

Committee for Institutional Assessment
Wednesday, December 7, 2016
8:00 – 9:00 a.m., BA524

Agenda

Present: Dwight Watson, Jan Loft, Scott Crowell, Linda Nelson, Michael Kurowski, Matt Zabka, Alan Matzner, Kathy Schaefer, Lori Baker, Pam Gladis, Cindy Aamlid, Nadine Schmidt; Nancyruth Leibold and Chris J. Anderson via phone

1. Review minutes (see attachment) – Thanks to Lori Baker for the minutes from the last meeting. Minutes passed with the correction of the spelling of Nancyruth's last name (Leibold).
2. Secure today's minute taker – Nadine volunteered to take minutes.
3. Graduate Assessment Update (MBA) – Dwight and Raphael met with Denise Gochenouer and Mike Rich to review what was submitted last year. They will jumpstart this assessment once again, as graduate education is a key point of our focused HLC review. Dwight and Raphael will meet with Denise and Mike again this week regarding moving forward with the plan. The plan envisions 5 blocks within the MBA assessment, so they will be submitting SLOs which will be threaded through all 5 blocks, with a signature assignment in each block, and a capstone (portfolio). This plan is a hybrid of two sets of faculty opinions and would incorporate formative and summative assessment. The plan will need to represent all areas of the MBA program, including accounting and finance, management and leadership, strategic marketing, international economics, managerial economics, legal, etc., so assessment by blocks makes sense to capture the entire experience, with a portfolio to bring everything together as a capstone.
4. Discuss Spanish Proposal for Assessment Funds (see attached) – Jan let the committee know that this application should be set aside for now.
5. Discuss English proposal for Assessment Funds (see attached) – Kathy moved and Jan seconded approval of this application and the motion passed. Discussion included that this is a Level 3 application, and Lori explained that the Department has an established rotating cycle, and artifacts for different courses are reviewed each year. Faculty decided to combine the review of ENG 099 and ENG 151 to try to avoid inflated results noticed in the past in the review of ENG 099 artifacts. Artifacts are chosen via random sample out of all sections of a course, including College Now. Each artifact is read twice and scored on a rubric. Ratings are done in the spring, with a subsequent report to the Department, then they “close the loop” in the fall or the following spring by conducting a follow-up meeting to discuss and decide on an approach to address the results of the assessment. ENG 251 is up next to go through this cycle. The requested funds are for food and pens (for marking/scoring, a common need). Given the budget proposal, the

Committee recommends a transfer of \$175 to cover the stated expenses (rather than the full \$200 available).

6. Discuss Psychology proposal for Assessment Funds (see attached) – Scott moved to approve the application, Cindy seconded, and the motion passed. This Level 2 application proposes to purchase and evaluate the use of the ACAT assessment instrument. The Committee noted it seems a good match with the program SLOs. The grant award is \$200, and the Psychology Program will contribute the additional \$20 required.
7. Nursing –Scott moved to approve this Level 4 application, and Jan seconded. Nursing is requesting \$200 to purchase food for meetings during which they will “strategize, create, and initiate” their assessment plan. The Committee noted there were not many details on what would be done during these meetings. There may be additional files that are part of the application but accidentally didn’t get forwarded to the Committee. The Committee decided to hold the vote on this proposal until Dr. Watson can check on the additional files. Matt moved to table discussion, Lori seconded, and the motion passed. Update: Dr. Watson sent the additionally files and called for a vote via email and the application was approved.

Dr. Watson noted he was glad that we received a good number of proposals.

