

## ASSESSMENT & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, November 30, 2016

McMullen Hall 209

### MINUTES

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

**Std 1:** Cliff - visited with Matt to get some guidance and have not met since.

Subcommittee feels good about what they are supposed to be doing. Should be pretty straightforward.

**Std 2:** Redinger - still hanging out there. Sent the various parts back to folks who did Year 3 Report. Have some new ammunition for standard 2. Matt's task is to take that part of NSSE (CCSSE) and add to whatever people send from their various parts. Matt asked for these back by end of calendar year.

**Std 3:** Kathy and Michael - meeting next week. Kathy is going to interview Bruce to build history and documentation for what we have done so far. Subcommittee will use Box and share documents.

**Std 4:** In October met. Directions developed. Looked at various parts and pieces of evidence they would bring to bear for each of the 8 questions in this standard. As going through that was struck by how much this standard and standard 5 overlap. John Gillette is going to lead some assessment workshops for chairs.

All the departments have assessment reports in the box folder. A lot of reports are there though many are incomplete according to Dr. Shearer. She is trying to get the CAS chairs to work to see what other departments have done to demystify the process.

Steve Coffman presented the best analysis of curriculum mapping of all the chairs. Did in short order.

Program assessment plans were to be due in November, but Matt never established due date. To follow-up we need assessment report at end of the year.

There are a lot of moving parts in terms of the assessment reports.

Group went to APC meeting - came away with sense to redo some of APC processes to come up with concrete list of essential data points to come up with reliable predictable data to use to perform much better program reviews.

Dean Fishbaugh: Can we articulate why APC was done when it was done?  
Was not done to cut programs. We were responding the NWCCU, but later were facing our first round of budget cuts.

Michael Barber: The conversation we are not having is how Activity Insight is going to be playing a role in this type of process. Four pieces/sources of evidence: IR, building a campus-wide academic analysis, Activity Insight, and program narratives.

Christine brought up issue of time to degree with courses with duplicate learning objectives. Some deans talked to provost from MSU-Northern about NWCCU visit. Assessment was main thing but the visiting team got down to course level assessment. Need learning outcomes for each course. We need to identify our library of those. Northern's visiting team had interviews with instructors to make sure syllabi statements were authentic. Assessment has to go to course level.

CAEP wants education to assess outcomes of the program and what Jeremiah has started curricular mapping to make sure those program outcomes are covered somewhere.

We will get Northern's report and get a deeper sense of what was expected per the standards.

At chairs workshop, and every forum have chairs ears - Matt has said that syllabi must have the student learning outcomes at the course level.

**Std 5:** Also met in October. Productive conversations to look for evidence. Divided up writing responsibilities.

Barbara Wheeling will look at datasets and identify value. What is it we can learn from them (from a users perspective). All in creating a better culture in data-based decision-making. Barb worried about 5a1 and 5b1 - better process on how data is being used.

Joann Stryker will write preliminary narratives on APC, Gardner, and Budget Cuts.

Not strong in core theme indicators - we don't talk about it on campus and very little

dissemination of that information.

## 2. Plans of Attack

Matt believes we need to have a finished draft by December 2017. Gives 6 months to polish and publish. His consternation is how broad this effort goes. Subcommittees would mobilize various groups on campus to write and not write themselves. How do we move in that direction?

He suggests we should have rough drafts for outside reviewers by end of this academic year. Need gaping holes identified and addressed. With draft verbage, we can provide campus communities with something and give to various people to review.

Each subcommittee will set their own deadlines.

## 3. NCCE Mapping to NWCCU Standards

Joann Stryker provided the AAC with an overview of the crosswalk IR developed for the NSSE and NWCCU standards. Most clear connections: Standards 2 and 4.

Check on the toolkit provided by NSSE:

<https://msubillings.box.com/s/tc3cbnpfs24llg6llkjhebb0f68vxbz>

## 4. The *Raison D'Être* of the AAC

The AAC had fallen into hiatus when year 3 report was filed. The AAC should be an ongoing council reviewing the departmental and programmatic assessment plans. What does the committee think of this?

That makes sense. Feedback could be given.

Check with each subcommittee to set deadlines of first drafts of narrative stuff.

AAC is scheduled to meet next on 1/18/16.

### TASKS:

1. Subcommittees will develop timeline for when going to have their written report done.
2. Matt will update list of indicators in Box.
3. Michael will fill in with data

4. Matt will check on responsible parties for indicators
5. NSSE data Review
6. Next big task: for the AAC to establish targets for the indicators rubric.