Assessment Leadership Team Meeting

Nov. 15, 2019

FCTE

9 AM

Attendance: Shelley Arvin, Kelley Woods-Johnson, Deanna Fry, Eric Hampton, Brian Stone, Greg Bierly, Andreas Kummerow, Ellen Malito, Nathan Myers

Chair’s Report: Shelley delivered the chair’s report. She talked about her responsibilities as chair since she will be going on sabbatical and Brian Stone will be taking over as chair. Last year, she worked on co-curricular assessment and creating training and process. She also worked on artifact repository, which is on hold because Steven Patton is busy with other issues. The next step is for the assessment coordinator and Patton to develop procedures. Shelley has been involved in the Higher Learning Commission Criterion 3 and 4 committees as well. She checks in with Kelley regularly and Kelley can request other responsibilities. Members can suggest chair tasks as well.

Kelley asked Shelley to discuss her work on the Grad Council ad-hoc committee and in program review.

Shelley said she is working on the program review subcommittee. They are reviewing programs that are up this year. They are reexamining review procedures for graduate programs. There have been complaints about overlapping reports in terms of assessment, graduate college reporting, accreditation reporting, etc. in terms of the level of work involved. They have made a few changes and talked to Kelley about a spring committee to meld reports to make the process better and work out deadlines. Shelley believes they are looking for a representative from each college to serve. Shelley is seeking input from the library. Rusty Gonser is the chair of graduate council if you want to inquire.

People can inquire about whether there is a rep from their college and make suggestions.

Eric asked if the graduate program review is based on blue reports.

Shelley responded in the affirmative. Now there is a template that people should be able to plug things into and make it easier.

There are questions from graduate council about attaching assessment reports from several years. They would like to know if we change to a section on what you have learned from four years of assessment. Kelley is supportive of that. Linda Sperry asked about streamlining reports for accredited programs. Faculty representatives involved with accredited programs should be reaching out to faculty. Kelley notes that the duplication of effort is a major issue, and program review is seen as a major area of improvement. They will bring conversation in the spring back to this group.

Shelley said that the previous Tuesday Rusty presented changes to the Senate exec as an information item. It was just informational, nothing was approved.

Kelley provided the coordinator’s report. The SOAS review is on-going. They are collating feedback and some reports will be going out next week. Kelley and Deanna will have to wrap up feedback during Thanksgiving week. Less than 60% of reports in. Kelley is following up with programs. Some programs scheduled meetings. Other programs just need a little more free time. Some programs are exempt from submitting due to curriculum revisions.

Kelley and Deanna are also working on web site updates. Getting program updates on outcomes and curriculum maps.

Kelley is collecting learning outcomes from certificate programs and documenting them on the web site. Since it is a conferred credential we should know what it represents. Faculty and deans have been helpful.

Throughout this week and into next week, there have been open meetings with the learning management system committee as they consider a replacement for Blackboard. Listening sessions will be valuable for collecting feedback.

Andreas noted that the contract with Blackboard is up August 2022. They want to have the new system up a year before. The committee is willing to listen to wants and needs. Fair number use it for things other than instruction and the committee is considering these other uses.

Kelley noted that administrative use is an important thing to consider.

Andreas noted that a key question is How long would we still have access to Blackboard after the switch?

Kelley noted that there are concerns about LMS switch because of the last switch. They are offering a variety of listening sessions, including on-line sessions. Once RFP is sent out, part of the RFP will involve a demo to look at how the system works. They are considering the issue of importing courses from Blackboard and taking into account the “worst case scenario” in terms of difficulty transferring material. What would the labor cost and risk be? Blackboard Ultra and Canvass are among the options being considered. There were 800 responses to the student survey. Students have used LMS’s in high school. A number of faculty have prior experience with Canvass, some more varied in terms of exposure to multiple systems.

Member Reports

Eric noted that CAEP (Committee for the Assessment of Education Programs) was visiting the next week.

In regard to Old Business, the Excellence in Assessment designation was discussed. We are currently weighing whether to do a full application or a soft study to figure out roughly how close we are to the standard. Right now we are looking toward doing a soft self-study and going from there just to get a sense of our status. Kelley is reaching out to Jordan Trachtenburg at Rose-Hulman about the EIA process and how useful the process is. There seems to be a general sense that it would be a good idea. There was no information about financial cost found. There could be a cost to bring a coach to campus to help prepare.

Discussion then turned to the Assessment Council description in the policy library. There are concerns about getting too specific in the description where it requires constant revision. We need to revise membership to reflect administrative changes. We need to clarify requirements for voting (is quorum required?) We don’t want the chair to make judgement calls. We need to specify the current frequency of meeting times. We also need to look at participation and whether lack of participation can lead to dismissal. In the past, the coordinator has reached out to faculty not attending. The goal is not to be punitive, but we need quorum. Selection process of members varies by college. We could change the process from members being selected to members being nominated. There was a review of how current members were selected.

Kelley stated that in reviewing the description she wants to look at broad issues as opposed to going line by line.

Shelley noted that there are some questions about unlimited terms.

Foundational Studies Artifact Assessment: Kelley and Brian led the discussion. Bailey talked about holding date of Feb. 8 for artifact assessment. It will be all day activity. They are gathering faculty and staff, possibly students, to evaluate artifacts from global perspectives/cultural diversity and literary studies perspective. They will try to norm to the rubric and then evaluate.

Brian suggests that activities like this should come with a stipend. This would help to address Issues with getting people involved. There is value in participation, but money is an important incentive.

Kelley said some universities do have stipends, it depends on culture. The big issue is involving adjuncts who already have pay issues. Money is currently not there. The Assessment Council is strongly encouraged to participate, and they are reaching out to faculty in general. Stipends would be useful to show gratitude.

Eric noted that there are limited opportunities for assessment to help with professional advancement. It should be added to promotion and tenure documents and be factored into biennial review.

Kelley said they are working to influence change at the college level through Faculty Council. Assessment contributes to teaching and should be rewarded, perhaps on par with service. The Assessment Council could make it a priority for spring to start conversations.

Announcements? None.

Adjourned at 9:53 AM.