8. Encourage nominations for the HLC/Assessment Coordinator position – Dr. Watson isn’t sure if the call for this position has been widely distributed. Faculty had desired a fixed term replacement for the reassigned time, but there is no money available for that. This fact might engender people not applying, but that is how the situation stands. The SMSUFA Executive Committee expressed a preference for only tenured faculty to be considered for this position. Dr. Watson prefers that the call be open to all faculty, and left up to individual faculty discernment. Dr. Watson feels this position could be a legitimate part of service which could contribute to promotion. The objection to fixed term might be because fixed-terms are one-year positions and this position is a two-year position. Possibly a fixed-term person in this position could get a guarantee of two years? Having a fixed-term person in this position may not lend towards consistency, but at this point, we need someone who is willing. Dr. Watson would like to open the position to as large a pool as possible. If there is still no result, we will know we’ve exhausted all options.
9. Assessment Academy and LEC Meeting – Pam and Alan – The Assessment Academy will meet with the LEC on January 17 at 3:30 pm in BA 524 to open the discussion about where we anticipate that project going, so it will largely be a communication meeting. We’ve been through one cycle of LEP assessment, and we need to figure out whether to amend or change that process. The Assessment Academy team can contribute to that discussion. What will happen next after the Assessment Academy project is complete and where do we go with it? The CIA may be involved in this discussion moving forward. CIA members are welcome to come to the January 17 meeting.

10. Survey Catalog – Alan gave a brief overview of the data on the Data Management and Institutional Research page (<https://www.smsu.edu/administration/datamanagementinstitutionalresearch/>) He is trying to collect information on all student-data-type surveys going out around campus, so please let Alan know if you know of any. Alan gave an overview of the surveys already on the list: (https://www.smsu.edu/resources/webspaces/administration/datamanagementinstitutionalresearch/Survey_Catolog.pdf - this link may be updated). Some of these surveys may need review and comment by the CIA on whether/how to continue, and some may need adjustment; for example, it might make more sense to conduct the entry survey later than 10 days into the semester or within First Year Seminar. Perhaps we should align the first year survey more with the senior survey to provide better pre-/post results. NSSE is being done again in 2017. Would we also want a survey in the middle between first year and senior year – to gain a diagnostic at midpoint? We want everybody to have an articulated understanding of assessment, and want students to have an articulated understanding of SLOs and be able to articulate their progress toward SLOs. More discussion on this will be added to a future agenda.
11. Scheduling Meeting for the Spring – Fall meetings have been opposite Assessment Academy meetings. A couple of members have 8:30 MWF classes next semester. Tuesdays also have some issues – 9 am classes, Transfer Pathways, etc. The Committee settled on 8 am on Thursdays, remembering that Cabinet meetings are at 9 am or 10 am on Thursdays. The first meeting will be January 12, then every other Thursday. Linda noted she will be in the Testing Center on some Thursday mornings due to the testing schedule. In a subsequent email, Dr. Watson listed the meeting dates below, with all meetings at 8:00 am in BA 524:
- January 12
 - January 19 (The first two meetings are back to back because Dr. Watson will be off campus on January 26.)
 - February 9
 - February 23
 - March 16
 - March 30
 - April 13
 - April 27
12. Need members from Finance and Accounting and the Sciences – We still have gaps in our Committee membership, so what should we do? It's not unusual to have gaps on this Committee. Class/lab times can affect who is able to volunteer. The Deans will follow up with department chairs. Jan has already heard back from the Sciences, and they will have no representative to put forward. It's good to still publish minutes, especially for those who don't have representatives, though if the minutes are readily available, are people then less likely to volunteer?
13. Other – Assessment Day – We usually have a speaker in the morning, and afternoons are designated to work within programs. Should we have an update of the Assessment

Academy project? Does the Assessment Academy need programs to do work for that project on that day? We need to know where programs are and provide help to those who need it. We need an overall topic related to all for the morning session. There was a question about whether departments could provide an overview of where they are. This process has already started with the assessment status reports sent out earlier this semester, but perhaps Assessment Day could be used to strengthen this process. It was helpful when some sort of report was required at the end of Assessment Day to provide an update on what was accomplished. We would like to include co-curricular conversations that day as well; for example, helping faculty to understand more about what Student Services and co-curricular elements contribute to the SLOs and how to integrate the two sides. If the whole morning isn't taken up with a speaker, it would be helpful for some programs who are reviewing artifacts for assessment that day to have some morning time in addition to the afternoon.

14. Cindy update on VALUE project – Cindy reported that they are rolling out all the data finally. There is a meeting set up in January for Minnesota schools to discuss and figure out how to move forward with the data that is being released.
15. Adjourn – The meeting adjourned at 9:15 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Nadine Purvis Schmidt