

CIA Meeting

Date: Friday, October 2, 2015

Time: 9-10:15 a.m.

Room: BA 524

Present: Teresa Henning, Jan Loft, Nadine Schmidt, Pam Gladis, Marcia Beukelman, Alan Matzner, Rick Robinson, Joyce Hwang, Monica Miller, Kathy Schaefer, Maureen Sander, Jay Brown, Dwight Watson

Information Items:

- Meeting days and times for the fall semester; 9-10:15 these remaining Fridays: 11/6, 11/20, 12/4, possible meeting during finals week? TBA
- **Please note: The 10/23 meeting is cancelled.**
- Assessment mini grants – Teresa reported that we have received one application from Nursing. There was discussion about how to review the application and make a decision, whether to have a meeting, leave the decision up to Teresa, or some other arrangement. Jan observed that Laurie Jo has submitted grant applications before, so this one is likely to be a good proposal. It was decided that Teresa will send the application via email and members can let her know if they have any concerns about approving the application. Teresa expects two more applications to be submitted in the December round.
- AHA Team reports – Following is the language describing the review process that is being followed:

Each AHA Team will prepare a summary report on their assigned student learning outcome by the end of September in the following academic year. These reports will be delivered to the LEC and the CIA and will describe both the processes for data collection and the implications of the data.

By the end of October, the LEC will prepare a summary report based on the work of all of the previous year's AHA Teams and deliver this report to the SMSU Faculty Assembly, after which the individual reports and the summary will be distributed to the campus community and posted online. Both the LEC and individual programs will use assessment results to propose adjustments to their respective curricula. <http://www.smsu.edu/resources/webspaces/academics/liberaleducationprogram/lep%20assessment%20plan/smsu%20lep%20assessment%20plan%20adopted%202-14-13.pdf>

Teresa and other committee members provided status updates on the various reports as follows:

Regarding the Civic Engagement report, Teresa noted they have 40 pages of data, and are supposed to have a draft report in later in the day (Friday, October 2).

Regarding the Creative Thinking report, Teresa noted the team is behind schedule, but they did a great project last year and are working on processing that data. Their project consisted of reviewing artifacts from LEP 400 using a rubric. Only three faculty have submitted artifacts so

far. Teresa asked the committee members to encourage others to submit artifacts. The team's preliminary report is due October 12. Teresa is allowing only this team to have until the last day of classes (December 11) to turn in a final report.

Jay reported that his team (Communicate Effectively) has finished their report and it is posted on the T drive.

Teresa noted that the Annual Report from the Department of Fine Arts and Communication was very helpful. It included data and reports on assessment, which Teresa forwarded for use in the reports for Communicate Effectively and Creative Thinking. Teresa would like the assessment portion of this department's report to serve as a model for other departments.

Pam and Teresa provided an update on the Critical Thinking team's work. Data from LEP 100 has been very helpful. It has been a little confusing for faculty since LEP 400 assessment is going on at same time. The team received data from three sections. The team is meeting Monday. It has been difficult while Lori Baker is on sabbatical because she has a great store of knowledge regarding this outcome. The team is getting close to completion. They will have a solid draft soon, which probably will need just minor edits.

Teresa reported that the Diversity and Physical World reports went to the LEC Tuesday and will be passed on to SMSUFA after that.

There were some questions about the form in which these reports will be presented to the Assembly. Will there be a summary and also some way to access full reports?

There were questions about the approval process for rubrics. Do they go to the Executive Committee first and then Assembly? The consensus was that this is indeed the process, and it was noted the rubrics do not go through the full Curriculum process.

Teresa believes that the progress and plans described above will bring all AHA reports back on schedule.

- Additional item – Teresa provided an update on the MBA assessment, which had been a point of concern for the HLC. Teresa met with Mike Rich and a grad student named Bruno, who had conducted a literature review. They have drafted SLOs for the program. The faculty have not reviewed these yet, but the process is underway. They understand the faculty review and approval process, and Teresa will assist them as they move through this process. Mike will send the revised SLOs to Teresa and she will post them, noting that they are provisional until they have gone through the approval process.

Action Items:

- Respond to Alan's draft of a first-year student survey (see your email for the link he will provide)

The committee reviewed the survey. There was some clarification and fine tuning of language to specify who is sending the survey, "your experience" vs. "our performance," "time with us" vs.

“time here”/ “thus far,” “appreciate it,” and adding in a mention of the number of questions and estimated time to take the survey.

There were also the following discussions about each question on the survey:

Question 1 (reasons for choosing SMSU) – Alan noted the choices are randomized. Should we allow them to choose more than one? (All that apply, primary and secondary?) Yes, Alan can add that. Perhaps we should ask for the main factors or the top three, or limit how many they can choose so they don’t choose all of them as a default. Teresa noted that this is a pilot, so we could allow them to click all and see how that affects outcomes.

