

Notes - Academic Assessment Council

Thursday, December 6, 2018, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., AD 317

Present: Krista Prock, Anne Zayaitz, Carole Wells, Karen Rauch, Anne Carroll, Denise Bosler, George Sirrakos, Diane King, Gil Clary, Michelle Kiec, Natalie Snow, Greg Shelley, John Ward, Jon Kremser, Crystal Horninger

Middle State Commission on Higher Education Annual Conference Report: Workshops were interested and Prock noted some practical things to do here. They found others in the same position as we are. She met a good contact from New York, and she will be in contact.

Anne Zayaitz, Carole Wells, Gil Clary, Krista Prock, Denise Bosler and Brian Meares attended for Kutztown. They attended academic and non-academic sessions, as well as strategic planning presentations. Next year, the conference will be in Philadelphia, and the theme is student success.

Sustainability: Among the things Middle States is looking for is sustainability even after we are off warning. We are going to schedule to keep on track, and it is found we are on the right track.

Updates: Most rubrics and assessment plans are on SharePoint as of November 15th. We can't offer too much feedback on rubrics. Rauch shared that many rubrics for LAS only have three levels, and it may be found that a three-level rubric won't be as helpful. It will be more helpful to allow faculty to use these, and find it needs to be adjusted. Discussion followed. A meeting will be scheduled after data has been submitted for constructive discussion. It was suggested that a workshop be scheduled based on common expectations. Some department submitted an assignment and the rubric. At our next meeting, we can review all submitted rubrics.

TracDat: Prock and Clary are moving forward in building TracDat. Bailey has been uploading listing of courses. This will help in developing the curriculum map. First we need to remove old information from SLOs. Discussion followed. This will be a good assignment for the grad assistants when they return next semester.

Monitoring Report: It is being written, and Clary is starting a chart. The introduction will provide a brief overview of the major issues, ten pages noting the changes and improvements being made with the chart. Wells informed John Ericsson is our consultant. He has all the documents to review before he reviews the monitoring report. He would like the report by February 1, 2019. January 22nd, we would like to have some data, data about student learning and at least some discussion on how we can use the data for student learning. Wells will meet with Dr. Corbett.

Honors Program: They would like to move forward with an approval of the three SLOs they selected from their advisory group.

1. Successfully achieve the SLO of their degree program. It was asked if this should be changed to "honors" courses.
2. Design capstone project. If honors students must complete a capstone project.
3. Integrate concepts, theories and or methods from general education, degree program and co-curricular experiences. This could tie into their required service project.

Wells will meet with Jen Schlegel to share suggestions with her.

January 14, 2019 Assessment Workshop: A Save the Date to the First Annual Assessment Workshop will be sent shortly to the campus community. During the morning session, John Ward and Anne Carroll will facilitate with workshop about what to do with data. Lunch and then the afternoon sessions would include 2017-18 GEAC report, acknowledging all the work being done, and where we are at. GEAC, GEC, college assessment committees and the AAC will be included. Sirrakos indicated the report was discussed at the last GEAC meeting.

To have an annual assessment event on the second Monday in January will help demonstrate the sustainability piece of assessment. It is thought a September event will also be held.

Culture of Assessment:

- We are not experiencing much foot dragging here at this time. The “warning” helped with this.
- Systematic – in the spring, we will develop a more systematic schedule.
- Budget decisions: Disbursing funding to meet benchmarks. This tied to program, college and University level – tech fees, hiring, SLOs and programmatic needs tied to data. Discussion followed. We need to document what we have done. There is a list of grants linked to assessment and other budget decisions based on assessment and learning. Middle States says there needs to be a single truth. Everyone should be on the same page. Policies need to be consistent too. It was suggested that the assessment grant tie some money to an assessment project. The assessment grant call for proposals will be going out this week. It should be tied to a University goal. A team reviews the proposals for approval. It would add a level to involve the college assessment committee. Another example would be the general education revision and introducing the FYS course.
- Program Review: We need to make sure when we do these things, we do them in a public manner. The LAS assessment committee shifted the focus to assessment rather than work done previously such as *high impact practice*, etc. it was asked if we are trying to standardize each college. It might be helpful to do this.
- It is believed this committee needs to continue and develop one truth. We may need to look at the role of all the college assessment committees. Assessing the assessment. When is the best time to talk about that? At a future meeting, we can look at our charge.
- Teaching Excellence: the Schellenberg award for junior faculty has an assessment piece.
- Pre and post tenure SRIs: Don’t always offer an opportunity for feedback to improve. It would be nice if faculty had to submit a reflection and show how they use results for improvement. Discussion followed. Perhaps a local agreement could be made with APSCUF. It was suggested to invite UPC and UCC chairs to a future meeting.
- Professional Development: Stuart Ross and a pilot project with a cohort. Assessing in fall and debriefing in January. We need to ask Jeff Werner how much of grant funding was used for assessment, assessment grants, conferences.
- Assessment meetings at the department level are held. It is becoming part of the regular discourse. Some departments are having a day-long meeting on assessment for us and for their accreditation.
- Many workshops, conferences, developing electronic handbooks, additional workshops will be held in the spring for more sophisticated work.
- Incentives and rewards offered – Temple offers merit points. Stipends are offered for the assessment grants. All of this can be worked on.
- We will work on this next meeting.
- We have meetings with feedback from departments. Some departments are asking for early feedback so that they can prepare for future assessments. We should formalize our process. It is thought this

committee be removed from the feedback although others feel cross-college feedback is helpful. As time goes on. This may be less necessary.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am.

1/18/2018