

CIA Committee meeting 9/7/17 In attendance: Bell, Jeff; Anderson, Chris; Maureen Sander-Staudt; Borowske, Kate; Crowell, Scott E ; Holmes, Diana; Kovar, Kristin; Leibold, Nancyruth (on phone); Nelson, Linda; Onyeaghala, Raphael; Schaefer, Kathy; Schindler, Frank V; Schmidt, Nadine; Shouse, Aimee D, Watson, Dwight; Zabka, Matthew J.

Meeting began at 3:05. Minutes and other documents were sent again.

1. Assessment academy team met yesterday. They will be scheduling meetings about assessment template for status report that will be going out. The template is a basic guideline but we want them to be personalized for each program. From document:

Insert individualized feedback that includes comments pertaining to:

Assessment cycle level designation

Need for timeline

Content coverage, move to situated assessments

PQS: Praise, Questions, Suggestions

Goal is to get them done by end of Sept. with help of liaison from assessment academy team. Idea is to get programs engaged at the start rather than end of the process. Meetings will go from every 2 weeks to every 4 weeks.

2. Mini-grants: Jeff Bell—one of my duties this summer was to get all mini grants on T drive. Does the entire committee need to look at every one of these mini-grant applications? It would be better to have a sub-committee to attend to do this, of people who enjoy this work, Lori Baker suggested a few names, she will participate but maybe not convene it. Provost: Last year Pam Gladis was the point person, she would bring proposals to Dean, and then to the committee. When approved, CIA would send out a letter of approval, the program would do project, and then send a report. We did them in parcels, e.g. 3 a meeting, but a sub-committee would free up time in meetings. JB: Envisioning an electronic process. CA: Could have 3 deadlines, then sub-committee could do them in waves. General discussion: It did not seem to take much time to do this in meeting times, and committee would not be in loop about what assessment is going on. Like FIG grants, if no report is submitted, then cannot apply for another. Q: Are there criteria and objective standards for proposals? Provost: we look at proposal and goals, and if they seem to fit and be productive they are approved. But is there is a template that is more user friendly. Provost—if the current process is not broken we will not fix it JB: As we go on we may have bigger tasks, but if group thinks it is manageable we can keep it the same. LN: For those who submit they may get useful feedback from the committee. Provost: we can keep 3 cycles and in 1st cycle we can bring to committee and if it gets cumbersome, then can switch to sub-committee. We will keep Lori Baker as the point person for these submissions. The person on the committee who represents the program submitting abstains from voting, but can provide important info. The process also informs new people of how to submit a proposal. How to assure reporting? Dean should encourage, also program director, chairs, etc. It may be that chairs do not even know that some programs have submitted proposal for mini grant. LS: At other schools, programs cannot submit curriculum proposals if assessment reports are not filed, but this is heavy handed. DW: Chairs should request reports, noting that the Dean and committee has noticed failure to report. JB will send a reminder e-mail to those who failed to file reports. CA: Do we have a template? JB: There are specific directions. Discussion: A template would help guide the process. Having done this I provided amount, results, and some data. We should find a few good ones and draw out desired points. Jeff B will work on this.

3. All members of committee should have access to T Drive: smsu.shares/assessment academy project year two/ay 16 17 Department Annual Reports. Are these public documents that Alan

can allow all access (to committee)? This drive should have limited access to just committee members. Alan needs to know whether Nancy Ruth can remotely access these within permissions and cisco private access. DW: These will be stored on T drive, and relevant files will be e-mailed to committee for meetings as needed.

4. Discussion, prioritization, and refinement of CIA goals 17-18: Template has accomplishments listed on left, goals/tasks on right with timeline.

A) Interact with LEC—we have done this in past, and this is a top priority.

B) Review assessments of rubrics and outcomes. What other assessments do we have for other outcomes? Where are specific and universal assessments, e.g. Moorberg Letter, moral reasoning assessment—MS: which we have one in Philosophy but it is specific and not a general assessment that could be used in all courses under this goal. Provost: An entire meeting and maybe more should be devoted to this. LS: Do we want to collaborate with LEC about possible revisions. DW: We want to look just at assessment components. LS: We need assessments that are practical and doable?

C) Review CIA brainstorming in response to HLC: Responses to results of focus visit, need to make it imperative to get through the chart, prioritize tasks, and bring to next meeting.

D) Put together university wide assessment plan, start with procedure we already have and work from there. This is almost complete. Would like this committee to look at this draft to make corrections, revisions. The goal is to look at what we are doing and align them with what we should be doing. This will be at least 1-2 sessions depending upon how much prior reading we have done. This is the committee to first vet this and then send to others.

E) Participating with liaisons—what is role of CIA with program assessment. As we put together artifacts and summary reports, CIA committee must vet these. HLC committee is divided into 5 sub-groups, criterion 4 was assessment, and CIA and the sub-group 4 needs to work together.

F) CIA advance guidance for criterion 4 HLC sub-group: Make sure that focus visit is refined, and there is a plan for how to address the assessment piece, the sub-group is comprised of CIA members

G) Plan and implement assessment activities: Poster template will be arriving to all in next few weeks. We want to identify old and new projects, and if there is carry-over we from 2016-17 let us know and we will move to 2017-18.

H) Others? #7—Nancy Ruth looked at vendors and activities related to diversity. Found an assessment tool for diversity but it was too expensive, so we may wish to discuss universal assessment tools, look at what we have, and what needs to be added. Work closely with the LEC, to show HLC that SLOs are being tracked and being assessed on levels/years 1-4 on program level, but also ask do we have universal level assessments that are not program based, e.g. signature assignments that are implemented across different programs in flexible way, so it is not only one specific tool. LS: We should look for tools and examples that will help us draft our own. CA: Do we have a single syllabus format? No, So how can we have universal assessments? DW: This is a problem I have noted from the start. This is not the kind of culture where this type of approach will work very well. JB: In past in assembly, suggestions were well received, but required singular syllabus were not. The idea is that for any course that meets LEC goals, a statement about how these goals are being assessed. LS: Should this not be put in a report, students do not need to know this, per se. NS: This is being drafted as part of Rollie's course outline project. Assessment should be a more explicit part of this. JB: This is the kind of thing that needs to be brought to LEC. We can expand on our course outlines to include assessment that filters through Deans, Chairs, Programs.

Feel free to add any agenda items in future, just e-mail Jeff. JB moves to adjourn. KS seconds.Meeting adjourned 3:57.