

ASSESSMENT & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, March 16, 2016

McMullen Hall 305

MINUTES

1. Update of NWCCU Year Seven Report requirements

[Packet of information for today passed out including guidelines for preparation and standards for Year 7 Report.]

Chair shared perspectives gained at NWCCU meeting in Seattle:

Now no longer year 3 report - it is a midterm report – status/snapshot of where we are, and we can expect that no recommendations will be based on that report.

Year 7 report now includes all five standards. We will take year 3 report and restate for year 7 report. We will be one of last institutions going through this. Delayed to fall 2018 for year 7 report.

Linda Macon - Utah Valley - was reviewer for year 3 report who met with chair in Seattle:

Shared information on how her institution prepares for year 7 report

- do year 2 report every year
- easy to update, keeps everyone in tune to accreditation

Accreditation fatigue comes from spending two years getting ready for the report. Easier to do regular reporting of issues.

We are going to move to a more regular cycle of reporting for accreditation on std 2 resources and capacity standard:

Every September 15th (for instance), update reports.

How will work be parsed out? Widely dispersed.

NWCCU needs us to be done worrying about inputs and tasks and need to turn our focus on outcomes: what of that assessment resulted in actions and how did those actions make a difference?

NWCCU - perspective on core themes – it seems the only thing they care about are student learning outcomes

Learning outcomes don't come from just courses and programs. There are extracurricular learning outcomes.

With the start of the new cycle, we will need to re-examine the core themes - has the potential to help us identify what kind of graduate we want to produce. This report is done with our existing mission statement and core themes. Upon submission of this report, we will revise our mission and core themes for the year one report.

Roll of strategic plan was danced around at northwest meeting.

Measurable metrics - testing our success in core themes. Right now our metrics are problematic in many ways. We came up with metrics after core themes identified.

NW likes rubrics.

Learning outcomes - must be in course syllabi. We have no choices in those kinds of things.

Northwest - federal pressures; institutions pushing policy; political arguments

2. Assessment Issues

a. General Education

Chair is meeting with Gen Ed committee on Monday; will be discussing some issues there including a look at the data to assess our programs - multiple measures of assessment are the “coin of the realm.” For now, Gen Ed has just the Proficiency Profile exam - don't really have that either (small sample).

Have had more courses do it than in past. Collectively over the last three years may have a valid sample for one year. Senate has discussed requiring PP for graduation.

Conversation at the NWCCU meeting kept returning to the necessity of having a four year Gen Ed program; chair went to AACU Gen Ed assessment conference - talking about it there as well. We ought to find places in our Gen Ed program where we can find easy ways to implement a four year gen Ed program. For example, link capstone experiences to Gen Ed outcomes is a possibility. Gen Ed stresses critical thinking, written communication skills; we could add an element to the capstone, testing those. Would have Gen Ed assessment of senior level.

b. Program Assessment ideas:

<https://tll.mit.edu/sites/default/files/guidelines/a-e-tools-methods-of-measuring-learning-outcomes-grid-2.pdf>

c. Expected Issues

i. Great Falls' Experience

NWCCU wrapped Great Falls over the knuckles for verification of online students, that is something we need to be working on.

City College requires 40% of exams proctored; or process assignments

Sue Balter-Reitz and Michael Barber are working on a session for pedagogical approaches to proctoring.

ii. Bozeman's Experience

Bozeman's experience - they had to redo their report. Write about std 4 and 5, around core themes.

Get someone from NW to come and do a presentation - i.e. Someone like Ron Acher. Get a consultant to come in and help and make sure we are on the write direction.

We all need to be aware accrediting agencies are evolving, moving targets are to be expected.

3. Unexpected Issues (NOT DISCUSSED)

4. Division of the 2016-2018 work efforts

Next Steps:

Matt get trained as a year 7 visitor; they need volunteers to be visitors [Redinger bypassed as visitor].

How do we break up 5 standards in a workable structure?

Most efficient having small groups for each standard?

- identify who needs to be at table

Institutional Self-Study - whole institution is pulled into the process.

Chancellor starting a new planning process - externally driven now.

CAS has strategic plans for every department.

Don't do annual reporting on strategic plan. Most programs don't do an annual assessment report. Reality is we cannot continue that way.

May find that some units have already done it. In history looking at spending a portion of every upper division class covering footnoting, etc. Added a 200 level course to cover those skills. That is assessment and an action. Now we need to see if that has worked.

We need to spend some time on the standards and especially study 3, 4, and 5 so we are approaching the task efficiently.