

Committee on Institutional Assessment  
Tuesday, November 6, 2018  
4:15 PM - 5:15 PM  
Minutes

**Present:** Jeff Bell, Dwight Watson, Raphael Onyeaghala, Aimee Shouse, Abu Haddud, LeeAnn Syring, Kathy Schaefer, Kate Borowske, Alan Matzner, Nadine Schmidt, Diana Holmes.

**Consent to Agenda.** Unanimous consent was given by those in attendance.

**Approve 10/2 minutes.** Jeff reviewed; no changes or revisions to minutes. Motion to approve by Kathy Schaefer; seconded by Kate Borowske. All in favor; passed.

**Approve 10/23 minutes.** Jeff reviewed; no changes or revisions to minutes. Motion to approve by Kathy Schaefer; seconded by Kate Borowske. Most items on discussion for today. All in favor; passed.

**Revisit CIA Work Plan** for 2018 – 19 to cover last year's accomplishments and timeline for this year. Reviewed last year's accomplishments 1 through 11 which included first assessment PAL meeting, development of campus assessment master plan (CAMP). Pretty full year. This year's tasks include moving forward the same items as well as:

- key performance indicator data,
- additional focus on moving programs to level 4,
- focus on programs needing the most help which is on this committee;
- plan assessment day,
- conduct mini-PALs forums. Mini-PALs forum information will be covered by HLC; perhaps CIA will need training before sending this work to Mini-PALS. Renamed CIA Training/Mini-PALS. Josie Welsh, HLC team, commented on additional practice for CIA.
- Discuss graduate program data and have grad programs present their RASL to CIA. Alan will share key performance indicator data with the committee at the next meeting.
- Conduct Share Meeting with CIA and LEC already completed on October 23. The committee feels confident we can tackle this work plan for the year.
- NSSE Data will also be discussed between CIA and/or at Assessment Day/Professional Development Day.

**Reflect on the CIA/LEC Share Meeting.**

- Both committees are starting to arrive at a general understanding, but may need to tighten up some areas. Jeff mentioned a mini-conference held in St. Paul on June 10-13 for assessment of higher education. An assessment expert will be brought in to do some training, pod casts.
- It was suggested to bring an expert in for assessment day. Perhaps bring in Bernie for a series of consultancies to include meeting with the CIA.
- We will need to identify our knowledge gaps instead of something general – to include LEC members – both committees have similar gaps.
- Do we all have a common understanding of the assessment cycle; what are the ideas to move on to the next cycle? Arrive at the point to situate assessments to measure particular outcome – do we have a cadre of suggestions to share with our programs? With the data, programs can begin to aggregate, need to help them get there. We need to know and understand these

pieces. Pull and rate samples with a reliability measure – before we roll out, we need to be knowledgeable of this process.

- Discussed historical context with LEC member's part of the AHA teams. Not much turnover on the LEC team.
- Thursday at Noon, discussion on LEC 100 to discuss thinking goals, assess the liberal education and MnTC goals. We need to do more with liberal education goals; revision of the goals. We need best practices for artifact scoring and understanding of basic of statistical understanding to approach assessment to allow assess the effectiveness of scoring, goals, data collection, to make recommendations. There seems to be a sort of muckiness to level 3.
- Josie comment on the poster and statistics – and why changes made on such a small population (small class size) – what are we going to change and do better? Can we learn more about when it is appropriate to make changes – do we do this based on a small population? The decision also depends on the measurement – is it total number of majors, or one class, or over time? Better to look over the context of time over several semesters.
- Best practices of survey research over percentage of population or time? This is a fine-tune item – Alan Matzner can help us with this – or in-house person can provide tutoring. Our faculty are hungry to learn when their data is useful, did we do this right? How do we analyze to make a best, informed decision. Ready to have a session whether within CIA to unpack and discuss these items.
- We have in-house expertise or rubrics and scoring; on assessment design, we'll need to go external for this piece.
- Assessment of 150 education majors, what's the best way to assess portfolios, or SLOs? We should conduct internal issues first before tackling external assistance. Perhaps a CIA artifact scoring/rubric use lunch and learn. What is our common knowledge before lunch and learn. As we come out of our liaison meeting, we can use our discoveries for our questions. This is the stuff we need additional training.

