

# Assessment Council

## IPFW Campus

### Meeting Minutes February 29, 2016

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** K. Johnson, D. Huffman, J. Hook, K. Stoller, B. Price, N. Mann, S. Anderson, J. Hersberger, K. McDonald, N. Adilov

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** A. Downs, N. Jackson

### Acta

Debrah started the meeting at 12:08 in KT G83.

**HANDOUTS: COAS Feedback on Rubrics, COAS Executive Summary with Department Letters, Draft Assessment Council College Level Report Review Rubric, and minutes of 2/1/16 Meeting**

- **Approval of agenda**

### OLD BUSINESS

- **Review of minutes** – the 2/1/16 minutes were approved as amended.
- **Amendment to prior minutes** – Kent will contact CELT to inquire about organizing the next Faculty Development Day around an assessment theme.

### NEW BUSINESS

- **HCL Preparation** – Kent discussed organizing the CELT Fall Conference around an assessment theme with Marcia Dixon. The program for Fall 2016 has been set. Marcia raised concerns about attendance at the event for an assessment themed conference. The committee also discussed an assessment theme at the COAS Learning Conference. Debrah Huffman raised concerns and the committee decided that this would not be a good format. The committee suggested delaying an Assessment Themed University Wide Assessment Workshop until departments and colleges are more familiar with using Appendix D to guide programmatic assessment.
- **Feedback from COAS on using Appendix D Rubrics** – Debrah discussed the COAS reports and their decision to exclude “scores” from the College Level Report. Jim described mathematics’ objections to scores on the rubric as unreliable and lacking validity because they are “perceptual measures”. The committee agreed. Kim suggested viewing the rubric in Appendix D in a more holistic way. Kent agreed that this could work. Jim asked how this would affect HLC accreditation. Kent responded that describing the “process” and demonstrating assessment findings were used to guide programmatic changes that improve student learning and success was the more important requirement for HLC and most accrediting agencies. The decision was made to amend Appendix D.
- **Assessment and Program Review** - Teri raised concerns that the inclusion of the Annual Assessment Report as part of Program Review and in combination with USAP process implies that the assessment reports could be used as part of resourcing decisions for academic programs. Kim described the consolidation of the annual USAP report; assessment report; faculty, students, staff,

and alumni accomplishments; and institutional research data into one annual report and suggested that the Annual Assessment Report is important in describing the quality of departments. Kent stressed that the primary purpose of programmatic assessment and the design of the assessment process at IPFW was to examine how programs are changing to increase the probability of students succeeding, the likelihood that they successfully matriculate through academic programs, and ultimately enhance student completion of high quality degrees.

- **Assessment in Accredited Programs** – Terri raised concerns about completing assessment reports annually for accredited programs and suggested the possibility of a longer timeframe for these programs. She also questioned if annual reporting was to actually make assessment better or if it was simply for HLC purposes. Kent discussed the design of the IPFW’s Assessment Process as “flexible” to meet the various differences in assessment reporting and required reporting for professional accreditors. He reiterated that a major design consideration was that the IPFW reporting would complement the professional accrediting process. He also emphasized that the purpose of the assessment design was guiding programmatic improvement to enhance student success. Kent suggested the annual IPFW assessment reports (for most accredited programs) would ease the completion of reports for accreditation visits. Terri responded that CAEP (College of Education’s Professional Accreditor) requires an annual report and the completion of the Assessment Report might not add value to programmatic assessment in the College of Education. Kim suggested that the Annual Reporting to IPFW shares many of the same goals as professional accreditation but also serves specific IPFW goals. Deb suggested that a “common language” for assessment across all departments at IPFW is important and is needed for the University Assessment Process. Kent discussed the parallels in the reports and the benefit of annual completion of the Assessment Report. The annual reports (in that respect) serve to facilitate programmatic improvement aimed at enhancing student success. He said he would look at the professional criteria and discuss ways to ensure reporting effort is not duplicated and that the process is as efficient as possible. Kim suggested getting all professionally accredited programs together for a discussion. Kent is reviewing all professional accrediting requirements for assessment and will discuss with the professionally accredited programs.
- **Pilot Draft Assessment Council College Level Report Review Rubric using 2015 COAS Assessment Committee College Level Report plus department letters** – The decision was made to “table” the review of the COAS report while we review the College Level Report Review Rubric. Specifically, in discussing the COAS report, it was noted that the summary potentially lacks the detail needed. However, Kent, Kim, and Deb noted that the reports to the departments from the COAS Assessment Committee did include details. One suggestion was that the assessment reports include more summary information across all academic units in a college. The committee decided to examine the guidelines and metrics for the College Level Reports at the next meeting.
- **Assessment of Certificates and Minors** – Kent suggested that the council discuss the assessment of certificates and minors at a future meeting.
- **Good and Welfare** - none

Committee Motions, Results and Actions

The Assessment Council moved to amend SD 15-6, Appendix D. The amendment will remove all references to scores and the total column for scores. The amended rubrics will add a fourth rating category, "Not Evident". All voting members unanimously approved the motion.

#### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Monday, April 11, 12:00–1:00 – room SB 176

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

- The meeting ended at 1:14 p.m.