Question 2 (academic planning and advising) – As first semester students, do they have enough experience with academic planning and advising to answer? Dr. Watson noted that this question measures their perception of the experience. Monica observed it might capture whether they have a very good or a very bad experience. Alan asked if we want to send the survey out in October, or do we want to send it out after advising day? Teresa said she would feel better sending after Advising. Alan noted that if we want to take a measure between freshmen and seniors, we might want to do the surveys around the same time of year. There was general concern that this question could be setting us up for low ratings. Maureen asked if we could have a “don’t know/does not apply” option. Monica and Joyce suggested adding “thus far.” Jay noted some students would have received advising of a sort at Registration, and perhaps we could ask about that. Everyone liked the suggestion to add “thus far.” Pam asked if they will understand the difference between advising and degree planning. Some programs are more specific about degree planning than others. Jan noted that undeclared students would not have degree planning. Pam asked if there is a follow up question for ratings less than 3 stars; Alan said yes. Kathy noted that the opportunity for one-on-one meetings with students affects degree planning. Should we add a “no experience” column? Alan commented that comparing results from Freshmen and Senior surveys will affect how to ask this question. Jay observed that the two surveys serve as a kind pre-/post-test. There was concern that we need to differentiate between lack of experience and a bad experience. Jan contributed that feedback from the Admissions exit survey provided lots of specific comments about advising. This survey will, too. Would a “no experience” option become a default? Should we leave as is for the pilot, to see the quality of feedback? Nadine asked if “course selection” was about assistance with course selection or availability of courses. There was discussion to change this item to “course availability.” Does this need to be changed on senior survey, too? Yes. Kathy noted this item could then help clarify differences between course availability between spring and summer registrations.

Question 3 (confidence in skills) – There was discussion about rankings – high to low vs low to high. People are accustomed to seeing left to right, low to high. It was also noted that if this item is asked in the form of question, it needs question marks after each item. Monica suggested the wording, “Please rate your confidence in your ability to:” Alan noted there is a difference in format if the survey is taken on a phone; options open up in a drop-down menu. In that case, students might expect to see “Excellent” at the top. Joyce commented the scaled answers might also say “Very confident,” “somewhat confident,” etc. If the language is changed to “rate your confidence,” we can keep “excellent,” “very good,” etc.

Question 4 (satisfaction) – There was discussion to make the scale like the scale in the previous question. The more consistency there is in scale, the better for validity of data. There was discussion about including word “satisfaction.” We would like to add a follow up question if students report dissatisfaction.

Question 5 (recommending SMSU) – There was discussion to add “to others,” instead of specifying to parents, students, etc. We would like to add a follow up question if a student answers this question with a “no.”

Question 6 (faculty/staff contribution) – President Gores wants to encourage and appreciate faculty who are positively affecting the lives of students. Suggestion to change “that made” to “who have made.”

Alan sought the committee’s feedback on several questions regarding the following:

Title of the survey for the distribution email and at the top of each page – The general consensus was “first semester satisfaction survey.” We prefer not to use the term “freshmen.” What’s the admissions survey called?

Timing of the survey – October or after advising? We don’t want to give the students survey fatigue. Earlier the better? The consensus was to conduct the survey after Fall Break. It was noted we can survey all the first year students, or take sample of 100 (or half) to survey early, then can do another sample after advising. Everyone liked this idea. There was more discussion about group vs. individual advising in both summer registration and regular advising.

Undergrad degree seeking as survey pool – do we want to survey both traditional and transfer students? Yes. Alan can differentiate results by type.

How soon can we get data? The survey will be open for a week to 10 days. Alan said we can get data relatively fast, and can identify by each student’s discipline.

Alan can also add a “back” button so students can return to earlier questions.

Alan asked if the committee wants to see another draft. The consensus was that there is no need and Alan can proceed after today’s changes are made.

- Brainstorm about what role the CIA should have in addressing HLC concerns (see attached report pages 23-25 and 27-28) (this item was not addressed at the last meeting)

Teresa provided a sample of a response to one item, along with a template that can be used to respond to the other items. Teresa had planned a group activity, but we ran out of time at this meeting. Teams of two volunteered to develop responses to the remaining items, as follows: Dwight and Jan, page 6; Nadine and Pam, page 3; Monica and Jay, page 4; Kathy and Joyce, page 2; Marcia and Maureen, page 5. Teresa asked members to send her these responses before the next meeting on November 6, and she will prepare them for review at that meeting.