



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

**October 4, 2018 Meeting
Provost Conference Room 222, Library**

MINUTES

Members in Attendance:

Susan Perry (co-chair), Pat Vermeersch (co-chair), Sarah Wu, Hollie Simpson, Marcia Kibler, Jessie Carduner, Joe Clark, Erica Eckert, Larry Froehlich, Mary Ann Haley, Chris Hudak, Brian Huot, John Jewell, Jenny Marcinkiewicz, Joan Meggitt, Jennifer Miller, Richmond Nettey, David Putman (via phone), Swathi Ravichandran, and Valerie Samuel.

I. Welcome and Introductions

New members - Susan Perry commenced with a welcome and introductions of members, new and continuing, requesting suggestions from members as to who we may want to invite to serve on the committee for the faculty vacancies representing the College of Architecture and Engineering, Information Services and College of Public Health.

Co-chair position - Susan Perry advised Pat Vermeersch has agreed to continue as co-chair for this committee for the upcoming academic year.

II. Purpose of ACAA

Susan Perry shared that the Advisory Committee on Academic Assessment is to serve the university as the primary advisory body to the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning. Members serve as a liaison for assessment ideas and issues to their units while fulfilling their committee responsibilities as university citizens. Members may also provide leadership to academic units by bringing information to their areas as they help foster the implementation of a comprehensive academic assessment plan for the university. The value of the committee is it provides an opportunity to brainstorm about strategies on assessment culture and diverse perspectives. Additionally, the committee provides an opportunity to bring diverse perspectives to the table to brainstorm about strategies for moving the assessment culture forward.

Previous year's accomplishments – Susan Perry reviewed the previous year's accomplishments, which included discussing data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), reviewing university and program level learning assessments and

data, discussing the administration of climate surveys, setting goals for the implementation of Taskstream, developing strategies, for engaging faculty and reviewing evidence to use for Criterion 4 of the HLC Assurance Argument. Other activities from the previous year included making the recommendation to discontinue the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA+) as the data were not valuable enough to justify the cost and use of administrative time in conducting the assessment each semester.

Current assessment activities – Discussions within units are taking place concerning the importance of assessment data collection using Taskstream. Sarah Wu will continue to support academic units, while Valerie Samuel will support non-academic units in the use of Taskstream. The committee will continue to work on Criterion 4 for the Assurance Argument along with the Higher Learning Commission Accreditation and Accountability Committee (HLC-AAC) who have been working on the document and evidence files throughout the previous academic year. The ACAA will need to continue to review evidence, notes, and suggestions to develop and refine the argument for Criterion 4 about student learning assessment.

III. Approval of April minutes

The minutes from the April meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

IV. Announcements/Updates

Larry Froehlich announced that regional campuses now have a program review process established and implemented. Chris Hudak updated the committee on the School of Information's accreditation visit scheduled on October 8, 9 & 10, 2018. Pat Vermeersch shared that through a two-year process, the RN to BSN program is finally a one-campus program

AAC&U Institute and Kent Core – Jenny Marcinkiewicz provided an overview of the five member team that attended the Association of American Colleges & Universities Institute (AAC&U) 2018 Institute on General Education and Assessment in June 2018. The idea is for the team to leave with information on modern general education approaches as well as an action plan for implementation and assessment. The team reported back to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee about their experience and shared their action plan. With this information in hand, the URCC will present assessment findings to Faculty Senate regarding the current Kent Core and will engage them in a discussion of what the Core should look like in the future to meet the needs of our students. Susan Perry advised Paul Gaston used to be faculty for this institute in the past and he met with the institution team for discussion about what he has seen taking place at other institutions and the state level regarding general education. He provided a draft document about principles of general education that the state has asked Ohio institutions of higher education to provide feedback on. This document has not been widely shared but Susan will check with Paul about sharing this document with the committee. Susan Perry provided a handout of a slide created by Alison Smith with an approximate timeline for revising the Core. This timeline has been shared with the Faculty Executive Committee and will be presented to the Faculty Senate at a future date. ACAA will need to consider what structure might best support the assessment of the new Kent Core, whether it should be a subcommittee of this committee or a separate

entity. Jenny Marcinkiewicz advised she is attending a Faculty Senate Retreat at the end of October to present the plan for general education revision. The AAC&U LEAP outcomes were mentioned in regard to the Core revision and the committee agreed these should be revisited and part of the discussion going forward. The URCC has promised a report in March on the assessment data previously collected on general education and the recommendation plan moving forward. We can incorporate this into the Assurance Argument as evidence that we have been using our assessment data to inform decisions about the revision of general education.

GSS/FDS administration – The Graduated Student Survey (GSS) conducted each year, reaches out to all recently graduated students asking them a variety of questions about their satisfaction as a student while at Kent State as well as about career/educational outcomes. In an effort to make the surveys more cohesive, the GSS and the First Destination Survey (FDS) were combined through a new software platform, Handshake. There were some initial functionality challenges which delayed the launching the survey, but these have been resolved and the survey has been sent out to undergraduate, graduate and associate degree students. The College of Business Administration and the College of Education, Health and Human Services will be included in a second phase of the launch due to the addition of program-specific questions pertaining to their specific accreditation needs. The response rate in the first few days of this survey was about 10% to 12%.

Website – The Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning is currently updating their website. The AAL office has hired a Computer Science graduate student to bring the site up to date and to make it more user-friendly, while providing relevant information and documents needed in Kent State University's accreditation and assessment processes.

Faculty and staff surveys

- **Great Colleges** – Susan Perry provided a handout about results the Great Colleges to Work For Survey. This year the university wasn't recognized in the Benefits and Compensation category, when in previous years it had been. The survey results contained concerns about communication such as employees not being informed about topics that would directly impact their position, unclear pathways for career development for non-faculty employees and budget and compensation. It was pointed out that the results are based on a very small number of employees so they should be triangulated with other sources of data.
- **COACHE** – Susan Perry provided an overview about the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) faculty survey. The response rate was around 40%, which is similar to the response rate three years ago. The survey was sent to full time tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. The data were received in late summer and an advisory group is currently looking at the data and comparing it to the results from the previous iteration. This year open-ended comments are going to be included in the data analysis. The committee mentioned concerns that faculty might have about confidentiality that could lead them to not respond. Susan mentioned that Institutional Research processes and holds the unit-level data file, AAL only has access to the reports.

V. Watermark participation

Assessment plans and reports submitted – Sarah Wu provided a handout about the Achievements for the KSU Program Assessment report. She explained that as of the deadline of September 30, 60% of the programs submitted assessments reports. This is a 42% increase over the 2015-2016 submission. She explained there has been engagement with deans, directors, faculty, staff and administrators through various training and visits to collect the assessment data. She provided goals indicating assessment is an ongoing process that raises attention to teaching and learning through quality of learning outcomes and quality of measures.

Support group – Sarah Wu provided a handout about the creation and continued efforts to recruit members for an Assessment Support Group. The goal/mission of this group is to encourage and promote a culture of assessment. The development of assessment skills and strategies occurs through monthly meetings. Sarah is encouraging members to take this information back to their areas and promote a culture of sharing challenges and exchanging ideas about assessment by contacting her to join the support group. She emphasized the need for collaboration and support by having people reaching out to her to join this support group.

VI. Goals for the 2018-2019 Academic Year

In addition to our current work, the committee will continue to work on Criterion 4 for the Assurance Argument due in June, 2019.

VII. Next meeting: November 8, 2:00-3:00pm, Library 352 (Glass Conference Room)

Meeting adjourned