. Jeff noted we have to learn as we go, but at least we have some thoughts going in, so that we can have a more meaningful discussion in the future.

9. **Other** – None

10. **Adjourn** – 4:17 pm

Respectfully submitted by Nadine Purvis Schmidt on 10/19/2020.