

Assessment Leadership Team Minutes 2015-09-04

3:00 pm, September 4, 2015, Rankin Hall Conference Room 245

Present: Shelley Arvin; Sandeep Bhowmick; Eric Hampton; Mary Herrington-Perry; Nathan Myers; Susan Powers; Troy Allen;

Absent: Molly Hare; William Baker;

Visitors: Brittany Bernard (graduate assistant)

Chair: Mary Herrington-Perry

Recorder: Shelley Arvin

Timekeeper: Nathan Myers

- Prior to meeting, Herrington-Perry distributed the following attachments by e-mail.
 - Academic assessment plans and reports for Taskstream.doc
 - Academic Program Assessment Timelines 2015-16.doc
 - ASSESSMENT COUNCIL 2015.doc
 - Conceptual Framework New Version.doc
- 1. Called to order at 3:00 pm
- 2. Updates/Questions from Mary et al (10 minutes)
 - a. ALT members reviewed the membership of the Full Assessment Council. Herrington-Perry questioned whether some members had completed term limits.
 - i. Arvin reported that the original Conceptual Framework did not specify any term limits for Full Council members.
 - b. Herrington-Perry has been meeting with people across campus. She reported that some departments are not aware of the content of the *Expectations and Timelines for Academic Program Assessment 2015-16* and the *Academic Program Assessment Plans and Reports*.
 - i. It was suggested that a graphic might communicate expectations better for those who think visually.
 - c. Herrington-Perry added her own name to update the Full Council roster. The roster will be taken to the full Assessment Council as a Point of Information.
- 3. Conceptual Framework (10 minutes)
 - a. Myers explained that the original Conceptual Framework had been divided into two documents: a Conceptual Framework and Bylaws. It must be approved by the Full Council. It was not approved at the last Full Council meeting due to no quorum.
 - b. Next steps are to address the internal parts of the documents. Possible areas to address include
 - i. What is assessment meant to accomplish?
 - ii. Stages of assessment
 - iii. Goals and instruments
 - iv. Terms and definitions

- c. Last year, the Council discussed different methods to evaluate assessment plans. The Council never evaluated the plan to give feedback, counsel, and help to departments.
 - d. Hampton suggested holding people accountable for student learning outcomes. The process is still unclear to some.
 - e. Powers stated she liked the idea of defining roles and responsibilities. Roles could be defined for the chair, faculty, the dean.
 - f. Herrington-Perry said that roles could be put into the Bylaws document.
 - g. Myers had assumed the role of drafting the Bylaws and Framework. But he prefers a conversation of the Leadership Team and Council on assigning roles.
 - h. This will be added to the next Full Council agenda
4. Planning for Upcoming University Assessment Council Meetings (10 minutes)
- a. Herrington-Perry will contact entities to verify representatives. There was a general feel that under attendance occurred last year. This was particularly noticed at the last meeting in spring. Arvin remembered that a misunderstanding of roles was speculated as a reason for low attendance.
 - i. Arvin said that Full Council minutes could be examined to assess attendance accurately.
 - b. Bhowmick asked for an actionable and executable strategy. Herrington-Perry suggested perhaps this should be put in the Bylaws.
 - i. Powers said that Assessment representatives did not hold the sole responsibility to tell colleagues about assessment. Deans should help. ALT representatives should take assessment information back to colleges.
 - c. Powers suggested asking the Provost to visit at the first meeting of Council. Herrington-Perry said she would request this.
 - d. Powers suggested coordination between the Student Success Council and the Assessment Council. ALT members acknowledged that there was overlap of the entities. Arvin said that last year it was discussed that Assessment Day & Student Success spring events be done jointly. Powers reported that Student Success was planning to emphasize Writing Across Curriculum this year. Both groups could combine resources to get the keynote speaker, etc.
 - e. It was suggested that the Full Council had struggled with not having any work. As a working group, members should have more responsibility and tasks. ALT could have the Full Council take a more active role in working with Foundational Studies. There should be a shift from turning in assessment artifacts to turning in *useful* assessment artifacts.
 - f. Herrington-Perry inquired how will this work. Would ALT continue to meet twice a month. She said that the Full Council probably will not meet until at least the third week of September.
5. Moving Assessment Forward: Next Steps (20 minutes)
- a. Herrington-Perry wants to communicate information about the Conceptual Framework to the university. People had expressed to her a desire for a brief monthly e-mail that links to a robust website on assessment. It was said there should be collaboration, partnerships. The Assessment Council could work with

Student Success. The Council could improve the Conceptual Framework. Existing assessment plans could be evaluated. Beth Whitaker has met with Herrington and is willing to cooperate.

- i. Hampton said deans have the responsibility of making sure assessment gets done. They have all of the responsibility and little of the work.
- ii. Bhowmick asked if every College has an assessment committee. No. But an assessment committee is useful when it exists.
- iii. Powers said employees need to take ownership of assessment. A committee takes assessment to a peer level. All colleges/library have an assessment committee except the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Technology. The College of Ed has standing assessment committee under the Teacher Education Committee (TEC).
- iv. Hampton said the Council should talk about faculty responsibilities for assessment.
- v. Powers added the Council should also talk about program director and chair responsibilities.
- vi. Faculty must develop learning outcomes. It is both a faculty right and responsibility. Powers said, if faculty are responsible for student learning, then they are also responsible for learning outcomes. It goes hand in hand.
- vii. Powers said the responsibility for writing down an assessment plan need not fall to faculty as a whole. But some faculty must be responsible for assessing and analyzing.
- viii. Hampton said all faculty of a program should be looking at the data. Someone must be reporting the plan and reporting the data. A coordinator must report.
- ix. Powers agreed. One can't have an entire group doing the reporting. That would be a mess.
- x. Herrington-Perry said, in her experience, chairs and program directors are doing the same thing. They can share those roles. Their role can include summarizing the unit's assessment activities in a report. Powers and Hampton agreed.
- xi. Associate Deans could identify who is the contact. Who is the liaison with faculty. Who are appropriate individuals to report out to the Council.
- xii. If a College level assessment committee exists, then the Committee could rally and disseminate assessment information.
 1. As an example, the College of Business could communicate goals. Look at data that address goals across the entire college. It could lead the charge for outcomes that cross the span of business programs.
- xiii. Hampton said that nonacademic units should receive attention. They should have coordinators and program directors handle assessment. How and what should be assessed raises the question of where does student learning happen.
- xiv. Powers asked if the university had broader institutional learning goals across units. Are there attitudes that the university wishes to instill in graduates?

Perhaps create community engagement outcomes? Are we counting how many people voted after voting drives? Arvin asked do graduates continue to be involved in community engagement after leaving ISU.

1. Powers suggested perhaps to add someone from Community Engagement to the Full Council.
2. Herrington-Perry said it was important for the Provost and President to help to create a positive tone for assessment. Assessment statements should emphasize helping to make successful graduates and students. Maybe it should be a shared responsibility.
3. Arvin added that also there should be an emphasis on the evidence-based decision-making process compared to a "I'll just do this today" process. Powers agreed.
4. Bernard suggested to add a students' role. The student role is to be aware of learning outcomes. An HLC Requirement is how to communicate your outcomes. Many universities do lots of graduate exit surveys. They assess cross-campus or cross-college outcomes. Bernard said it is useful to state learning goals to students in order for them to understand why they are taking this class or learning this thing.

6. Next time

- a. Herrington-Perry will send another Doodle poll to schedule the Full Council. ALT will aim for the third week of September for a Full Council meeting.