

Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) Meeting  
September 14, 2015  
3:00 – 4:00  
MacArthur Hall, Rm. 620

*Present:* Jennifer Waite, Mike Newtown, Molly Mott, Ken Erickson, Wil Rivers, Rachel Santos, Sarah Todd, Kirk Jones, Paul Bowdre, Jondavid DeLong, Tatsuhito Koya, Rashid Aidun, Marela Fiacco, Doug Scheidt, Renee Campbell

*Missing:* Jennifer Sovde, Christine Thompson, Patrick Casselman

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

- Introductions
- Discussion of what are goals are for the year, and what the AAC's role will be.
  - A decision was made for three (3) faculty from each school to be on the AAC rather than two (2).
  - D.Scheidt suggested that instead of Middle States (MS) guiding our goals, we should reverse that and be ahead of the game by directing our goals toward best practices for the benefit of our students. It was suggested that our instructors should be reflective, that the entire campus should think about our work based on data, SLO's and Assessment, and that we should use the available data to shape our work. We should work to standardize assessment across the campus. The AAC itself should lead the best practices initiative, and we should be able to document assessment data in the spring. SUNY Canton should be a lead school, staying ahead of MS, through the use of best practices.
- Discussion of what can we accomplish this year:
  - There is a need to set Taskstream parameters for course based assessment – we need to close the loop and get to the data!
  - S.Todd suggested Program Assessment (PA) – we need to look at that data as well as the data for Gen.Ed. and Assessment in the Major (AIM).
  - JD.Delong suggested that members of the AAC need to meet with the people doing the assessments to go over it. To do that, we need to set the parameters for 2015-2016.
  - GMMD has completed their AIM, however GMMD now needs to either back date or manually enter the data.
  - J.Waite noted that there is a monitoring aspect to the AAC – should we begin that process with a meeting?
  - M.Newtown suggested that perhaps there should be sub-committees to oversee the assessments. K.Jones suggested GER and Assessment sub-committees. Self-studies are due at the end of this semester. We also need to review what assessment was, or was not, done last semester.
  - J.Waite posed the question of whether last year's GER were done. If they were, they have not been seen. It was indicated that Math, Science, and Humanities are done, and R.Santose has turned hers in. We *have* to do these. It was suggested for the Deans and AAC members to tie the assessments back to potential budget allocations for needed resources. K.Jones noted that the faculty have had the summer to communicate with colleagues at other colleges, and that they may have heard that the other colleagues are involved in a similar process at their own institutions, so they may be a bit more on-board with assessment this year. (Special assessment for Gen.Ed.)
  - A question was asked as to who is able to see what in Taskstream (TS), there is a transparency issue. Full transparency was recommended, and it was noted that TS has the capability to allow full transparency. Criminal Justice faculty currently can see all the data for their program – the data is used for mentoring the new faculty and adjuncts.
  - It was stated that it is difficult to have a cohesive process for assessment when different groups of faculty and/or programs are doing things differently. At the same time, we cannot overwhelm the faculty, we just need to prioritize. Is GER assessment the place to start? Should we focus on those who are doing the GER assessments?
  - Assessment needs to be reviewed on an ongoing basis. Data is needed *now* and we need to use whatever data is available from past semesters, no matter how incomplete it is so that we can get moving on action planning and use the available data.
  - Moving forward, we can close the loop on AIM for 2013-2014 which hasn't been done yet in SBLA. Currently, December is the deadline for the 2014-2015 data, not this past May. Should it have been due in 2014-2015? We need to close the loop on those that are completed and get moving on the ones that are not done.

- It was decided that we need three-person sub-committees to accomplish these goals. There are enough AAC members to do so now.
- Creation of three-person sub-committees:
  - This is a catch-up year
  - Catch-up – GER & AIM – K.Jones (Chair), W.Rivers, P.Casselmann, S.Todd), M.Fiacco, R.Aidun, C.Thompson
  - Current-Year – GER & AIM – P.Bowdre (Chair), S. Todd, JD Delong, T. Koya, and J. Sovde
  - The AAC members should not be doing all of the work, summaries of the process and progress should reach the AAC.
  - The process should include Data Point → Action → Resources needed (ie. Money, equipment, etc.)
  - J.Waite will go to each committee to work with the Chairs on timelines.
- Operational Program-Based Assessment (PBA)
  - One (1) program SLO and Goal were supposed to be in TS by the end of the Spring semester.
  - Electronic, indirect measures, such as surveys, are recommended.
  - A sub-committee was created for PBA:
    - JD.Delong (Chair), M.Newtown, K.Erickson, J.Waite
  - It was noted that data-collection pieces are not due until this October. If indirect measures were not used, there is potential to use course-level SLO's to feed them, or the program can have two (2) of them.
- D.Scheidt, J.Waite, and S.Todd will meet to draft formats for the committees to use: questions to answer, five (5) outline headers, etc. to help the committees keep on point and produce the data required.
- Critical Thinking Assessment (CTA) – Institutional SLO (ISLO) has it – we have not yet done it, but we need to. It was suggested to collect SLO data in December and aggregate them for the ISLO start point, and then work on improving it. There may be around 700 data points. We do not have an institutional rubric for the ISLO's to lend some consistency to them.
  - A sub-committee was created for ISLO:
    - Sarah Todd (Chair), M.Newtown
- The AAC need to meet every other week. J.Sovde cannot do Monday's at 3:00pm. Another Doodle poll will be created to assist in scheduling the next meeting.
- Update from Non-Academic Assessment Committee (NAAC)
  - Terms for ½ of the membership are up; rebuilding membership, kick-off meeting end of September
  - Highlights from last year:
    - Cont. with Assessment Ambassadors program that provides outreach to the non-academic areas on assessment practices
    - Offered an In-service to campus: *Taking Goals to Next level* (encouraging areas to focus on creating goals that move an area forward rather than goals that just articulate daily business—workshop very well attended~ 30 participants)
  - Task-Stream
    - Committee needs to provide more help and support across the board to help areas finish (Quick Flow created)
  - This year's focus will be on Task Stream:
    - Review and tweak all web-based assessment resources and our ambassador program to fit TaskStream
    - Help areas to tie up loose ends in Taskstream
    - Need to discuss the cycle for Task-stream, such as:
      - Develop Assessment Plans in the fall semester, collect data for the measures
      - Enter Findings in May when data is collected and analyzed
      - Enter Actions (Closing the Loop and continuous improvement plan) in June
      - What is the review process? Assign the review of workspaces to members of NAAC and forward those results to workspace managers. Supervisors have access to review and comment on workspaces related to their area of responsibility.
      - How do we share and discuss the results?

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Recorder: Erin Voisin