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Laura Froelicher, Andreas Kummerow, Greg Bierly, Whitney Nesser, Elijah Davis, Brian Stone, Kelley Woods-Johnson, Deanna Fry, Joe Harder, Laura, Alyce Hopple, Paula Jarrad, Bailey Bridgewater, Ellen Malito, Carry Birch

Bailey reported on Assessment Day. There were 16 faculty divided into 8 teams. Student results were mixed, between needing development and meeting capstones. The evaluations used AAC&U rubric. Most pairs agreed with rankings. The group was happy with the results generally. They are looking at rubric changes and changes to assignments. There were questions about the sampling approach, as some sent samples and Bailey had to pull others from Blackboard. They plan to make changes to sampling next time. They are going to college council to look at data and are putting out reports to see what was learned. The process will repeat.

Kelley noted that this was the first time we’ve done this approach. In the past Foundational Studies has done a big review project at the end of the year. There were 16 volunteers, mostly faculty. It was good to hear conversations and look at student work. The plan was carried out effectively and the experience was very positive. Faculty and the dean were happy.

Brian said that everything went smoothly. It was a challenge to prepare a faculty member to assess work from another discipline. Do we have similar views on cultural awareness? Would faculty from other departments assess writing portfolios in the same way? Success has to do with faculty buy-in. How can we get faculty more involved? Easy answer is money. Eric had suggested having assessment included in tenure and promotion. Could inspire participation. Looking at artifacts, some were better than others. Some were very brief and didn’t give a full view. It was suggested that faculty give more robust artifacts.

Bailey noted that there will be a workshop, possibly in March, to talk with literature and Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity about assignment development.

Brian said it could encourage more faculty to then participate in the assessment. It could also get faculty involved in developing rubrics. Outcomes are aligned with the rubric and haven’t been revised in some time.

Literature has revised but Foundational Studies won’t review them. He was skeptical about the AAC&U rubric, but is more convinced. Using the One Drive was successful. Some faculty didn’t submit portfolios.

Kelley reiterated that Eric Hampton raised the issue of inclusion of assessment in Tenure and Promotion. She raised the question of whether our group could shape how this would be included in the standards. There will be a meeting with Susan Powers next week to discuss the path forward. It will primarily be a faculty-driven discussion. It came about because of the Excellence in Assessment rubric.

Updates-Kelley reported that four more assessment reports were received this week. She will share college-based summary reports. She is still pushing to get missing reports.

Co-curricular assessment-Kelley reported that the process is a little on auto-pilot. They are coming back to the table to see how people are doing. Some haven’t gotten past the learning outcome stage. The process includes student success, the library, career center, center for global engagement, and student transition programs. They are meeting to see where people are at and keep things moving forward. New criterion will go into effect in September and will be evaluated on the inclusion of co-curricular activities.

Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Committees have finished draft of their Assurance of Learning argument. It is open for review with a Qualtrics survey. Don’t focus on syntax and technical writing issues. They want to know what we are missing. Kelley reached out to Greg about focusing more on honors. No one has the whole picture. It is 71 pages, so take it piece by piece. At the end of each section is discussion of the criterion. Some sections are fleshed out, some need work. It truly needs feedback. Only one survey submitted so far.

LMS Committee-This group is going to start looking at requests for proposals. They will bring venders in mid-March for demos. The committee wants people to come out and ask the hard questions.

Andreas, a member of the information technology committee, agrees with timeline. They want to have a “sandbox” so people can actually work with the product.

Kelley noted that students should work with it as well. She recommended that Elijah report back to SGA.

Comprehensive learners/Microcredential committee was the next topic. It is similar to the co-curricular transcript and activities need to meet a threshold of quality or rigor. The goal is to create a seemless transcript of academic learning and learning through co-curricular activities. State wants to have a comprehensive learning record in place over the next year. A group is working on it and is going to ISHE meeting to learn more. No new funds will be coming for this effort.

Microcredentials would be considered less than a certificate. It is evidence of learning, similar to what would go on the comprehensive learning records. Different types of learning activities will be mixed together.

Bailey asked if students can opt not to have information included, such as using tutoring.

Kelley said tutoring will likely not included among the activities.

Joe noted that Meece Center activities are linked to Learning Outcomes.

Kelley said the first question is is what institutional learning outcomes should we base our learning outcomes on? It is a big undertaking to identify learning outcomes for every ISU student.

Brian asked for reports from members.

Joe said that accreditors were coming to the College of Business next week. He said he thinks the college is ready. They already know the areas of concern.

Assessment Council Policy

Two questions from previous meeting: Should Susan Powers’ position be ex-officio? Susan says it should. Now that there is not an office of Student Success, should we remove that position? The question went to the provost and Susan and they agreed that it should be removed.

Other requests for recommendation proposed.

Ellen asked a question about appointing of student members. The rules specify that one student will be appointed by SGA and one student will be appointed by the Graduate Student Association.

Greg made a motion to approve as amended.

Andreas seconded the motion. He said the document is flexible but complete.

The vote was 11 in favor, no opposition, no abstentions.

Kelley said the next step is to verify whether it goes to faculty senate or straight to the board.

Andreas said we could send it to Senate Exec to get feedback.

Kelley said she will check to see if the Provost wants to review beforehand.

Brian transitioned to the next item, the assessment grant.

Kelley thanked the group for their good questions. The motion did pass. Brian’s department will use money for advanced assessment work.

Brian said that time is of the essence. They want instructors to be more involved in the assessment. They don’t want people not teaching the classes to make the criticism, but they can’t ask people doing 5-5’s to do service work without some compensation. They will be working on logistics in the next week or two. They will be carrying on this process until 2025.

Kelley reported that there is $2,000 left in the budget for grants. We want to encourage faculty to come forward with proposals if they have them, even if it may seem like a stretch.

New Business

Excellence in Assessment designation from NILOA. Student who was going to work on inventory had to step back from the doctoral program. The council needs one or two faculty to work with Kelley and Deanna. We need to take a brief look at how we think we fit with this area of practice. Joe and Bailey volunteered.

Greg asked if this is about how many units are doing reasonably well or whether a few units are doing exceptionally well?

Kelley said it is probably a preponderance, although there may be some places where a few standouts can make a difference. This is more about us taking our own temperature and figuring out where we stand and where we should put our energy.

Brian asked if there is other business? None indicated.

Meeting was adjourned.