ALT Meeting

Feb. 21, 2020

9AM

HMSU 307

Attendance: Brian Stone, Nathan, Andreas Kumerrow, Greg Bierly, Laura Froelicher

Policy language to Faculty Senate, then Board of Trustees. Write-up a brief rationale.

Brian started the meeting by noting that the revised policy language was being transmitted to Faculty Senate and then to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The group reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. Corrections were noted but approval was tabled.

The group briefly discussed the rationale for the revised language. It was noted that we are just updating the material to reflect things that no longer existed. In doing so we are trying to figure out how to make the group most effective. Susan Powers’ ex-officio status was clarified, with her agreement. Clarification was added as to how each college is represented. There is flexibility to insure that different organizations are represented, including flexibility in terms of how they are chosen. There is also clarification of how many and who is required to be able to have a vote.

Kelley will be meeting with Susan about incorporating assessment into the tenure and promotion guidelines. The group indicated they are glad to hear wheels are moving. Brian noted that there is frustration that there is a lack of engagement in assessment. But we must consider what the incentive to participate is. Tenure & Promotion could be an incentive. Motivating people involved in instruction to participate in assessment is important. Some institutions have robust incentives to participate in assessment. The recent Assessment Day is a good step in the right direction.

The rest of the meeting was spent reviewing the SOAS results for each college. I will not include the specific numbers for each college, but will address some overarching issues. The College of Education saw improvement across multiple categories. It was suggested that we consult with units about being exemplary across the board. In reviewing the results for the College of Arts and Sciences, it was asked what it means if a program went down from the previous year. Brian noted that the score measures engagement in the process. It is possible some data could be missing or the process was rushed. Potentially there are some flaws in the process. Brian said he will talk with English program assessment committee. They are looking at the artifacts used and the instruction around creating those artifacts. A lot in regard to assessment comes down to the chair.

The College of Business was 100% complete, but saw a decrease in some scores. It was suggested this could be attributed to interim leadership in the college. In reference to the College of Technology, there was discussion of what should be done if assessment artifacts do not permit effective evaluation. If you ask for different artifacts that gets into curricular issues, which can create problems. Foundational Studies has made clear that in order to offer a Foundational Studies course you need to cooperate in regard to assessment adjustments.

In reference to report regarding the College of Health and Human Studies, it was asked if people from the Higher Learning Commission will see the report. Brian indicated that they probably would, but it would be up to the program to include it in the report. Reviewers might want to ask about why some have gone up and gone down. Brian noted that nothing in the report indicates negligence, it has a lot to do with materials submitted.

Brian would like to do more to share findings. Historically, findings are not shared. In composition, portfolio assessment leads to professional and curriculum develop. Northern Illinois University is a good example. They share assessment findings on their website and have a user-friendly presentation to share with the public. There is more incentive to improve.

Andreas noted that in his college, program outcomes are published, including testing results, completion rates, etc.

Brian noted that there are ethical considerations in the humanities. Should we be preparing students for other careers? Being transparent about findings can serve as a recruiting tool, but is also ethical.

Andreas noted that professional degrees are different, but other degrees do have the same process.

Brian said that transparency goes a long way and web sites make a difference.

During member updates, Brian noted that composition assessment was coming up on Wednesday. He was excited to dig into the materials.

Vote to adjourn at 9:35 AM.