**Reflect on HLC Site Visit.** Jeff thought the visit went well, campus excitement to participate, unprecedented feedback from the reviewers as to how things went, organized visit, never felt lost, knew what was next, engaged faculty, staff and administration. Congratulations to all for this feedback.

- Distance Learning questions and feedback. Easy discussion, positive.
- Faculty session how the assessment changed since the last visit. Articulated understanding about assessment. Alan Matzner longest on the committee and changes in attitude, this sentiment was reiterated, more comfort with the process. Kristen observed that when she arrived, it was what we do, these are the tools, and automatically read the importance of what we do. New people on CIA, this year we had three new members, helps to distribute the learning model.
- Jan's last request for information was for graduate program assessment reports. The HLC team presented themselves as our advocate and in the role similar to a lawyer, with several layers of hierarchy above the team also reviewing the report. Will Thomas' students attended the open session as engaged students. Team noticed we were in reactive mode, and now we need to be in proactive mode, not to slow our momentum, but shift our perspective.
- Josie indicated that we need to put the RASL reporting on a cycle – some programs doing in one year, with others the following year – an aha moment of how to prevent assessment fatigue.
- Josie mostly in consultative mode – very useful feedback.

**Updates from Liaison Teams** – what we need for support, how do request follow-up items?

- Accounting/Finance/Marketing and Management. Nadine – will ask for this information when they sit down with the program. Reviewed the T: drive to double-check and verify this information. Will check-in if it's the most current PASL; not sure if the most recent PASL was uploaded from last year's assessment day. Otherwise, face-to-face, will ask for additional stuff, unless it's interfering with their review.
- Art, Communication, Theatre Arts – Aimee needs to upload review sheets. Kate hasn't had a chance to review. Will discuss any missing items with the programs. Kate not sure if she reviewed Music. Aimee had to dig for Art's information.
- Justice Administration, Ag, Culinology, Hospitality – Raphael has been off-campus, does not have any needs at the moment.
- Grad programs, Education, PE non-teaching – Provost and Jeff set-up a plan now that HLC is over.
- Philosophy – Diana and Cindy plan to review each other's notes before meeting with the programs. Verifying information on the T: drive.
- Social Work, etc. Abu impressed with one submission and will use as a benchmark. Another department was lacking information and will discuss with program to address. Will share the benchmark report to share with other programs. Will thank Cindy Aamlid for her submission and ask for permission to share with other programs. Jeff pulled Cindy's report for the reviewer.
- Biology, etc. Kathy Schaefer and Alan Matzner has not set up a meeting with Exercise Science or Chemistry. Biology is complete, great report. Mark Fokken and Kathy meeting with Biology this week, Emily Deaver tomorrow. Alan working on Chemistry. Alan will ask for information he does not know – does not feel qualified to judge their program. Jeff suggests consultation is more about finding out what reports they need. Consultation is also about what supports they need; ask questions about xyz, use the checklist to verify what's missing.
- Math, etc. LeeAnn and group need to find time to meet and review reports. Stephen Davis knows he needs to submit several items.
- Perhaps use the LEC reports to help us understand their learning; they're learning curve is steeper than ours. They're looking at other items than CIA.

**Assessment Day Agenda – 2/28.** The committee reviewed the tentative agenda.

- Debrief may not take an hour.
- Thought to ask Cindy to present on how to use the SMSU adopted the core rubrics (writing, oral, course skills, info literacy, diversity, civic engagement, moral reasoning) as a universal assessment for the outcomes. Discussed the qualitative and quantitative measurements. Rubrics are available on the SMSU Assessment webpage. Writing rubric is not quantitative – discussed how to measure (i.e., 30% of students).
- Large afternoon section for consultations; morning can include a short plenary session. Need to discuss rubrics and give programs time to work on alignment matrices. Jeff requested we send topic recommendations for discussion at the next meeting.

Kate motioned to adjourn at 5:19 p.m.