CIA

**Friday, October 18, 2013**

**Time:  10:30am – 11:45am**

**Room:  BA 524**

**Present:** Betsy Desy, Lori Baker, Pam Sukalski, Wiji Wijesiri, Monica Miller, Sangnyeol Jung, Alan Matzner, Christine Olson, Nadine Schmidt, Linda Nelson, Jan Loft, Rhonda Bonnstetter, Jay Brown, Carrie Hansen and Michael Cheng.

**Absent:** Scott Crowell, Marcia Beukelman, and Mike Rich.

**Guests:** Provost Weatherby and President Gores.

**Informational Items:**

* Lunch and Learns for 2013-2014
	+ - Fa1l 2013
* Christine Olson--discussion of Civic-Minded Graduate (CMG) results in ST-218 (Oct. 24). This has been posted on *SMSU Today*.
* Jay Brown—“Research across the University” (Nov. 7) hopefully in CH-217.
	+ - Spring 2014
			* Assessment of student affairs (Crowell)
			* Information literacy throughout the curriculum
			* Presentation of latest NSSE data?

**Action Items:**

* Greetings from President Connie Gores: The President informed the group that in her next column in the *Marshall Independent* she will focus on civic engagement.

Discussion: Betsy Desy briefly explained the history of the CIA, which typically had been comprised of faculty, but upon Linda Suskie’s advice, now has a complement of members from across the campus. The President thanked all for serving on the CIA. Assessment is important in higher education and certainly at this time. The President looks at assessment not so much as something forced upon us but sees assessment as a learning process, to explore how the improve, to help the institution. It is developmental and positive.

What is important to the CIA, questions from the group or clarifications? How will we as a committee be supportive of the HLC process, is there something we should be thinking about to do between now and the visit? They will want to know what is our assessment plan, what are the roles of the CIA, do we follow the plan, what do we do with the data once we have it, how do we use the data once collected, do we have a “spiral of improvement,” a use the data for the future? Assessment, budgeting and other components all come together under the broad rubric of assessment. Think integration of what happens across the campus; do we have a comprehensive approach? If we have a model are we following the model, and what are we learning about what we do? Everyone having an assessment plan and process and that the plan/process is followed is very important. The HLC will understand that areas will be at different levels of planning; but we need to have plans in place and that we follow the plans. We do have an ambitious plan, presented last year at the HLC. It is very integrated and not yet to the point that all parts are being utilized. We are at the first bullet point; we’ve done a lot of work on that. Overseeing all programs is where we perhaps are not following quite yet…we know theoretically what we want to do but are not everything yet, such as reviewing Program Reviews/Self-Studies and Annual Reports. President Gores explained that the HLC does not expect us to be perfect but improvements and progress will be noted and noticed.

There was considerable discussion on the language of the original charge to the CIA. Are all components of the charge still relevant, should some portions be deleted, added or changed? Broader based? There should be a link between the Program Reviews and the CIA and the Provost.

Review of the Jay Brown designed “Catalyst/Reactant” model: When looking at the truly integrated student learning process there should be two groups involved, one involving student affairs. How do we truly address institutional assessment beyond academic assessment? The CIA is much more integrated already which the communication flow chart demonstrates; how do we measure the effectiveness of some of these, that which we do not oversee per se but how to help integrate the information. “Oversee” is too strong a word? Betsy explained the desire for transparency and the ability of everyone to see how everything is connected; we hope for a systematic way to make it clear there is connectedness, the plan is synergetic.

Carrie Hansen spoke to the idea of “institutional” assessment and all the many components of the University, how to be assessed, how to develop a plan for each area of the University, e.g. Student Services now has a plan but would Business Services.

**Due to time, please send to Betsy any questions or comments you may have on this subject, she will send them forward to the CIA for continued discussion in November.**

* Review of assessment mini-grant applications and recommendation for funding---Agronomy and Music (can be found on CIA t-drive):

\*\* Motion 1 \*\* Jan Loft move to approve the proposal from the Music Program.

Linda Nelson seconded.

Discussion: Question on “support for a meeting.” It was meant to get everyone together, adjuncts that rarely are together at the same time and same place; for input not only verbally but to have adjuncts also take responsibility for the assessment plan. This does not pay them to “come to campus” as part of their job; the revised proposal shows this is to create ways to support getting adjuncts together.

**Motion passed.**

\*\* Motion 2 \*\* Monica Miller moved the Agronomy proposal.

 Jay Brown seconded,

Discussion: Betsy explained that Lee French is now leading the Agronomy Program, now a part of the Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics. Lee has really taken on this whole program, is engaged in developing the assessment plans and has created a three year plan for the Agronomy students. He is highly motivated and knows his stuff.

**Motion passed.**

* Review of CIA member’s term limits --- see handout. Our desire is to have off-set terms so that everyone does not go “off” the CIA at the same time. Betsy balanced the terms to ensure an overlap of membership/terms. Please, everyone stay on the CIA through the HLC visit, even if it appears your term has concluded. There will be a “transition” year, some people with three year terms, to ease the group into workable terms. It was suggest to get rid of “start” dates but use “ends” to help clarify when a term ends, to help ease interpreting the overlapping term plan. Betsy will do a revised version of the term grid to show the suggested changes.
* Review of CIA “committee size”—suggested revisions
* Re-examine CIA charge; aligning CIA charge with suggested priorities for FY14: see comments above in Discussion. Betsy explained the line change in the charge to now read: …“two MSUAASF representatives…”…..there was agreement to change the language. What about “from each academic Department”? How about an asterisk that programs related to the Department formerly known as Department of Business and Public Affairs will rotate? Use the term “Committee Membership” not size.
* Priorities for FY14
	+ Potential collaboration between CIA and CN committee
	+ CIA’s role in reviewing dept. annual reports, program self-studies, future HLC activity
	+ Discussion of departments/programs/units posting their goals on respective webpages
	+ Upgrading CIA webpage:  what should we be posting that will assist faculty and staff in assessment activities?
	+ Program and Department Annual Reports
		- Template for Program/Dept. assessment of student learning to be used for Dept. Annual Reports
		- Program Annual Report template (should this be additional requirement from each program?)
		- Where to post?