

ASSESSMENT & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL
MEETING
Wednesday, January 18, 2017
McMullen Hall 305

AGENDA

1. Progress on Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

STD 1 - not a whole lot to do; take updates from Yr 1 and Yr 3 reports and then updating those. That section is pretty well on its way. Cliff reported.

STD 2 - Matt looked at deadlines for getting information back, requested by end of calendar year, that did not happen. Updates to Std 2 Resources and Capacity will change over the next year. Report that we have from Yr 3 Report, will have to address the recommendations NW gave us to Std 2. Proceeding appropriately.

STD 3 - Kathe and Michael. APC write up: Kathe reviewed Dr. Duin's notes, visited FutureU website and interviewed Bruce. Is going to review and also meet with IT and then pass it along.

Matt is going to write up narrative on strategic planning process for one of the other standards. Kathe can work on the narrative on strategic planning process.

QUESTION: Do we want to go back and address how things meet specific questions, i.e., 3a1, 3a2, etc? Report has to be set up so it is clear how it is addressing each section. Dr. Wheeling suggested we look at Northern's format. The 3a would be in the heading.

Matt is really surprised about std 4 reports.
Lots of schools had the text for several questions and then big block of text.
Others are doing question and then text.

Not clear to Barb that they are asking for a point-by-point addressing of each item.

Florence Garcia is the only Year 7 trained reader at MSUB; she needs to be on this council. Invite her to next meeting.

We can always refer back and put links; can have internal links within the report itself.

STD 4: Matt's notes for the meeting last week, have to look at strategic plan indicators. Subcommittee is setting up a Qualtrics survey, rubric for levels of program assessment from very beginning (establishing learning outcomes) through identifying needs for changes and doing the changes to improve program. Northern had 16

steps. Too onerous. Programs will be assessing the state of their own assessment. Important that programs themselves be self reflective on their level of assessment.

Std 4 has 6 big parts:

- 1- program assessment and where they are in their process
- 2- 5- full assessment report for each of the core themes we have - draw heavily from indicators we are going to look at in a few minutes (Core theme 1, core theme 2, etc...)
- 6 - another section on General Education

STD 5 Met last week.

Focusing on data, Dr. Wheeling prepared a great inventory of MSUB data posted on the IR Sharepoint. Sharepoint set up as a series of folders. What is not clear is what is in those folders. If someone wanted data on gender, for instance, there's no way of knowing where to find it. She went through documents in each folder and described contents. Doesn't have everything; Career Services Surveys, Student Course Evaluations, and Student Learning Assessment are not included in the SharePoint.

Another thing we are doing is coming up with a grid or a table for us to get a handle on the data we have on campus but asking the questions who has access, how is it used, when is it used, where is the evidence it has been used, etc.

QUESTION: Will there be some kind of tag on the open/closed nature of the data? For example, in assessment of student learning the department chairs have access and the access stops there. Matt will check with NWCCU.

Since Std 5 is so culminative of the other std's, the deadline for writing is this summer.

2. Plans of Attack

Matt: Does everyone know what they need to do and when they need to have it done?

Depends on std subcommittee deadlines set for themselves. Something needs to be done by end of academic year to distribute to appropriate people to react to.

We don't write the report, we organize for others who are most appropriate to write. Goal is not to have this committee write the report to mobilize others across campus to write the report. Looking at end of calendar 2017 to have first draft completed.

Everyone was confident they have a direction to move forward.

QUESTION: Does Matt have any \$ for post-retirement activity? Kathe is retiring next year; she is a Standard 3 co-chair with Michael Barber.

3. Interim Deadlines for Standards Reports

[Committee covered due dates in number 2 above.]

4. Setting Baselines and Targets for Indicators

Discussion on indicators.

INDICATOR #15 - COST PER COMPLETION: We don't use cost for completion for anything. In a philosophical sense if this goes up or down what does it say about providing an environment for learning. Confounded with other factors which have nothing to do with how fast students are completing.

Complete College America Metric - time to completion - look into this and see if we can get consistent data for this. How do we differentiate between University and City College? Would need to bifurcate out as well. JOANN DO.

What do we want to do?

Difficult to set a target

If it goes up what does that mean

If it goes down what does that mean

So much confounding it, as Dean, Dr. Wheeling does not know what to do with that number.

Dr. Shearer: One issue identified by Susan Gilbertz, Chair of the Senate, is that we have many programs with high credit numbers required. 38-40

QUESTIONS: What are we trying to measure?

Do we even know how they calculate it if it is OCHE data?

How would we set a target?

For us it is a hard number to calculate, with pre-programs and nursing programs and certifications - none of which we award credentials for, how would we handle that? For this sense, Michael is in favor of removing this metric.

Group consensus about removing this metric.

INDICATORS 12b and 13b: GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT (FTE) and UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENT ENROLLMENT (FTE): Joann pointed out that underrepresented definition has been changed, making 13b unmeasurable. Also, calculation of student FTE is inconsistent and the indicators do not reflect accurate student metrics.

Deleting 12b and 13b from the metrics.

Now the challenge is to establish the baselines and the targets.

INDICATORS 2-5 For Core Theme 1 - funds awarded: should be expenditures and not budgets.

Michael suggested we have Trudy, LeAnn, or someone. Do we want \$ amounts or do we want % of budget? We need simple metrics by which to measure ourselves. Meaningful - not confounded.

Trudy and LeAnn should be here to talk about \$.

Matt wanted to get these set so we can work on achieving targets.

By completion of the Year 7 Report we will have only one year of effort in reaching our targets since we didn't set targets soon enough. Will waiting a month for the discussion over "expenditures vs. budgets" make that much difference in coming up with targets and baselines? Dr. Wheeling said no we should not put this off another month. We need to go to Trudy and LeAnn and get information on this outside of this meeting. Set baseline and targets and these are the steps being taken in next academic year. This meeting is not the only forum for going out for this information.

Michael had a conversation this morning talking about budget vs expenditures. Since Michael is privy to those kinds of conversations, he will get sign off from Trudy and LeAnn on what we should be measuring. Michael will work on metrics involving \$ to establish definitions and baselines.
Get suggestions for targets.

INDICATOR 18 Service Learning - courses list enrollment in courses tagged as service learning courses, but this is not accurately representing service learning courses. How do you define a SL course? Campus Compact reports should have lots of data that we do not have to generate. Should we add service hours - volunteer hours as an indicator? Matt will check with Jenny Randall on appropriate metrics for Service Learning courses.

INDICATOR 22 - client served through client based student projects. Were we thinking about doing a survey of faculty to get at this? Some capstones keep client data, such as Business.

DISCUSSION: Attempt to gather data - if fluctuating and bad data then use as rationale not a good measure. This is what we have - but how can we improve the process. Add a tag for this in to Digital Measures?

QUESTION: Do we need metrics for all the things we do? Or should we strike them and then address in the narrative? Matt will check with Kevin Nemeth on appropriate metrics for MSUB Extended Campus.

We need to build a framework for where struck metric items are being addressed in the narrative.

We do have the option of moving indicators from one core theme to another - just have to explain why.

INDICATOR 19 Number of Community Events should be moved to Core theme 4, Enhancing the Community.

Next meeting is Wednesday, February 15. Matt will invite Florence Garcia to join us for that meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35.