

Assessment and Evaluation Sub-Meet and Confer Committee

October 4, 2013, 9:30-11:00 a.m.

CSU 204

Notes

Present: Kirsti Cole, Walter Zakahi, Paul Mackie, Farhad Reza, Henry Morris, Diane Graham, Daria Dona, Kim Greer, Kathy Dale, Heather Van Camp, Jean Haar, David Jones, Rick Straka, Jessica Schomberg

1. Approved notes from 9/13/13 meeting
2. Approve committee charge – Kirsti moved to approve, Walter seconded, approved
3. Update on the Fall HLC Academy Roundtable – focus will be working on writing assessment; Oct. 16-18.
4. Discuss ways to coordinate with GCAP, UCAP, and GenEd on student learning outcomes. (Joint meetings, other?) – joint leadership meeting in process; want to set up joint working meeting with the GCAP, UCAP and GenEd sub-meets
5. Show IRPA's HLC SharePoint site – look for InfoPlace on the IRPA site
<https://share.mnsu.edu/acadaff/irpa/assessment/Assessment%20%20Evaluation%20SubMeet/Forms/AllItems.aspx>
6. Sub-group work
 - a. Assessment of Student Learning
 - i. Devise process to highlight signature outcomes from academic and co-curricular programs (October discussion)
 1. Identify signature outcomes from Academic and Co-Curricular programs. The pilot folks working with Paul would be the best to focus on this year's ISLO, Communication. Paul will send the rubrics to the Co-Curricular people so that they can identify the signature outcomes that they want to highlight.
 2. Kirsti will email "W" people to ask them to highlight an outcome from the Writing Program that sets it apart or is worth highlighting.
 3. Walter will send an email to department chair to provide sample outcomes that line up with Communication, and Kim/Walter will ask the Deans to do the same.
 - ii. Continue program review process and ways to close the feedback loop
 1. Finalizing and having a meeting with the Dean, Provost, and Dept. Chair Determine to what degree this is or isn't a problem. Ask the question to

the community, but because of the turn over with the Provost the final meeting hasn't happened.

2. Go back through reports 5 years, look at the patterns in feedback, attempt to produce a one page-ish document that acknowledges the problem, gives feedback in a summative way: strengths, department/program identified areas to work on, and support mechanisms for that.
- iii. **Devise process to look at academic achievement and self-directed learning (later discussion)**
 1. Next month we'll tackle academic achievement and self-directed learning
- b. **Institutional Effectiveness**
 - i. **Work on documenting assumed practices**
 1. Reviewed draft crosswalk, began to fill in data as we could. Individuals will continue to work on this as they have time. Will continue to work on it at the next meeting.
 2. Need clarification on how HLC defines credentials, and if they want instructor information for both credit and not-for-credit courses
 - ii. **Institutional performance indicators**
 1. Daria, Lynn and Barry Ries have met to talk about grad performance indicators, will work to draft some
 2. Lynn, Jessica and DeeAnn Snaza talked about professional development; Jessica and DeeAnn will lead a small workgroup of people from professional development committees and other relevant parties to develop appropriate indicators
 - a. Question: Could we get a report on professional development funding across campus, and perhaps set goals on spending dedicated professional development funds (primarily affecting faculty?)
7. **Report back from sub-groups**
8. **Other**
 - a. Requested a report to our group about assessment results from previous years' strategic priority funding; to share with Planning, including information about good models and suggestions for improvement