



**Advisory Committee on Academic Assessment (ACAA)
Accreditation, Assessment and Learning
Office of the Provost
Kent State University**

**March 11, 2021 Meeting
*via Microsoft Teams***

MINUTES

Members in Attendance:

Susan Perry, Erica Eckert (co-chair), Shannon Helfinstine, Hollie Simpson, Marcia Kibler, Ching-I Chen, Elizabeth Graham (guest), Suat Gunhan, Mary Hricko, Chris Hudak, Karen McDonald, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Jennifer Miller, Richmond Nettey, David Putman, Sandra Randulic, Valerie Samuel, Elizabeth Sinclair, Linnea Stafford, Brittany Thomas, Therese Tillett, Fangning Wang (guest) and Deirdre Warren.

I. Welcome

Susan Perry welcomed all committee members and guests.

II. Approval of February minutes

The minutes from the ACAA February meeting were presented, reviewed, and accepted as written.

III. Announcements

Susan Perry shared a Great Colleges to Work For survey update, set to begin on March 15. Susan encouraged members to participate if they receive the email and to encourage colleagues to participate as well. Advertising across campus includes the HR faculty-staff newsletter, Kent State Today, signage in Kent campus buildings, a Flashline notification, and mention in the Deans, and Chairs and Directors Meetings. Email announcements and reminders will be sent by Melody Tankersley, Senior Vice President and Provost to all full-time employees. Susan also encouraged everyone to take the KSU Campus Social Climate Survey, which opened on March 4.

Shannon Helfinstine shared updates about the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) college presentations. She has met with several colleges, most recently the Honors College. She thanked the College of the Arts for responding to her feedback questionnaire. After all feedback questionnaires are returned, Shannon's goal is to share a summary report with ACAA. This would take place at the end of this year or the beginning of next academic year.

Shannon also provided Taskstream AMS updates, as she has been working with University College and the Library on the non-academic assessment template for operational goals and achievement data. Shannon asked committee members for suggestions to promote and advertise Taskstream assessment training and also, when would be the best time to hold training sessions given that the assessment deadline is September 30 each year.

For promotion of trainings, Mary Hricko suggested listing sessions on the Information Services, Learning Stream website. Deirdre Warren suggested sharing the information at the Chairs and Directors meetings. Jennifer Marcinkiewicz shared information about Education Elevated (e2) Conference and suggested it would be a good venue to hold a Taskstream assessment workshop in the future. For timing of trainings, Chris Hudak suggested when looking at summer months not to overlap with Canvas LMS trainings. Erica Eckert suggested both summer and early fall semester trainings to accommodate faculty contracts.

IV. Annual assessment report rubric

Erica Eckert shared background on the annual assessment report rubric that was created by ACAA subcommittees over a year ago. Shannon Helfinstine shared the rubric document along with a recent sample report in Taskstream, pointing out the areas on the report that correspond to the rubric. Five randomly assigned break-out groups were created to pilot using the rubric with the selected assessment report. Susan Perry reconvened the break-out groups for discussion.

From the break-out discussions, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz shared that her group found it difficult to evaluate the mission statement and did not have a good sense of what “fully articulating” meant. They also talked about grades being a direct or an indirect measure. Erica Eckert advised that grades should be added as an indirect measure (i.e., at the top of the rubric) and discussion continued with committee members about grades and how/when those can be used to assess specific student learning outcomes. Deirdre Warren shared that her group found it was not clear what items were needed for the “findings” section of the Taskstream report. Another group discussed that when assessing licensure exam results, adding a trend comparing years of data on this particular outcome would be beneficial.

Susan Perry summarized that it seemed the rubric is not difficult to use and can provide supportive feedback to programs, but ACAA may need to be more explicit and specific in conveying program assessment expectations. For now, Shannon suggested tweaking the rubric’s mission wording. Jennifer Marcinkiewicz stated the small-group exercise was very useful and future iterations would be helpful using exemplary and non-exemplary examples. Susan and Shannon recommended bringing more reports for the committee to review with the rubric in small groups for the next meeting and there was a consensus agreement.

Next meeting: April 8, via Teams