Institutional Assessment Committee
Minutes for Wednesday, November 18, 2015 (11:00-12:00)
CAS Conference Room

Members Present: Cece Brennan, Todd Bruce, Rodney Hessinger, Dan Kilbride, Peter Kvidera, Brittiani McNeil, Scott Moore, Mike Nichols
Members Absent: Dan Kilbride, Cathy Rosemary
Guests Present: Rich Clark (assessment coordinator for Peace, Justice, and Human Rights), Penny Harris (assessment coordinator for Sociology and Criminology) Sharon Kaye (assessment coordinator for Philosophy), Krysta Kurzynsky (member of the Assessment Academy Action Team), Bath Martin (assessment coordinator for Psychological Science), Sheila McGinn (assessment coordinator for Theology and Religious Studies), Tom Pace (assessment coordinator for English), Mike Setter (assessment coordinator for Chemistry), Andreas Sobisch (assessment coordinator for Political Science), Mariah Webinger (assessment coordinator for Accountancy)

I.   Welcome and Charge

Dr. Bruce called the meeting to order at 11:00 am. After introductions, Dr. Bruce reviewed the charge of the committee, and explained how the italicized items interacted with the ongoing Assessment Academy project. During the process, he clarified how the Institutional Assessment Committee, department/program assessment coordinators, and the Assessment Academy Action Team are related to each other (details available in Appendix A to these minutes).

> The Committee is responsible for:
> - Collaborating with the Provost's office to ensure ongoing systems of academic assessment, including:
>   - *Advise and assist the Assessment Academy Action team in the development, implementation, and maintenance of academic assessment processes at the institutional level;*
>   - Review of institutional and departmental academic assessment reports;
>   - Advising and assisting the Core committee in planning and carrying out assessment of the University's general education programs;
>   - Recommendation of changes and modifications in institutional academic assessment processes.
> - *Reporting to various stakeholders and constituencies the findings of the assessment program and their implications for maintaining and improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction.*
> - Advising faculty, departments, divisions, and colleges on assessment procedures and methods.
> - Recommending to and collaborating with the Assessment Director to provide assessment workshops and seminars for faculty.

He then quickly reviewed how those items will play out in a typical academic year.

- First Fall Meeting
  - Action on Core Report
  - Assignments: Spring/Summer Reports, Audits
- Second Fall Meeting
  - Action on Spring/Summer Reports
- First Spring Meeting

- o Assignments: Fall Reports
  - o Begin Changes Conversation
- Second Spring Meeting
  - o Action on Fall Reports and Audits, Changes
  - o Faculty/Staff Development Recommendations

He also explained how the committee would now be pivoting to more of an institutional view (through reviewing all assessment reports from across campus and adding staff and student members). There was also some discussion of the upcoming elections for faculty representation to the committee. The attendees saw the benefits of both more faculty representatives and fewer.

II.   Work Before Us This Year
        A.   Assessment Coordinator Guidelines (to be finalized at first spring meeting)

        The draft position guidelines provided at the meeting (and below in Appendix B) are essentially a set of task descriptions. The attendees were supportive of crafting a document that provided departments and programs with guidance in the selection and appointment of an assessment coordinator rather than binding rules or requirements. Other results of the discussion: selection/appointment should parallel other departmental appointments (like graduate coordinator or curriculum committee chair) in process; coordinators should serve a three-year term with a recommendation of no more than two consecutive terms. While there were strong feelings that appointing a non-tenured faculty member would be irresponsible, the group did acknowledge that there might be situations where such an appointment would be acceptable. Dr. Bruce will draft a document and subsequently circulate it to the committee, the assessment coordinators, and chairs/program directors for comment with the goal of an assessment committee endorsement vote at the first meeting in the spring semester.

        B.   Assessment Audits (approval vote at second spring meeting)

        Dr. Bruce then reviewed the task of auditing a program's full assessment system prior to their Academic Program Review. Normally, the process will happen two years before the APR, but in order to give all programs the same feedback, for this year only, the process will include two APR cohorts. After reviewing all assessment documents, two auditors for each program will complete a checklist of questions and provide comments and feedback for the program's consideration as they embark upon APR. The form is attached as Appendix C. The attendees felt the form would be useful for other purposes as well and should be sent to all assessment coordinators.

        NOTE: After the meeting it was decided that Pre-APR Assessment Review would be a better name for this process than Assessment Audit since the end result is feedback, comments, and questions, and not an official ruling of some sort.

III.   Upcoming Tasks

        Finally, Dr. Bruce reviewed the remaining tasks for this academic year.

