

**Academic Assessment Committee Meeting**  
**October 7, 2019**  
**10:00 – 11:00 a.m.**  
**MAC 620**

**Present:** Christine Brassard, David Button, Renee Campbell, Peggy De Cooke, Ken Erickson, Cullen Haskins, Kirk Jones, Tatsuhito Koya, Johanna Lee, Christina Leshko, Phil Neisser, Wil Rivers, Jennifer Sovde, Jessica Spooner, Sarah Todd

**Updates from Kirk Jones**

**Website**

Next large web update request is completed. I'm sending the files and request to Travis today. Includes GER results repository space for our current cycle, ISLO policies and procedures, and more.

**AIM**

Faculty are still on track. I'm meeting with the folks who fell behind in the next two weeks to ensure section H (post external reviewer) is taken care of.

**Administrative Group**

The ticket is in for the Administrative Group to be created. Once created I'll add the update spreadsheets there for concerned parties.

**GER**

GER 3 is finally under way for this semester. We'll be posting the results from this cycle at the beginning of the upcoming calendar year.

Wil and I have spoken about GER 12, and will schedule a meeting by the end of the month to take inventory of Info Management courses in our programs to gauge the feasibility of proposals discussed at our last meeting.

**Middle States**

Mid-Point Peer Review Response submitted.

Middle States is beginning to "update" their standards as they conduct their site visits at each school. Here are a few of the most recent developments:

- Many non-academic areas are now required to have student learning outcomes (Johanna and Molly have already heard rumblings of this and we're beginning to take action)
- Instead of two years of data required for the upcoming site visits, Middle States has changed the requirement to two cycles. We're still in good shape regarding PSLO/ISLO assessment. However, with AIM we need to make some adjustments (more information on what other schools are doing included in our presentation today).
- It has been suggested that Middle States will continue to update their expectations as they conduct more site visits. We'll keep our ear to the ground and do the best we can to avoid them throwing us a curve ball.
- There have been no town hall meetings to communicate these updates so hopefully we won't receive a monitoring report for something we were not made aware of.

**Action Item: Kirk:** Share some Student Learning Outcomes for non-academic assessment to Johanna.

## Issues for Discussion

### **1. Topic: GER ~ Incorporating a Diversity Component into Programs**

Kirk will be making the formal announcement about our changes to ISLO 4 at the upcoming faculty assembly meeting. We discussed this at the end of last semester. Instead of programs needing to hit competency and mastery points in “two of four” subcategories, they need to have at least one competency point for ethical reasoning, one for teamwork, and at least one course for global learning or intercultural knowledge. This is because Middle States has both a diversity general education requirement and an ethics general education requirement (Standard III.5).

The issue is that some programs are struggling with accounting for diversity. Kirk proposed an in-house GER for diversity that programs can either elect to take care of in their core curriculum or the requirement can be outsourced to an elective diversity course from across campus.

**Discussion:** Concerns were raised with this proposal. The requirement is for all programs so some two-year programs do not have room in them to add this component. There are however, existing courses that do have cultural diversity embedded in them and are assessed.

**Decision:** It was decided that the preference is to keep this requirement housed within the courses if possible. Departments will need to look at their programs to make sure that at least one course will meet this requirement. If programs do not have courses that can meet the diversity requirement, they may outsource to other courses featuring the in-house GER for diversity (courses will be identified in the coming year, as we have until 2021 before the diversity cycle year is upon us).

**Action Item: Kirk:** Communicate this out at Faculty Assembly.

### **2. Topic: Assessment in the Major ~ External Reviewers**

**Discussion:** While it is great to use faculty from other SUNY campuses as external reviewers in AIM, it was suggested that it could be more beneficial to look outside SUNY instead. There is the risk of potential competition which could create a conflict of interest. The committee agreed.

**Action Item: Kirk:** Reach out to Middle States to obtain a list of outside external reviewers for programs to pull from. Create a repository of the reviewers in Blackboard.

### **3. Topic: Assessment in the Major ~ Blackboard Repository**

**Discussion:** Some problems have been identified with regard to AIM. First, it takes a long time looking for old data, because we do not have a central housing repository for all of our archival data. It used to be that hard copies were sent to the Dean’s Office and the Provost’s Office, but we no longer do that. Second, mission statements need to be added to the sidebar on program pages so that faculty can easily access them. This would help faculty with their Assessment in the Major and would ensure consistency across all programs. Lastly, new curriculum coordinators with limited knowledge of program history are having to tackle Assessment in the Major with no background in which to do so. There needs to be a succession plan, a period of overlap, so that a pathway can be laid out for the new curriculum coordinators to follow. Good examples of closing the loop are needed to help faculty understand the importance of Assessment in the Major.

### **4. Topic: Assessment in the Major ~ Middle States vs. SUNY Timelines**

**Discussion:** Going forward, Middle States will want to see two cycles of Assessment in the Major data on their site visits which are every 8 years. However, our current cycle is every 6 years. Kirk explained that Herkimer has adopted a three year 'follow-up' for AIM in their programs in order to comply with the Middle States timeline. How do we want to proceed?

**Decision:** It was decided that we will explore processes with regard to the Middle States vs. SUNY timelines with some other SUNY campuses before making a final decision.

**Action Item: Kirk:** Reach out to some other SUNYs and inquire how they are handling this shift in timelines and report back.