Assessment Council

November 8, 2019

9 AM

HH 307

Attendance: Kelley Woods-Johnson, Shelley Arvin, Brian Stone, Bailey Bridgewater, Andreas Kummerow, Deanna Fry, Ellen Malito, Laura Froelicher, Margaret Dalrymple, Cary Burch, Nathan Myers

Review of Minutes: No corrections to the minutes.

Web updates: Updates on a variety of components, but lagging on assessment plans. The goal is that by the end of spring everything will be up to date. Program information may be taken down if not updated. We don’t want the Higher Learning Commission to see incorrect information. We can tell HLC that we are working on updates.

Kelley and Deanna are working through outcomes assessment reports. Deanna is finished, Kelley is still working. They still plan to have feedback by Thanksgiving. Response rate remains lower than last year. Associate deans are following up. Kelley will follow up with department chairs. Malea Crosby wrangled 100% of reports from the College of Education.

Kelley is getting lots of request for engagement around campus. Kelley met with the Biology faculty. They figured out they haven’t been using their own outcomes, they are using CGPS outcomes instead. They don’t know what they were or where they went. The department did a fantastic job in putting together a first draft. Kelley will serve on an ad-hoc committee for graduate program review. Graduate Council is looking at how to make program review meaningful and manageable. It is fairly agreed upon that it is not very manageable.

Kelley was invited to the Curriculum Affairs Committee to talk about rubric development. They get a lot of data, but don’t have an efficient way to analyze it. They are working on developing approaches.

Bailey and Kelley working on Foundation Studies assessment.

Learning Connections Summit is wrapping up. Next step is to find ways to get feedback. There was poor attendance at the presentations. Chris McGrew attended a lot of events. The keynote speaker had the best attendance. They are looking at ways to improve attendance.

Nathan Myers asked about recording presentations. Kelley noted there are some issues with accessibility of technology. They may have one room for the use of technology. There will never be a good time for presentations. Lots of options was good, but also overwhelming. They are going to make a direct call for feedback from attendees and presenters.

The steering committee met with the HLC liaison and asked questions about the process. The committee invited him to understand if we are on track for the visit in September. Is the way we are approaching data collection appropriate? Liaison selects peer reviewers and the hope is he will select reviewers that understand institutions like ISU. They received positive feedback and had questions answered that they had wrestled over. He addressed misconceptions and had good ideas about possible peer reviewers who can give actual actionable feedback, as opposed to feedback from non-comparable institutions. It was a relief, but they don’t want it to be too much of a relief.

The draft argument will be available in the spring semester. Everyone in the campus community will be able to provide feedback. The committee is trying to make sure it is a shared perspective of the campus. It may be available in late March or early April.

Member Reports: Shelley went to a conference and presented on library assessment.

Brian met with literature and creative writing colleagues. He found out that reports had been sent, even though assessment was not completed. They are trying to decide who is responsible for what and are figuring out what the process will look like in the future and what artifacts best represent student learning. Some faculty are resistant, but there is a strong core of supporters. They are making process in figuring out the process and identifying meaningful arguments. Kelley will return some of the reports.

Deanna presented a Power Point presentation on the National Institute on Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). This is based on a review of web site and case studies.

There are two tiers: Excellence (building) and Sustained Excellence (have evidence over years). Having the designation allows students to evaluate the effectiveness of the institution. The reasons for the Excellence in Assessment is to Recognize, Connect, and Engage. The criteria for designation include: People, Student Learning Outcomes Statements, Institution-level Plans, Institution-level Resources, Institution-level Activities, Institution-level Evidence of Student Learning, Use of Evidence, Reflection and Improvement Plan. The application components include a letter from senior leadership, contacts form, who is involved?, and the application narrative (background of university). The rubric includes 8 categories, 24 subcategories, Grading Scale (5=exemplary-0=No evidence). In calculating the final score, most categories are weighted as 1, some are weighted at 1.25 and 1.5. The question is would this be useful to help us guide and improve our own practice?

Shelley asked if we have centralized assessment resources? Kelley said that we do offer institutional training and grants. But other efforts, due to budgeting, will have to wait for the future.

Brian noted that there are concerns about portfolio assessment. Faculty are concerned about being individually judged. They could get people more invested if there were stipends attached. Sharing results with stakeholders is great. NIU is a great model for providing information to students and other stakeholders. They need to make information easy, quick and digestible.

Kelley said the EIA process gives an opportunity to get an external reviewer to say these are areas where help is needed. It may spur more funding for those areas. She is not sure if there is a cost to applying.

Andreas asked what would we be asking people to do?

Kelley said we would have to figure out timing. We need to get people together to look at what we are doing well and where we need improvement.

Ellen asked when do we hear from HLC? Kelley said it would probably be a couple of weeks after the visit.

Kelley said committing time to a self-study as part of EIA demonstrates commitment to improvement.

Andreas asked if the assessment council would be leading the process. Kelley said it would be a good place to start, and then get others involved. Andreas said it is important to avoid an echo chamber.

Shelley said that EIA would be good to show a framework for the future. But people ignore the rubric when completing the current assessment reports. Kelley said some people are using older Student Assessment of Learning forms.

Shelley said we would need administrative support to get people to pay more attention. Kelley emailed department chairs with the template, the rubric, and the pre-populated career readiness template. Kelley and Deanna will look into details to pursue a self-study in preparation for a possible application.

Assessment Council Policy Library Language-What needs to be updated to reflect current process? This is homework for the 12/13 meeting. If you can’t attend, provide feedback. There is no procedural guidance about how the group operates. Representation has grown, but we don’t have guidelines on how to include different units and ex-officio members. We need to update to operate more efficiently and need a little more formality. We want to work on this as a group because it will need to work through the governance process. Look at section 107.10.

Foundational Studies Assessment needs volunteers. They are collecting artifacts from faculty members. They want 1 assignment and 4 student responses. They need to review assignments related to Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity/Literary Studies. They will be sitting down with teams to score the artifacts. It should be beneficial and allow consideration of broader philosophical issues. They are looking at a breadth of assignments given across campus and reviewing what students are producing. The review will be February 8, a Saturday, and food will be provided.

Adjourned at 9:47 AM.