



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

**April 8, 2021 Meeting
*via Microsoft Teams***

MINUTES

Members in Attendance:

Susan Perry, Erica Eckert (co-chair), Shannon Helfinstine, Hollie Simpson, Marcia Kibler, Hend Baza, Jessie Carduner, Ching-I Chen, Dale Eilrich, Elizabeth Graham (guest), Mary Hricko, Chris Hudak, Judy Lightner-Noll (guest), Richmond Nettey, David Putman, Sandra Randulic, Elizabeth Sinclair, Yvonne Smith, Linnea Stafford, Brittany Thomas, and Deirdre Warren.

1. Welcome

Susan Perry welcomed all committee members and guests.

2. Approval of March minutes

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

3. Annual assessment report rubric

Continuing the conversation from the March ACAA meeting, Shannon Helfinstine reintroduced the assessment report rubric. In reviewing the document sections, Shannon pointed out how the components of the assessment rubric correspond with the reporting sections within Taskstream. She also addressed previous comments, questions and suggestions from committee members regarding the rubric. For the upcoming exercise, Erica Eckert clarified what committee members should be evaluating and gave final instructions.

a. Break-out groups in Teams

Each of the five breakout rooms were assigned a specific Taskstream assessment report for review and discussion. Each group was asked to review the mission statement, learning outcomes, measures, findings, and action plans (if applicable) using the assessment rubric. The groups would then provide overall feedback on how well the program area addressed these topics and the overall function and usability of the assessment report rubric in evaluating the assessment plans.

b. Reconvene and discussion

After conducting the exercise, several committee members recognized and agreed that having an outside perspective when evaluating a program's learning outcomes is beneficial. Conducting this type of review prior to assessment report submission was mentioned.

The committee members were then asked their thoughts on the usability of the assessment rubrics. Overall themes and suggestions going forward in the use of the rubric were discussed:

- Clarification of the mission statement is needed, pertaining to activities - Articulate aims and intentions.
 - Erica Eckert explained that this section was intentionally written as a broad statement in an effort to cover both academic units and non-academic units.
- Provide more definition and detail concerning student **learning** outcomes (SLO).
 - i.e., what students need to achieve success
 - Provide examples of SLOs – looking at the catalog, syllabi, etc.
 - Course syllabi and textbooks are a great source in which to build program SLOs
 - Differentiate and evaluate each student learning outcome section with a minimum of three SLOs and allow space to clarify the outcomes.
- It is easy to measure persistence but is not a true SLO, instead it is a “consequence” or operational outcome.
 - Persistence is measurable, thus the confusion, so there should be guidance on measuring learning versus the outcome of learning. Looking at one unit comparing SLOs on the same topic at the operations outcomes, consequence outcomes and learning outcomes, may make the difference more obvious.

Liz Sinclair commented that various SLO measures are being used in the College of Business including standardized tests, oral presentations, writing samples, as well as student evaluations of each other (e.g., teamwork, digital technology, quantitative reasoning SLOs) which are collected from Kent and regional campuses. Members also appreciated details including the number of students assessed, outcomes that were sequenced well, and creating an action plan when a measure did not meet the target goal.

Judy Lightner-Noll suggested there be one master or agreed upon resource, link or short video to direct program areas to that would guide them on how to create a SLO. Mary Hricko shared a link from Vanderbilt University recommending Bloom's Taxonomy which may work as a visual resource to help units understand the difference between a program operational outcome versus a student learning outcome. Shannon Helfinstine and Erica Eckert volunteered to update the assessment rubric based on the review feedback and bring back to the members at the May meeting.

4. Announcements

Due to the lack of time, Shannon Helfinstine provided the below announcements via email post-meeting for committee members to review allowing for the opportunity to provide feedback or ask questions.

- **Great Colleges to Work For** – survey was extended one week and closed April 9. 38% response rate, just up from last year's 37% response. Thanks to all who answered the survey or provided information for the Institutional Questionnaire. Recognition announcements come in September.
- **NSSE presentations** – thanks to the Arts and Honors Colleges for returning the "questionnaire"; for all other colleges, Shannon will follow-up in the coming weeks to gather more information for a summary.
- **Taskstream AMS training** – Shannon recently worked with the Schools of Fashion and Music in Taskstream and based on ACAA's recommendations, will also offer program learning outcomes (PLO) training this summer/fall.
- **AAL webpages** – updates made to university-wide surveys page <https://www.kent.edu/aal/assessment>, with more updates to come this summer (e.g., NSSE and GSS pages); ACAA meeting information updated too <https://www.kent.edu/aal/acaam-meetings>
- **Canvas** – collecting internal and external LMS training info and sharing on Assessment Support Group "Teams" page
- **AALHE assessment conference registration open, June 7-11**, keynotes include the AAC&U rep assisting with our Core rubric pilot, Kate McConnell - <https://www.aalhe.org/aalhe-2021-keynotes>
- **ACAA composition and focus** – at the May meeting we will discuss the focus and membership of ACAA for 2021-22

Next meeting: May 13, via Teams