

Academic Assessment Committee
Meeting Notes
March 19, 2019
3:00 – 4:00 p.m., MAC 620

Present: Michael Newtown, Ken Erickson, Philip Neisser, Sarah Todd, William Rivers, Cullen Haskins, Tatsuhito Koya, Jennifer Sovde, David Button, Renee Campbell

Agenda Item:

I. Middle States Steering Committee:

- a. Currently we have a small committee dedicated to standards review for Middle States. However, historically we have had a larger steering committee composed of people from across campus (15 in total it appears) that reviewed standards and assisted with preparing the college for the Middle States Review (in part through mock review). This appears to be created about two years out from the site visit. We're getting close.

Discussion: It is time to draft sustainable protocol for how we want to proceed with preparation for Middle States, something not only for this time around, but for the foreseeable future. Which aspects of the previous process worked well historically? Which aspects of this process were problematic?

Kirk: We have seven people in total on the Middle States standards review committee. Our charge is oversight of Standard 5. The committee has reviewed the seven standards, noticed deficiencies, and are working to correct them. We are currently not sure where to go from here and we're seeking insight as to how the steering committee had been created in the past and what issues there were so we can try to avoid them going forward. We know that one person was essentially in charge of putting together the steering committees. How are people appointed and where do we begin?

Sarah & Ken: This is an institutional problem because different divisions should be representing different standards. Historically, the steering committee made recommendations of who should lead the steering committee to the President who in turn appoints said person.

It was recommended that we begin with a large group; this is beneficial for the workgroup portion (as long as the work represents the work they are doing), as it is very important that they have feedback so everyone feels like their voice has been heard. Once a group is set in place, they will assemble all of the evidence. There will be a representative (Chair) for each group who will submit everything that is agreed upon within the group. It is important to be thoughtful of who is chosen for each group, specifically the Chair. In addition, we need to ensure that we have widespread collaboration on campus. Institutional memory will also be imperative when thinking of who to choose.

The group also discussed different ideas for a repository to store the information. Last time we had so much documentation dropped into the Blackboard shell we created, that we ended up needing to have one person organize everything. One Drive was suggested.

Action Item:

1. Kirk will provide Academic Assessment Committee resources from our last self-study. As we currently do not have much of a protocol in place with regard to internal controls, etc., Kirk will work on creating such a protocol for future reference.
2. Kirk will compile a list of people on campus whom he feels can lead each one of the 7 standards; he will vet the list through the Academic Assessment Committee. Fall of 2022 our self-study will be due and the Middle States visit will take place in the Spring of 2023.

3. Middle States is opening up a training center and Kirk will be attending that.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Recorder: Renee Campbell