**Assessment Leadership Team Minutes 11/2/18**

Attendance: Eric Hampton, Greg Bierly, Laura Froelicher, Brian Stone, Edie Wittenmyer, Kelley Woods-Johnson, Shelley Arvin, John Sare, Denise Collins

1. Review of the Minutes
	1. Need to add Edie to the attendance list from 10/5/18
	2. Shelley called for approval of the minutes. 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain, 1 not present
2. Reports
	1. Chair – Shelley
		1. John and Shelley shared the co-curricular assessment process updates with the HLC Criterion 3 & 4 committee. Bringing to Staff Council next to promote buy-in.
		2. Artifact repository has L: drive space now, and Stephen Patton is working on building that prototype now.
	2. Coordinator – Kelley
		1. SOAS Reports
			1. ISU total participation at 84%. Colleges: SCOB 100%, Library 100%, BCOE 94%, COT 90%, CHHS 79%, CAS 76%. Some additional reports are expected to come in soon.
			2. Timeline – Josh Powers and Student Success Committee will evaluate Part 2 as Ruthanne and Kelley evaluate Part 1. Kelley will combine the feedback to provide a single report back to faculty before the end of the semester.
			3. Associate Deans have been assisting with missing reports and have been informed of the timeline. Susan Powers and Provost Licari get regular status updates.
		2. Presenting at NFO
			1. Kelley presented to a group of 42 new faculty members through the FCTE’s New Faculty Orientation series.
		3. IUPUI Assessment Institute
			1. Much was learned at the Institute, and opportunities for exploring Assessment Management Systems and partnering with other professionals in the region for ongoing training were explored.
	3. Members
		1. No reports
3. Old Business
	1. Eberman Grant Request
		1. John Motions for a vote
		2. Greg seconds
		3. 6 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstain
	2. SWOT Analysis Discussion
		1. General lack of individual assessment competency – Eric
		2. Growing assessment knowledge; build on that momentum – Eric
		3. Shifting mindsets from assessment as a periodic deadline to an ongoing process (particularly in CoT) – Edie
		4. University-wide data management for assessment is both an opportunity and a threat. Lots of different entities need the same pieces of information so being able to coordinate collection all in one point could really reduce the stress and improve the use of assessment. This could add functionality for building in timelines to manage the work – Greg
		5. BCOE has used TK20. There’s a mixed experience. It houses all data, so all classes that are part of the assessment systems goes there as it is collected. Reports can be pulled. On the other side it is incredibly non-intuitive. – Eric
		6. Program review is likely going to be an academic affairs project, so it might not be something we need to put in our strategic plan. – Kelley
		7. We might want to consider including Graduate Program Review – may not be necessary because of the other reporting that is already done. Don’t need a redundant, non-meaningful processes that are only put into place as an act of survival. – Denise
		8. Individual competencies, as well as individual value for assessment can be lacking, especially with those who haven’t had it as a part of their professional practice and time they devote. – Shelley
		9. Using the qualitative swing to broaden what is meant by competency and purpose for assessment. – Kelley
		10. Most beneficial thing is opening up the feedback loop on what is begin assessed. Lots of faculty voices are present and understand the meaningful engagement. As English is assessing English composition, trying to bring in instructors and adjuncts who do a lot of the work for those classes is incredibly important, but that’s asking them to do more work for no compensation. Are there resources to bring them in and fairly compensate them, too – stipends? - Brian
		11. A weakness continually has been spotty support at best from upper-administration. The institutional focus was that they were happy to have an assessment council, but that there’s not a lot of support for the work that’s being done. In a lot of places the work is being done because it has to be done, not because they’re compensated for it. – Eric
		12. Can breed resentment when others aren’t doing it. – Shelley
		13. It all tends to fall on program coordinators, who are already doing a lot of work and getting very little in return. – Eric
		14. Faculty who serve on Assessment Council don’t get a lot of anything for being on. Faculty Recognition Banquet is primarily for Senate committees. – Shelley
		15. Are there other opportunities for giving recognition to those who do this work? – Kelley
		16. Assessment has become part of the culture in DSA. All Directors know they’re expected to produce information for assessment. They communicate ahead of time about questions they have and things they need to do. – John
		17. Feels good about positioning DSA as a leader in co-curricular assessment as other co-curricular units are onboarded to the process in the next couple years. – John
		18. Limitations of designators in Blue Reports for comparing data. This is a particular issue for Honors looking at comparing student performance. Finding ways to track Honors students in datasets from other programs is a big project. – Laura
		19. Everyone is so busy that it’s hard to reply to asks for data and artifacts from others (competing priorities); could be improved by an AMS. – Laura
		20. John asked for more information about what TK20 was. Eric explained. Kelley explained that it is owned by BCOE because of their accreditation needs.
		21. RE: AMS – People live in fear of all the random and unexpected data asks that they might get at any time. An AMS might reduce the amount of those requests. – Eric (Kelley – it’s Blue Reports for outcomes data)
4. New Business
	1. Mapping ISU Assessment
		1. Sorting out the difference between internal assessment processes and the assessment demands of external accreditors. – Edie
		2. Focus group, feedback lunch for program coordinators – Eric
		3. How do we do some reporting on a schedule (ALA) – Shelley
5. No Announcements
6. Adjournment