Assessment and Evaluation
Notes
May 5, 2012

1. Mission and Focus of the Group:

   a. Charge and Name Change Information from Lynn Akey

   b. Reviewing impetus of the charge and an effort to focus

   c. New simplification and possible subgroups within the submeet, 2 different areas (assurance of student learning, institutional effectiveness), attending both in the hope of improving our ability to attain actionable items

   d. Lindsay—good next step, what impact can we have meeting so few times if we are torn in multiple directions, a better framework to divide into subgroups

   e. Haar—President in convocation reiterates importance of this group coming up with solid suggestions

   f. Akey—Concerns?

      i. Straka—Appreciate the change, SCUP conference highlighted assessment split between academic and non-academic assessment.

   g. Trying to think about how to put this on the web, and putting documents etc on Institutional Research—Institutional Assessment site used to create a space for documents

   h. Capture a more thorough overarching charge and firm up split between the subgroups

2. Background and Orientation—Akey

   a. Process of refining ourselves and what it means to be a university wide submeet that looks at student learning and institutional effectiveness.

   b. HLC Assessment Academy

      i. Working on the process (handout), overview of the academy,

      ii. Offering from the Higher Learning Commission, started in the late 1990s, voluntary participation, following last comprehensive review. The area that we were noted for was our coordination of Planning, Budget and Assessment—need for continued focus and further integration

     iii. Need to focus on student learning—a lot of transition surrounding assessment on campus which has been refocused on through participation in the academy

     iv. Significant campus initiative surrounding student learning: action portfolio—4 year project and report with an e-network updated about project

     v. Initial process is underway—Draft concept—areas that we need to focus

          1. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes—what to do with them?

          2. General Education Outcomes—current process not working very well, ad hoc committee beginning to review process and putting together a new process by end of Fall '11.

          3. Writing/Writing Intensive—(Cole—Work in the Writing Task Force)

          4. Steering committee is appointed, beginning to meet and map shortly

          5. Ties into our upcoming accreditation visit with the Higher Learning Commission

3. Higher Learning Commission Changes

    a. Handout

    b. More explicit criteria of evaluation being revised.

    c. P. 13, Appendix A (current), criteria are being revised into open pathways.

    d. Explicit and multiple subparts for criteria

    e. For our submeet, there are higher expectations about the assessment of student learning, not just at course level but at department, division and institutional levels. At academic core but across the institution as a whole, continuous improvement and evaluation is key.

    f. Another revision coming into effect January 2012.

    g. We will need to visit and understand implementation of minimum expectations.

    h. Next comprehensive program review visit is Fall 2015—process is different than before.

4. Open Pathway at a Glance

a. Second major shift in HLC, process for accreditation

b. PEAK form is no longer an option for MSU, the process taking its place is the Pathways Process

    i. Pathways is focused on continuous improvement and continuous feedback

    ii. 2 components

        1. The assurance process and the improvement process

        2. Instead of a huge self study document, everything will be handled electronically, including an assurance argument addressing criteria, which should be maintained on an ongoing basis

        3. The improvement process will be the institution taking on a quality initiative. Our map will begin Fall 2012.

        4. The Quality Initiative—we can use the academy project as our initiatve

        5. Expectation to pick some challenging

        6. Is there a different infrastructure for responsibility in terms of how we carry out our work? (Daria)

        7. Jenny in the Assessment office will be taking some of that work on (Akey)

        8. What is our role in the new Pathways infrastructure?

        9. Think about which criteria fall under each group in our submeet***

5. President's Challenges

    a. 11/12

6. Group coming together to look at Academic Data Summary—Akey has the charge of the group and there is still a spot for a representative from A/E

    a. ADS—data summarizing the academic activities of the university and its use. (handout)

    b. Moving quickly, 2 meetings/month in Fall

7. Data Quality Campaign

a. The college of ed has been asked to represent MN at a conference that covers regional data quality campaign

b. "From Dartboards to Dashboards"

c. The group is focused on promoting collaboration between data-gathering, data systems, and forging state and national connections

d. Focus is on public schools first, focusing on teacher preparation, impacting undergrad education and the readiness of high school students to handle college course work

e. They want institutions to build data systems that will talk across other data systems across the state to study education from all facets. (handout)

f. Moving from the "hammer" culture to the "illumination" culture in use of data—start looking at the value of data system development

8. SharePoint PowerPivot

a. Notion of data access is a continuing theme that this group has been concerned with

b. What tools do we have available and how do we increase data access?

c. Gives us the capability to hook up data from any program that you have (excel, websites, databases, etc.)

d. A pivot bring these sets of data together and allows us to "slice" it according to a vast variety of categories.

e. Interfaces with SharePoint and anyone with access can get in and manipulate the data