



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

**October 3, 2019 Meeting
Library – Provost Conference Room 222**

MINUTES

Members in Attendance:

Susan Perry (co-chair), Hollie Simpson, Sarah Wu, Marcia Kibler, Dale Eilrich, Larry Froehlich, Mary Ann Haley, Ben Hollis, Chris Hudak, Karen MacDonald, Jennifer Marcinkiewicz, Collin Meyer, Jennifer Miller, Nicholas Adams, David Putman (via phone), Valerie Samuel, Elizabeth Sinclair, Linnea Stafford, Pamela Stephenson and Kevin Van Bell.

I. Welcome and introductions

Susan Perry commenced with a welcome and introductions of members, new and continuing.

II. Committee membership and charge

Susan Perry explained that committee members are appointed to serve as liaisons for their respective areas. The members represent their units and work to foster assessment and communication across the university through various initiatives.

Susan pointed out several vacancies on the committee roster. In reviewing the Faculty Senate description of the committee membership and due to restructuring of units across the university, areas such as Student Affairs and Distance learning are still represented in the current membership, but by different units than in the past. She will be reaching out to areas such as Enrollment Management and Information Services to see if those areas would like to appoint additional members.

Susan would like for the committee to provide nominations for a co-chair, which is a one-year, renewable term. A link was sent to committee members in the initial meeting reminder message to gather nominations. The role of the co-chair is to meet, plan and discuss upcoming agenda items for scheduled meetings.

III. Approval of April minutes

The minutes from the ACAA April meeting were presented and accepted as written.

IV. Announcements/Updates

Ben Hollis shared information about an RFP process happening during the spring semester for the learning management system (LMS) along with a pilot phase. It could be helpful for ACAA and assessment to be represented on the LMS committee and

to be able to provide feedback on the vendors. There are three vendor options being presented. Feedback on the software options will be welcome during future meetings to discuss how the chosen LMS product may interact with our current assessment platform Taskstream.

a. Great Colleges results

Sarah Wu shared the Great Colleges to Work For Topline Results report and how ModernThink, Inc. has created a dashboard which provides more details and can produce customized and longitudinal reports. Sarah suggested that members present the survey results to their respective areas to explore what customized reports the area may want produced.

Susan Perry discussed the context for interpreting the survey results, including the timing of the survey as well as the small sample size. Several suggestions were made with regards to communications across the university about these results and the need to possibly combine efforts with Human Resources and send one communication out to campus instead of three or four in a week. The committee also requested additional information to be provided regarding the Communication survey items to discuss at the next meeting.

b. Taskstream training

Sarah Wu shared a summary of the Taskstream training since 2016. The 2018-2019 Taskstream Status Report was distributed to the committee for review. This report shows that 60% of program have submitted their assessment reports across the university by the September 30 deadline. Sarah explained, now, there are 305 faculty, administrators and staff who have engaged with Taskstream and described what the future goals are for assessment to raise attention about teaching, quality of learning outcome statements and measures.

c. Annual assessment reports

The 2018-2019 Taskstream Status Report also shows an increase in submissions over the past year. AAL provides group and individual training sessions.

V. HLC review team feedback about assessment

Susan Perry shared information about the Higher Learning Commission review team feedback concerning the submission of the Assurance Argument in June 2019. There were a few weeks of interaction between the review team and the AAL Office with requests for additional information and data.

The team determined that all criteria were met, and no monitoring reports are required. The reviewers acknowledged that the embedded assessment monitoring report showed significant and positive changes in a short amount of time, encouraging KSU to keep up the momentum. URCC contributed a report on the assessment of Kent Core that was part of this submission to HLC. The review team was supportive of the URCC recommendations to align with LEAP outcomes and advised Kent State to keep moving forward with these efforts toward Year 10. The team provided a lot of constructive feedback and examples of evidence that would support our Year 10 report, including the need to provide evidence on the impact that our new and existing programs have on students. Moving forward we need to think about how to effectively measure and document impact without extensively adding to current workloads.

Hollie Simpson advised the office is taking time now to access the upcoming reporting process and is working toward the submission of the Quality Initiative Project in Year 7, the report submission in Year 9 and the Comprehensive Site Visit in Year 10 which is scheduled for the Academic Year 2024-2025. She has created a template for our action plan based on reviewer feedback to prepare for the site visit and federal compliance reporting.

Susan discussed an article that appeared in Higher Education entitled “The Next Generation Undergraduate Success Measurement Project” by Richard Arum, Dean and Professor at University of California, Irvine School of Education. She will share this article with the committee.

Liz Sinclair shared a discussion that arose in a meeting through the College of Business Administration with regards to career outcomes and how that data is being presented through Handshake. It appears that the data doesn’t seem to align with their numbers and questions of how this data is being calculated arose. Susan advised she would add this topic as an agenda item at a future meeting to continue further discussion.

VI. Assessment awards

Sarah Wu presented information about the assessment grants that were first initiated in 2016 but were discontinued. Currently, the AAL office is bringing them back as an option for faculty, administrators and program coordinators. The purpose in applying for the award is to enhance assessment activities in that area. Sarah shared the assessment award overview, application form and the proposed timeline to apply. The timeline may require further discussion and consideration. The suggested timeline was to submit applications by end of October or mid-November and announcing the award winner in Spring 2020, requiring the funds be used during the 2020-2021 academic year. Jenny Marcinkiewicz suggested using a dollar sign on the “s” in the assessment title and on the application form as a symbol letting applicants know that monies are available through an ACAA approval process. Larry Froehlich suggested expediting the process to think about a project over the holiday break prior to the start of the spring semester. Susan suggested the use of a Google form to apply for the award.

VII. Program assessment feedback process

Susan Perry and Sarah Wu shared a program assessment rubrics document that previous subcommittees of ACAA developed to provide feedback for program assessment reports submitted in Taskstream AMS. Based on conversations with faculty and program coordinators, Sarah advised that select programs can be reviewed by the committee first as they are volunteering to receive feedback on their assessment plans.

VIII. Next meeting: November 7, 2:00-3:00pm, Provost Conference Room 222

Meeting adjourned