Assessment Leadership Team Minutes 5/3/19

Attendance: Ruthanne Ekwealor, Malea Crosby, Ellen Malito, Eric Hampton, Denise Collins, Joe Harder, Brian Stone, Andreas Kummerow, Kelley Woods-Johnson, Shelley Arvin

1. Welcome
	1. Review of the Minutes
		1. Denise motions to approve. Andreas seconds the motion.
		2. Vote to approve: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained
2. Reports
	1. Chair – Shelley
		1. Thank everyone for their service to leadership team.
		2. Consider now running for Chair or Vice Chair next year. Shelley will be on sabbatical Spring 20, so it would be nice to see a new face in leadership roles.
		3. Vice Chair is a position we haven’t filled in the past, so that is something we would need to do next year.
		4. Should the Assessment Council chair send an email out to chairs to remind folks to be sharing their assessment feedback and discussing.
			1. Joe is the person who is the “pesterer” in SCOB.
			2. Kelley – is this a duplication of the efforts made by the HLC 3 & 4 committee?
	2. Coordinator – Kelley
		1. Co-Curricular
		2. FCTE Writing/Planning Days
		3. Learning Outcomes for Certificate Programs
		4. Quality Initiative Draft
		5. University College Council Assessment Plan Vote
	3. Members
		1. Brian – ENG composition (from 101-305) revised outcomes are complete. Met with instructors, adjuncts, TAs to talk about upcoming workshops and clarify expectations for collecting digital portfolios moving forward. The repository will be a future tool; they will use Blackboard for now. They are excited to see student progression over time. Talking with Chris Fischer about Writing Across the Curriculum efforts that this might support as well. Hoping to provide improvement to student disciplinary writing and writing in multiple contexts.
3. Old Business
	1. Artifact Repository – Shelley
		1. AMS is on pause for now knowing that we might have alternate options with Blackboard and the repository that are low-cost or free.
		2. Shelley attended a Blackboard webinar that was about assessment basics, mapping and labeling assignments to align with learning outcomes. Unclear as to whether co-curricular units can be incorporated because they don’t have Bb access created as a function of a class.
		3. Joe – Even more convinced that Bb will apply to the assessment needs of instructors and administrators in SCOB. The human side of getting everybody on board and coming up with the manpower to get it done is the bigger question. Very interested in following up with the conversation had with Kristie Bigler about how to pilot this.
			1. Kelley – After the end of the semester we could gather Kelly Wilkinson and Linda Maule to talk about how we can convince Kristie to allow us to pilot this in the summer. Joe is teaching a summer class; is willing to pilot.
			2. Andreas – Tap into the Blackboard experts on campus.
			3. Kelley – We have talked with them, and they have helped us understanding the options. We need to prove we can provide the people support because they don’t have the people to do it right now.
			4. Joe – WEAVE conversations are on hold as we investigate these other options.
			5. Kelley – The Bb option is probably more relevant and exciting to faculty because it has to do with their real-time assessment of student learning, while WEAVE is more of a workflow and storehouse for data that is more relevant for oversight and management.
			6. Brian – Would Bb remove the need for faculty to upload each portfolio individually?
				1. Joe – Bb would; Shelley – repository would not, but batch uploading can be done.
		4. Shelley – (Sharing the artifact repository screens document).
			1. Home page sign in
			2. Drop downs for selections to make it more error-proof and get the information that’s necessary.
			3. Can upload up to 20 papers at a time; this can be changed to a max of 50.
			4. Can upload .doc or .pdf
			5. Questions
				1. How likely are people to do this, or would enough be willing to do this so that there would be some artifacts for assessment. How can we improve this process to improve use?

Shelley – Changing the sign in page and improving the font size for readability. Changing the 991 field to prevent duplicate entry of 991.

Brian – Can students go to this to submit the artifacts or does it have to go through the instructor?

Shelley & Joe – Good question. Joe – the format could make it hard to manage, but that’s not necessarily a no. Could be easier if we’re talking about a trusted GA versus individual students in a class. Shelley – access would have to be granted.

* + - 1. Management Screen (backend)
				1. Current fields display 991, assignment, course, original file, saved file name, and date added.
				2. Need to add course section.
				3. Can search by date or by assignment.
				4. Administration page only exists as a tab on the front page.
		1. Shelley – IRB was consulted about the artifact process. They said that faculty who are potentially going to upload student work should put a statement that student work could be shared in their syllabus.
			1. Joe – If the intent was to write an article, informed consent must be expressly given. If using a body of work that’s already in the repository, then consent is not necessary.
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