

CIA Meeting Minutes  
 Thursday, November 21, 2019  
 3:30-4:30 PM  
 BA 524

Agenda Item	Vote	Duration	Running Time
1. Consent to Agenda	Consent	2 minutes	3:30-3:32
2. Approve 11/7/19 Minutes	Y	3 minutes	3:33-3:34
3. Review of Exercise Science RASL as a norming session	Y	55 minutes	3:35-4:30
4. Adjourn	Upon no additional discussion		

**Minutes taken by Ben Anderson:**

1. Committee consented to the agenda.
2. Minutes from 11/7 approved with minor revisions (corrected a couple of spelling errors).
3. Review of Exercise Science RASL as a norming session for CIA RASL program reviews:

**Note:** *the following includes the Liaison Reporting Form along with committee discussion summarized briefly in italics.*

**Step 1: Check the T: for the Components Listed Below**

*First part of review ensures that program has all documents. Program goals should be listed and a mission statement provided. Make comments about how these align with assessment (learning outcomes). Comment on the number in regards to whether there are not enough or too many (1 vs. 6 for example).*

*Course mapping and alignment matrix: These may be documented separately or together. Consider asking about courses not being assessed and why. For example, ask about why only 100 and 400 level courses are being assessed. Why not any courses in the middle area (200-300 level)? Middle year course assessments could allow for more formative assessment.*

*Timeline: make comments about whether the program is taking on too much especially in 1-2 year time period. If so, ask why this may be the case. Nursing, for example, may need to have this short cycle given accreditation requirements. Typically programs will have 3-4 year cycles.*

*Provide feedback to the programs based upon the guiding questions below.*

**Step 2: Check the RASL Executive Summary Template for Program SLO Assessment.**

1. Program Learning Outcomes.
  - Were the outcomes assessed measurable (evidenced by behavior or product)?
  - Did the outcomes include knowledge and/or skills?
  - Are the learning outcomes linked to department and/or university goals?

*Highlight any missing pieces that were listed in the timeline but not included in the report. Provide encouraging feedback to programs that are lacking in any areas. Indicate where reporting may have been improved (e.g. where summary could have been improved, etc.).*

2. Assessment Methods.

- Were the assessment methods for each learning outcome from a single method or a variety of methods?

- What assessment “tool” was used?

*specify tool (rubric, self-created, etc.). Provide feedback on how assessment measures could be improved.*

- Were the assessment methods used direct or indirect measures of learning?

*Indirect is more contextually based and direct provides higher level of evidence. Subjective report of learning would be an indirect measure.*

- Is there information in the methods for student level (e.g. 100-400, Freshmen)?
- Is there information about the quantity of artifacts assessed and was this a sufficient sample?
- Were the standards for mastery, competency, or proficiency clearly stated?

3. Assessment Results.

- Were the results qualitative and/or quantitative?

- If qualitative, was there any performance analysis or was it a collection of observations/comments?

- If quantitative, were there numerical analyses or only raw scores?

*Numerical analyses would include descriptive statistics (e.g. averages) or inferential statistics (e.g. t-test).*

- Was there an analysis of percentage of students performing at specific levels?

*This might vary based on the tool being used.*

- Was there an analysis of the number or percent of students that met expectations of performance level relative to the level of the course/student?
- Was there an interpretation of the results?

4. Recommendations.

- Did the program provide recommendations for programmatic improvement and/or course improvement?
- What program-level changes were recommended for instruction, pedagogy, curriculum, or future assessment processes?

*Assessment might be used to conclude that the artifact or assessment measure used is not well suited for these goals.*

**Step 3: Check the RASL Executive Summary Template for LEP SLO Assessment.**

1. Liberal Education Outcomes.

*These do not need to be assessed every year. They can be included in the rotation.*

- Were Liberal Education Outcomes assessed? If no, do not proceed further.

- If so, list which outcomes were assessed and the course-level where they were assessed (e.g. 100, 200, etc.).
- Were the courses that had learning outcomes assessed designated courses in the Liberal Education Program/designated as MnTC? You may need to check on this with the LEC Liaison Team member.
- Did the program use any of the 8 campus-approved rubrics? List the rubrics used for each LEP Outcome that were used.
- 2. Assessment Results.
- Were the results qualitative and/or quantitative?
  - If qualitative, was there any performance analysis or was it a collection of observations/comments?
  - If quantitative, were there numerical analyses or only raw scores?
- Was there an analysis of percentage of students performing at specific levels?
- Was there an analysis of the number or percent of students that met expectations of performance level relative to the level of the course/student?
- Was there an interpretation of the results?
- 3. Recommendations.
- Did the program provide recommendations for course improvement?
- What changes were recommended for instruction, pedagogy, curriculum, or future assessment processes?

Other notes:

Positive comments were made about the effectiveness of this form in providing sound feedback to programs.

Programs should go over the report. Liaisons should do this and then meet with the programs to discuss. Compilation of data will then move forward to eventually be incorporated into the executive summary.

Mini grants are still available (\$1600 still available).

Members present: Jeff Bell, Lori Baker, Nadine Schmidt, Michele Knife-Sterner, Abu Haddud, Yumi Lim, Aimee Shouse, Teri Wallace, Diana Holmes, Nancyruth Leibold (remote), Tony Greenfield, Kate Borowski, Ben Anderson

Meeting adjourned at 4:18 PM.

