

CIA Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 12, 2019
3:30-4:30 PM
BA 524

Present: Jeff Bell, Scott Crowell, Teri Wallace, Ben Anderson, Aimee Shouse, Lori Baker, Yumi Lim, Wije Wijesiri, Diana Holmes, Tony Greenfield, Lamine Conteh, Abu Haddud, Kate Borowske, Tim Beske, Alan Matzner

Agenda Item	Vote	Duration	Running Time
1. Consent to Agenda	Consent	3 minutes	3:30-3:33
2. Approve 5/2/19 Minutes	Y	2 minutes	3:33-3:35
3. Minute Takers for Fall 2019	N	5 minutes	3:35-3:40
4. Work Plan 2019-2020	N	15 minutes	3:40-3:55
5. Liaison Teams- Structure Discussion & Assignment to teams	N	15 minutes	3:55-4:10
6. LEP Assessment- Draft from summer work group announcement and discussion	N	10 minutes	4:10-4:20
7. Brainstorming Idea on RASL Submissions for programs with Specialized Accreditation	N	10 minutes	4:20-4:30
8. Adjourn	Upon no additional discussion		

1. Agenda:

Members consented to the agenda as presented.

2. Minutes:

Jeff provided a brief overview of the last meeting of the spring semester, as noted in the minutes that members received via email. Scott moved and Diana seconded that the minutes of the 5/2/19 meeting be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Minute takers for meetings:

Nadine volunteered to take minutes for this meeting. The remaining minute-takers for this semester are as follows:

9/26/19 – Lori
10/17/19 – Kate
11/7/19 – Diana
11/21/19 – Ben
12/5/19 – Aimee

4. 2019-2020 Work Plan

Jeff reviewed last year's work plan, accomplishments, and the color-coding system in the document that was emailed to members.

The committee discussed potential ideas for the 2019-2020 work plan as listed in the document that members received:

- Members discussed the Student Success Book Club, and the idea of a book club or "faculty learning community" for faculty/staff to focus on student success, such as discussing recent research and manuscripts as well as books.
- There was also discussion about the Student Success Academy. Aimee and Teri have had experience with Student Success Academy, which involves inventories of infrastructure, roadblocks, challenges, hashing out what the challenges are and how to adjust to meet them. It was noted that student success is not assessment, but they are aligned.
- There was discussion about student involvement in Assessment Day. The Psychology Program has had good results with incorporating students.
- Members discussed the merits of pushing Assessment Day later in the spring semester (due to wanting to avoid Hawaiian Weekend and winter weather concerns). Some members observed that if it's too late in the semester, then it's hard to present data to the department before the end of the academic year, in order to close the assessment loop for fall. Members generally felt late March/early April could work, and the CIA will seek feedback from departments and programs, while being mindful of deadlines for the Calendar Committee.

Regarding remaining items from last year's work plan, Jeff noted that assessment of graduate programs will remain on the work plan. Rubric training has moved to Professional Development Day. Programs needing the most help have been referred to Jeff.

After discussion, Jeff added a report to the CIA from HLC Criterion 4 team to the list of desired items for this year.

5. Liaison team discussion

Jeff asked for feedback on how the liaison teams worked last year, including the size of teams, number of programs assigned, knowledgeable about the programs assigned, etc. He also asked for ideas regarding future liaison team structure and process. Observations included:

- Some members felt they were more effective when providing feedback to programs they knew well.
- The checklist was helpful to track items, but didn't necessarily help team members feel comfortable giving feedback.
- Many people reported that they felt they didn't have the knowledge to dig deeply into reports and offer helpful suggestions.
- It was valuable to touch base with programs and help them feel positive about the RASL and the liaison team meeting if they had anxiety going into that process.
- Learning about programs was interesting and helpful, and it was positive to be able to offer support and resources rather than critiques and judgement, and to serve as advocates for programs in a sense.
- Jeff suggested that perhaps liaison teams could present summaries of their reviews to the CIA?

- The scheduling of reviews last year spanned from fall into spring
- Programs could do the checklist on their own, and then liaison teams could also do the checklist, and then the two lists could be compared during the liaison team meeting. This would help programs understand what is being looked for in the review process.
- Each department has a representative on the CIA, and each program has PAL – could that be the liaison team? The CIA member with the PALs from that department?
- We will revisit liaison teams at the next meeting, with a couple of possibilities: one arrangement like last year and one as suggested today.
- With the idea suggested today, what would be the role for non-academic CIA members?

6. LEP Assessment

Jeff reported that the summer work group considered “What is it about the LEP that SMSU truly values?” The group noticed that there were specific aspects that almost every program valued – written communication, critical thinking, and information literacy, to name a few. These are more representative of our core skills than the MnTC. Should LEP assessment be a core skills assessment? The following points were made:

- If we adopted a core skills assessment, that would help with the “too many learning outcomes” issue that has plagued our LEP and the MnTC.
- We don’t want to lose the “SMSU-ness” within the LEP.
- The core skills arrangement would make our liberal education assessment much easier.
- The HLC team noted that state curricular requirements (such as the MnTC) are just that, and are separate from the values we might want to assess.
- There was much support among members for the idea of core skills assessment.
- Core skills are also mentioned in our mission.

7. RASLs for programs with specialized accreditation

Some programs have to do extensive assessment reporting for their external accreditation. Should they still have to do a RASL? Members made the following points:

- There was some discussion about how long the span is between accreditation reports/visits. For some, it is several years, which seems too long to go without reporting on assessment at the university level.
- The regular every-other-year RASL should be helpful to these programs in preparing for accreditation reports and visits.
- Possibly programs could have the year off from the RASL if their RASL happened to be due in the year that their accreditation report and visit are due.

8. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.