

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 5, 2016

3:00 – 4:00 p.m.

MAC 620

Present: David Barnes, David Button, Renee Campbell, Patrick Casselman, J.D. DeLong, Cullen Haskins, Kirk Jones, Tatsuhito Koya, Doug Scheidt, Jennifer Sovde, Christine Thompson, Sarah Todd, Erin Voisin

The meeting was convened at 3:00 p.m.

I. Course Measures Copy Option in Taskstream ~ Issues

Kirk: When entering measures into Taskstream, everyone has the option to copy their measures over. However, multiple professors are entering measures in Taskstream and therefore are copying over them which is causing problems. Kirk has proposed that the measure copy function be limited to a small administrative group (perhaps Doug, Sarah, Kirk, department chairs?) This would require faculty to request the course copy feature. Mike Newtown inquired if Taskstream has the capability of doing that? Kirk believes Sarah said that the course copy function can be limited, but he will check with her. If this can be done, the group approved moving forward with Kirk's proposal.

Action Items:

Kirk: Check with Sarah to see if this can be done.

Sarah: If this can be done, move forward with limiting the measure copy option in Taskstream.

Update: Sarah is investigating this issue with Taskstream.

II. Plan for Spring 2017 Assessment

Kirk: FYI: Any course that didn't get assessed for ISLOs in critical thinking and communication this semester will be need to be assessed next semester. Courses would be exempt in the spring if they are done this semester, as the cycle is annual. One artifact can be chosen and assessed using the rubric. The new ISLOs are scheduled to be defined in the spring semester. The ISLO sub-committee will be meeting next Wednesday and should be ready to distribute new ISLO information to the AAC to review and agree upon. From there, they will be moved forward to schools for feedback. Finally, they will be presented at Faculty Assembly.

Action Items:

Kirk and Christine: Will meet to discuss the assessment process from the perspective of a program associated with accreditation to gain an understanding of how the process works for those programs.

III. Approval Process for PSLO Changes - Tabled until next meeting

IV. PSLO Assessment Pilot -

Kirk: Sarah has met with several programs and helped them create a curriculum map to ISLOs to demonstrate student mastery and student competency. What we want to do is to have just those courses assessed. We want to keep ISLOs at the programmatic level. Every course on campus could be assessed on a cycle in that fashion. One concern with this is that it may cause gaps in assessment, as we want to ensure that faculty sustain their familiarity and experience with the assessment process.

V. **GER/ISLO Assessment for Same Course** – Faculty this semester are being asked to do GER and ISLO assessment. Having faculty complete assessment for GER and ISLO for the same course is causing confusion, as they are being asked to assess their course with two different rubrics for each objective. It is becoming time consuming, as they are doing the same work twice. Kirk has proposed to exempt all CRNs selected for GER from ISLO assessment. They will still be assessed, just using the GER rubrics instead of the ISLO rubrics this semester, with the compromise being that ISLOs will be assessed next semester. Is one or the other more stringent? Should the service courses be doing just the GERs? Doug has proposed that every course assessment be mapped to one or the other. Should we remove GER assessment from non-service courses? GER courses adhere to GER standards. They will still need to be done on their cycle.

Sarah: Sarah is concerned that by doing this, programs will potentially not take ownership and we don't want to take that away from departments, as they should be developing maps to their department SLOs. J.D. asked if departments can be defined as disciplines instead and if non-programmatic GERs can be eliminated. The disciplines would have the option to decide which assessments they will do from here on out in regards to assessment mapping to critical thinking and communication; GER or ISLO. Currently, departments without a program (e.g., science), are being treated that same way. One concern with that is that if we allow each discipline to decide themselves we could end up in a situation where people will not map to either. Programs must map to ISLOs.

The committee agreed to move forward with this proposal. Going forward, each discipline will be responsible to decide whether a course objective is mapped to a GER or ISLO. Additionally, individual disciplines and programs will have to consider their mapping to avoid overburdening faculty with GER and ISLO assessment in the same semester.

Jen Sovde requested that the communication piece be more defined. Kirk agreed with her concern and the ISLO committee will be addressing this when we begin spreading the information to the schools.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Renee Campbell