

Committee on Institutional Assessment
Tuesday, October 2, 2018
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM
Minutes

Minutes:

September 18, 2018: Thanks to Aimee Shouse

October 2, 2018: Thanks to Kathy Schaefer

Present: Kate Borowske, Kathy Schaefer, Dean Aimee Shouse, LeeAnn Syring, Maureen Sanders-Staudt, Jeff Bell, Abu Haddud, Alan Matzner, Cindy Aamlid, Kristin Kovar, Diana Holmes, Nadine Schmidt, Matt Zabka, Nancyruth Leibold

1. Consent to Agenda
 - a. Unanimous consent was given by those in attendance.

2. Approve 9/18 Minutes
 - a. There were no revisions to the minutes for 9/18.
 - b. Diana Holmes moved to approve and the motion was seconded by Cindy Aamlid. There was no discussion. Motion carried.

3. Assessment Mini-Grant Application
 - a. Math and Computer Science have submitted a Mini-Grant Application.
 - b. Matt Zabka presented a summary of the grant, clarifying that the grant was for the Math Program only, and did not include Computer Science. The Computer Science program may still apply for a mini-grant.
 - c. The Math Program needs \$200 for two different things: 100 Remedial Math students should be taking the Accuplacer test in order to determine why students who are taking Math 060 are still not doing well in College Algebra. Additionally, the Major Field Test in Math should be taken by all graduating math majors.
 - d. Dean Shouse noted that the price of the Accuplacer is now \$1.85.
 - e. Matt Zabka moved that the members accept the mini-grant application. Kate Borowske seconded the motion. Jeff recommends funding at \$200.00. All in attendance favor funding the Math mini-grant for \$200.00.
 - f. Point of clarification, the Computer Science program may still apply for a mini-grant.

4. Liaison Team Restructuring
 - a. The Provost chose to take the first draft of the Liaison Team restructure. The draft was also sent to the LEC for their consideration and feedback was received. The Provost tried to group the teams into similar disciplines but that wasn't possible in all instances.

- b. The LEC would participate in areas where they have courses in the LEP. There would be six teams where the LEC would participate. There are slots for ten LEC representation on the teams. Dean Shouse indicated there are eleven LEC members, two of whom are on the CIA (crossover), plus Michael Kurowski and Linda Nelson. Jeff Bell reviewed the list. The members of the CIA will not be on the team for our own programs.
- c. Jeff Bell asked if we are able to approve the current list, or think about it and take a vote later.
- d. Discussion followed regarding the number of people on each committee. An LEC member would not be responsible for more than two programs. As long as the Liaison Team is reviewing an LEP program, an LEC member would be on that team. Each of the CIA team members will review the RASLs from all of their programs, which is Jeff's understanding of best practices with the assessment process.
- e. Jeff Bell suggests the document could be forwarded to the LEC and upon approving the names in the slots, the CIA could accept it as is.
- f. Diana Holmes moves that we forward the list to LEC for their suggested names.
- g. Kathy makes friendly amendment to Diana's motion, to forward the list to the LEC for their suggested names, and Jeff Bell as the chair will approve and finalize the LEC names. No discussion. Maureen Sanders-Staudt seconds the amendment.
- h. Kate Borowske seconds the original motion proposed by Diana. No discussion. The amended original motion is carried.

5. RASL Review Planning

- a. Jeff Bell explains the report template. The Assessment Academy Team will assist with the RASL reviews and create a review form. They would also help with compiling the data. Cindy Aamlid asks for clarification on what the final product would look like.
- b. The reviewer would provide to each academic program a report on their assessment report. Any deficiencies would be identified, liberal outcome program assessment levels would be identified, and guidance with regard to any future use of their data.
- c. Discussion takes place regarding the review process. At least two members of the team should review the same RASLs in order to avoid the RASLs being reviewed by one individual, i.e. four team members, four RASLs, each does one. Multiple sets of eyes on the RASLs is requested. Cindy Aamlid asked about a form that can be used. Abu Haddud suggests a standardized form. Jeff Bell suggests that the Assessment Academy Team create a standardized document that will be used in the review process. Submissions to the T-Drive have been diverse, and showing a significant amount of variety. A standardized form would help to bring the information together.

- d. Jeff would like us to have initial reviews done by the 23rd of October, using the template created by the Assessment Academy Team. We need to communicate with the other members of the Liaison Team. One letter/report would be completed by the Liaison Team and submitted to the folder in the T-Drive, 2017-2018 RASL Summary Reports. Jeff Bell would like the summary reports sent to the programs prior to the 28th of October visit.
 - e. Social Work, Physical Education, and Political Science programs are missing from the T-Drive.
 - f. Jeff Bell set up new folder in the T-Drive to accommodate the submissions and one for the summary reports. A folder will be created for each program. Kathy Schaefer clarifies that notes are taken independently but only one consolidated report is warranted.
 - g. Cindy clarifies that the summary report should be done by the 23rd, and will be discussed at the October 23rd meeting. Jeff Bell feels that preliminary evaluations of each program. Form letters to the program will follow. Instructions and Review Letter will be ready by Friday, the 5th of October. HLC will appreciate the Continuous Cycle of Improvement being adopted by our programs. There is no longer any closing, only an endless loop. Jeff Bell will not leave campus this week until the Instructions and Review letter are sent out to members of the CIA.
 - h. There was unanimous consent for the plan.
6. Rubric Training Brainstorming
- a. Rubric training was high on the list of items the CIA wanted to address. Eight of the AAC&U rubrics have been adopted. Kristin Kovar expressed her surprise at the interest in rubrics as attendance at the rubric training session was very lean.
 - b. Kate Borowske may offer regular training sessions on the 5th floor of the library. Rubrics would fit in. Repeated exposure to these topics would be beneficial as we continue with the assessment process. Kate is looking at the possibility of recording the sessions and creating a faculty development website where faculty could access training on-line.
 - c. Discussion about how rubrics should be used and calibrated for the level of the students took place, and it was suggested that Cindy Aamlid and Kristin Kovar provide a short video of their rubric work from Professional Development Day. Break down the subject into several 10 – 12 minutes videos that could be posted to the SMSU website.
7. CIA/LEC Share Meeting Dates
- a. Dean Shouse suggests a share meeting date for the 23rd of October and
 - b. Jeff Bell moves that only one shared meeting date will take place. We will not meet on the 6th of November. All in favor of one meeting on the 23rd of October.
8. Adjourn
- a. Moved by Maureen Sanders-Staudt and seconded by Kate Borowske.

b. Meeting adjourned at 5:12 PM.

Notes:

Please print out any items you may need in hard copy if you are uncomfortable with the digitally displayed items.

Upcoming Meetings:

October 23, 2018 BA 524	Tuesday	CIA/LEC Share Meeting	4:15 PM-5:15 PM	
October 28, 2018	Sunday	HLC Review Team Arrival		
October 29, 2018	Monday	HLC Site Review		
October 30, 2018	Tuesday	HLC Site Review		
November 6, 2018 BA 524	Tuesday	CIA/LEC Share Meeting	4:15 PM-5:15 PM	
November 7, 2018 Upper CC	Wednesday	All-University Conversation	12:00 PM-1:00 PM	
November 27, 2018 524	Tuesday	CIA Regular Meeting	4:15 PM-5:15 PM	BA
December 11, 2018 524	Tuesday	CIA Regular Meeting	4:15 PM-5:15 PM	BA