        A.   Review and Feedback for Annual Assessment Reviews (at second spring meeting)
        B.   Changes to Processes and Procedures (at second spring meeting)
        C.   Faculty/Staff Development Recommendations (at second spring meeting)
        D.   Integrative Core Curriculum Assessment Review (at first fall meeting)

Appendix A

The **Institutional Assessment Committee** is a University committee with a mixture of appointed and elected members. It usually meets twice a semester in order to oversee institutional assessment processes. Specific tasks under its jurisdiction include the review of Annual Assessment Reports, the review of the full program-level assessment systems of units prior to their periodic Academic Program Reviews, recommendations about changes to assessment processes and procedures, and suggestions about forthcoming faculty and staff development. While they are not required or expected to attend Institutional Assessment Committee meetings, assessment coordinators and Academy Action Team members are always welcome to do so.

Each academic department and interdisciplinary major program has an **assessment coordinator**, a faculty member who is charged with maintaining the program-level assessment process in that department or program. The group of assessment coordinators will periodically be assembled to announce changes to processes and procedures and to share ideas with each other about successfully accomplishing their tasks. Assessment coordinators are strongly encouraged to run for the elected faculty positions on the Institutional Assessment Committee.

The Assessment **Academy Action Team** is a group of volunteers from across campus who will spend four years pulling together existing assessment efforts into a coherent institutional assessment system that will enable JCU to make data-informed decisions about student learning across the institution. When the four-year Academy project ends, the resulting system will become the responsibility of the Institutional Assessment Committee.

Appendix B
Departmental Assessment Coordinator
Description of Duties

PREPARING FOR IMPLEMENTATION
The Coordinator, in close consultation with the Director of Assessment, will work with affected instructors and other designated members of the department
1) To <u>design</u> (and/or <u>locate</u>) assignments, surveys, interview protocols, and other instruments.
2) To plan the <u>logistics of administration</u>/data collection/scoring.
3) To plan the <u>logistics of sharing data.</u>

IMPLEMENTATION
The Coordinator will
1) Ensure that all assessment measures are administered according to the logistical plan created in Step Two.
2) Ensure that the collected data are shared with the Director according to the logistical plan created in Step Two.

THE ASSESSMENT MEETING
- The Coordinator, in consultation with the Director, will decide how best to <u>prepare the collected data for analysis by the department</u> (calculating relevant statistics, creating tables or charts to summarize the data, etc.). The precise division of labor can be decided based on departmental and Coordinator preference.
- The Coordinator will also ensure that the meeting room is ready, all relevant persons are invited, and materials are ready.
- At the meeting itself, the Coordinator will lead the attendees in the process of identifying strengths and weaknesses of the program in terms of student learning, and also ways to improve student learning and the assessment system itself.
- After the meeting, the Coordinator will file the program's Annual Assessment Report with the Director.

In subsequent cycles, the Annual Assessment Report will also ask for documentation that changes were carried out and for assessment of the impact of those changes.

Appendix C
 On next page

Pre-APR Assessment Review
[Name of Program or Department]

Checklist

Assessment Plan

*Has the department or program articulated distinct student learning goals for each of its majors?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do those learning goals differentiate between different degrees offered?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐NA

Do those learning goals differentiate between majors and minors?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐NA

Do those learning goals differentiate between concentrations within a major?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐NA

*Are the learning goals aligned with either the Academic Learning Goals or the University Learning Goals?

☐ Yes ☐ No

*Has the program identified at least one direct summative measure of each goal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

*Has the program identified at least one indirect measure of each goal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Reporting Questions

*Has the department or program been meeting at least annually to use assessment data for improvement of student learning?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐Insufficient evidence

*Has the department or program been assessing at least one student learning goal per year?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐Insufficient evidence

*Has the department or program provided documentation, where appropriate of changes?

☐ Yes ☐ Not Yet ☐Insufficient evidence

*Has the department or program assessed the impact of its changes?

☐ Yes ☐ Not Yet ☐Insufficient evidence

Pre-APR Assessment Review
[Name of Program or Department]

Comments

General
What are the program's overall strengths in the area of assessment?

[Type answer here]

Assessment Plan
Learning goals should be *specific*, *measurable*, and *focused on student learning*. Do you have suggestions for how the department or program could improve their learning goals in these areas?

[Type answer here]

Do you have any comments or suggestions for other improvements to the department or program's assessment plan (for example, possible measures)?

[Type answer here]

Reporting
Do you have any comments or suggestions for the department/program to improve its analysis of assessment data?

[Type answer here]

Do you have any comments or suggestions for the department/program to improve its assessment system?

[Type answer here]

Do you have any comments or suggestions for the department/program about proposed curricular changes?

[Type answer here]