ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION NOTES
JANUARY 20, 2012

1. Program Review Reporting and Tracking

    a. Strengthening the process on comprehensive program review, and what happens at the end of the process once the report was submitted to Dean and Provost. What is the next step?

    b. After the Council of Deans, a request for electronic based tracking system that is more transparent. A new template was developed in IRandA that they are working with—reporting sheet for each college organized by year and department. Organized by steps of program review. Proposing that they track and post, give dates on completion, a quick reference guide. Suggestion to scan and upload documents, but there is hesitation about that. Thinking about using the same sort of template for Assessment of Student Learning (also in SharePoint).

    c. Feedback: What are the hesitations with posting reports? Departments might be a bit exposed or out of context. Suggestion to password or network encrypt, or limit it further and make it by department. Potentially use SharePoint for the smaller groups, "view only." Perhaps post criteria on what's reviewed.

2. Developing Comparison Groups (Peer and Aspirant)

    a. Handouts (2)

    b. More comprehensive identification of our peer institutions

    c. Need further development of information and data-points in determining peer institutions and aspirant institutions

    d. Need a set group of reference points in order to evaluate our institution that relies on something other than historical data.

    e. We are typically categorized as peers within the MNSCU system, but we aren't necessarily peers with the internal institutions.

    f. This would be the body that would support and move that conversation forward and how we can.

    g. Feedback: Absolutely would be useful for us to have peer and aspirant institutions, from the A&H college perspective, comparisons are key because our units are very different than others on campus. We must have a baseline outside of our institution. What might the right quantity for such a thing be—we're not Division 1, but we're not exactly a Division 2 either. We need to look nationally in order to get data from institutions that look like us—thinking about Eau Claire in WI. About a dozen institutions seem to be manageable in terms of tracking.

Good networking can occur between peer and aspirant institutions. IPEDS has comparison groups that automatically generate. Most comparisons are typically historic or system-wide, or "masters public institutions." There is a list of peers and aspirants generated by the Graduate Task Force.

h. Subgroup on Institution Effectiveness—find the critical data-points to use for comparison in terms of peer institutions. Once determined IRA can collect the data and come up with a set of institutions and eventually pair down to a dozen or so, and bring the list back to this group. Work on Peer before we work on Aspirant.

3. Academic Data Summary Recommendations

   a. Handout

   b. New Academic Data Summary will be out mid-February, the information in the handouts is for the next report.

   c. The ADS has been with the institution for many years, and it's shifted and updated occasionally but the current format has stood for 10 years. It didn't get a lot of attention but existed, until we had to do our budget reductions in '09-'10.

   d. A lot of questions were generated about where the ADS data comes from and what's generated. Addressed major questions in the beginning of the report

   e. The work group pieced through the ADS and make recommendations on improvement.

   f. Consensus is identified and taken into consideration

   g. Consideration of items in this body, recommendations made by the ADS Work Group for feedback. (One major feedback—how is it used? Why?)

      i. Include an expanded introductory section—expanded understanding of definitions, clear articulation of the limitations of the data that is included (as it does not represent everything that happens)

      ii. Withhold estimate data (ADS comes out too late, almost a year turn around). The estimate column holds up the production of the report because they are waiting for timely estimate data. Without estimate data the book could be produced in August instead of February, and submit estimate data separately.

      iii. Summer Term Data—incorporate for the first time

      iv. Instructional Profile—Give full information on faculty/instructor information for each department.

<ol type="i" start="5">

Include breakout information for GenEd and Writing Intensive credit generation

Modify representation of offcampus and online credit hour summary—should off campus and online be represented as two different axes? Extended Learning, and Departmental, and Online/Hybrid—the chart doesn't take into consideration funding source—a lot of discussion about what offcampus means, what online means, what budgetary impacts those make, how to define, and how to use the data. What happens in gray-scale and black/white? Color coding doesn't help in dissemination.

Recommendation to include GTA FTE in FTEF, but no longer include Gen Graduate Assistant and Graduate Research Assistant FTE—bring into alignment with standard calculation for FTEF

Include details in FTEF about instructional position—definition holds up nationally and is in line with the Delaware study, the only place where we are still different is that we do not include sabbatical time as expended.

Include certificates

Adjust standards per FTEF according to peer institutions—needs to be more work done on the standards, the primary process was an internal, historical process. It doesn't provide a means to re-evaluate the benchmark, which is why the list of peer institutions would be so useful.

Incorporate the weight of writing intensive credit hours—support the WTF recommendations.

Use as a planning resource—there needs to be more and better information if departments take a more active role in planning. There is an interest to do that, but if we have questions that the data doesn't include, the book doesn't move forward as a useful tool. We need to think about this text as a planning tool and what constitutes planning resources and tools.

The Assessment and Evaluation officially supports the recommendations of the ADS Workgroup and will shortly send minor feedback to Lynn Akey.

4. Writing Task Force Report

   a. Order of the recommendations: perhaps move assessment forward—get the base data first

   b. Do we need more motivation for faculty/administration to work through writing intensive issues.

       c.

5. Subgroup Work

    a. Student Learning

    b. Institutional Effectiveness

Send out an email for approval of notes, attendance policy, and subgroup updates with the subgroup membership, and feedback for the ADS workgroup/WTF (?) as reminder***