

Assessment Leadership Team Meeting
January 20, 2017
9AM
Rankin Hall 245

Attending: Kirk Armstrong, John Sare, Shelley Arvin, Amy French, Lynn Maurer, Mary Herrington-Perry, Bhagyashri Dhome, Joe Harder

Absent: William Baker

Introductions/Discussion of the Holidays

Congratulation to John on the addition to the family!

- I. Welcome to Shelley as Chair, Intro of Amy French (Asst. Professor in Ed Leadership)
- II. Review of ALT Minutes
 - a. Minutes Approved with 2 Abstentions
- III. Review of Council Minutes
 - a. Minutes Approved with 2 Abstentions
- IV. Council Agenda
 - a. Delay of first council meeting
 - b. Working with AAC&U Rubric
 - i. 57 artifacts to review, possibly a total of 100
 - ii. Bhagya discussion of spreadsheet to organize review of artifacts
 1. Redact student information
 2. Each person will review up to 10 artifacts, each artifact will be reviewed by 2 people
 3. Mary will review if there are differences in scoring
 4. Rubric with scoring column (Mary)
 - a. Electronic
 - i. Score-save by student ID number
 - ii. Return to Mary
 - iii. Terry Dean will help to understand rubric and anchor the group.
 - iv. February 10th meeting, return artifacts by March 3rd
 - v. Mary will review and generate a report.
 - vi. Summary of strengths and weaknesses
 - vii. Questions
 1. Kirk-Contextualize rubric to match assignments?
 2. Mary will make sure assignments are applicable using mini-rubric.
 3. Kirk-Have faculty had training prior to giving assignment?

4. Mary-Goal to make sure that University College is meeting learning goals. Prof. Development activity with Chris Fisher to talk about what worked, what isn't, and have experts discuss teaching critical thinking. Help faculty understand what is being assessed and improve their assignments.
5. Shelley-Library doing a similar project with a rubric. Can librarians be invited to get a feel for how to assess using a rubric?
6. Mary-Fine to invite other faculty. 18 people on council. Hopefully at least 10 people will participate in the activity. Could help with development expertise on teaching critical thinking.

V. Coordinator's Report

- a. Provost's Award-Good event and lots of good publicity. Faculty Senate approved by-laws. Added a member of University College to the Council as an additional member starting next fall. Must determine term lengths for next fall. People serve full term on the council regardless of term on the Faculty Senate.
- b. Student Learning Summary Deadline Update
 - i. Discussion with Deans. Deans of different colleges have identified different deadlines.
 - ii. Joe discussed schedule for the College of Business.
 - iii. Mary will review reports in the fall. Reports will then come out in the spring.
 - iv. Mary-We did not collect 300 randomly selected artifacts for the Multi-State Collaborative Project. Hope to collect artifacts this spring.
 - v. Bhagya-Interim Progress Survey. Need to copy and paste in order to get it to work. ALT members had difficulty using the link. Bhagya will send out an email to clarify.

VI. Updates

- a. Librarians will have a discussion with IRB about what constitutes human subject research and what does not in regard to student assessment. Library wants to avoid having to submit projects for "Exempt" status if not necessary.
- b. Lynn-Efforts are being made to get "Exempt" projects through more quickly. They do not yet have a specific "Exempt" form.
- c. Shelley-IRB has been very helpful. Shelley wants to be able to clearly communicate with IRB what is being done. Library wants to discuss how the IRB views assessment projects.
- d. Difference between library assessment and grading?
 - i. Mary said difference is using results for research.
 - ii. Shelley-Does sharing outside the department constitute publishing?
- e. Mary-This is a useful conversation to have. This will be discussed at the council meeting.

- f. Is it time to do a conference or another type of university-wide event?
 - i. Need to prepare for the university accreditation in 2020.
 - ii. Assessment will be a big focus of the accreditation process to meet Learning Commission requirements.
- g. John-Pieces are in place in Student Affairs to use software to collect student data to make honest, critical assessment on programming. Excited to bring useful data on student programming to the council.
- h. Joe-Tampa trip to AACSB accreditation meeting. First day-Discussing making connection between Theory and Methods. Day Two is discussing Building a Community of Assessment. Consultant is visiting in February to consult with the college internally to examine core business curriculum which is key to accreditation and information every student has to take. Joe reports information from trips at SLAC meetings. Each SLAC member coordinates with department chair and individual faculty if a class is selected for data collection for a specific outcome.
- i. Mary-Would Joe be interested in doing a professional development activity? Joe responded that he would consider it. Consultant will visit in February, might be able to speak to a wider audience. Kelly Wilkinson is the point person.
- j. Mary issue is getting buy-in when there is little money involved. She would like to reward activity.
- k. Joe-Dean of the College of Business is very supportive and knowledgeable.
- l. Amy-College of Education working on getting buy-in by clarifying and simplifying in preparation for accreditation.
- m. Kirk-Programmatic site visit. Program thought it was clear on programmatic information. Out of 105 standards, they asked for clarification on 42 standards. Program only had 1 non-compliance in regard to assessment. ISU program has person going to Qualtrics conference. Kirk will be attending the HLC workshop.
- n. Shelley-Assessment Project on information literacy. Will ask professors who teach classes with seniors for artifacts of student work. They will use AAC&U rubric to evaluate those and report about what students know regarding finding and evaluating information. She is working on reminding colleagues to remind departments to collect information.
- o. Lynn-Grad Council is in Year 4 of program review with College of Technology. Grad College has made good progress in the area of assessment. Assessment has been bypassed previously, but this has improved. Self-studies from Technology have been completed.
- p. Mary-Learning Summary Reports are being put on-line for public dissemination. Grad Council can access the information from the web site.