

Minutes

University Assessment Council

9am, November 10th, 2017, Federal Hall (College of Business), Room 222

Members Present: Armstrong, Arvin, Ballard, Bunnett, Dhome, Donlan, Harder, Herrington-Perry, Myers, Osborne, Johnson, Sare

Members Absent: Baker, Lawson, Nichols, Paterson, Peterson, Powers, Shin

I. Welcome

Chair Shelley Arvin convened the meeting at 9:03 am and introduced Tracy Osborne, Director of New Student Programs and Testing, the new representative from Enrollment Services.

II. Review and Approval of the October 13th Minutes

Armstrong moved and Harder seconded the motion to approve the minutes. They were approved with one abstention.

III. Discussion of the Results of the Spring 2017 Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes (MSC)

Thirteen states including Indiana participate in the MSC. Last spring, ISU submitted 110 senior-level artifacts to the MSC to be assessed using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics for critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and writing. Herrington-Perry reviewed the results (appended to these Minutes) and asked for comments and suggestions on next steps.

Members noted that we could provide professional development opportunities to the faculty who teach Foundational Studies courses; share the AAC&U rubrics more widely so that faculty understand expectations; link the key outcomes to career readiness to get more traction; be advocates for student learning in our respective departments; and identify writing-intensive courses and emphasize writing across the curriculum.

Members decided to carry over this conversation to the next meeting. The key question is this: What are some targeted strategies we could develop to assist faculty in improving student learning in critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and writing? These strategies need to consider constraints on faculty time/resources, have the support of the University College Council and upper-level administrators, and be championed by members of the Assessment Council (among others).

IV. Discussion of the Requirement for Career Readiness Outcomes

By fall 2018, academic programs are expected to implement learning outcomes related to career readiness. (See the 9.21.17 Faculty Senate minutes for more information.) Few programs have learning outcomes explicitly related to career readiness (one exception is Psychology, which requires students to demonstrate readiness for post-graduation life), but

most require students to complete career-readiness activities (practica, internships, portfolios, etc.) to demonstrate that they have achieved other outcomes.

Some members indicated that they were aware of this mandate, and some believe their programs already are in compliance with it. But they agreed that clarification as to how units are expected to fulfill the requirement would be helpful, particularly so they can use it as leverage to move forward with career readiness initiatives. Arvin noted that the Senate expects departments to have the flexibility to adapt the new requirement to their particular program/discipline.

Note: The Coordinator subsequently learned that Dr. Nancy Rogers, Vice President for University Engagement, had developed a template that provides direction on how units can fulfill the career readiness requirement. Chair Arvin emailed this document to members.

V. Chair's Report

Arvin offered an update on the student artifact repository. Stephen Patton, chair of Library Information Systems, is providing advice about the project and has offered his support. This conversation will continue.

VI. Coordinator's Report

- The Assessment Coordinator has presented the results of last spring's critical thinking assessment projects to the University College Council (UCC). She and Chris Fischer subsequently led a session in the FCTE that focused on the results and how the UCC might use them to help improve teaching and learning in this area.
- As was previously mentioned, there is a plan to combine the SLSRs with the Success Reports, largely out of a desire to make the connection between success and student learning more explicit, but also to reduce the number of reports departments must complete. In the near future, members of the Assessment Council and the Success Council will be asked to form a subcommittee to discuss this issue. Stay tuned.
- The "Upcoming Events" section on the agenda lists the assessment-related professional development activities scheduled for 2017-18. Last week, Amy French presented a very upbeat session on how to use focus groups effectively; next week, Joe Harder will be presenting on how to encourage faculty to participate in assessment. Please join us and encourage your colleagues to join us as well.
- Only a few members of the council reported having any assessment-related meetings or activities to include on the proposed assessment calendar. It does not appear that a calendar is needed at this time.
- Herrington-Perry, along with colleagues Amy French and John Sare, attended the annual Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. She noted that many of the presentations focused on backwards design (i.e., building courses and programs by first identifying their expected learning outcomes) and transparency. She shared one especially good presentation on the latter topic (Pat Hutchings' "Transparency Across the Curriculum: Assignments, Alignments, and Learning Outcomes.")

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:55am. Our next meeting will be at 9 am on Friday, December 8th, in Federal Hall 222.

Critical Thinking Results

Dimension	ISU Assessment (N=50)	MSC ISU Results (N=73)	MSC Nationwide Results (N=2024)
Explanation of Issues	2.57	2.15	2.41
Evidence	2.40	1.77	2.13
Influence of Context and Assumptions	2.14	1.74	2.01
Student's Position	2.21	1.73	2.05
Conclusions and Outcomes	2.30	1.82	2.05

Quantitative Literacy Results

Dimension	MSC ISU Results (N=10)	MSC Nationwide Results (N=782)
Interpretation	2.9	1.75
Representation	2.4	1.71
Application/Analysis	2.3	1.61
Assumptions	.7	.84
Communication	2.8	1.76

Written Communication Results

Dimension	MSC ISU Results (N=95)	MSC Nationwide Results (N=2018)
Context and Purpose	2.11	2.49
Content Development	1.98	2.37
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	1.93	2.22
Sources and Evidence	1.77	2.14
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.14	2.44