Members in Attendance:

I. Introductions

Dr. Fashaad Crawford welcomed members.

II. Monitoring Report

Dr. Crawford provided an update on the monitoring report, which is due to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) on Tuesday May 3, 2016. The focus of the report is on enhancing the culture of assessment at Kent State University.

The University is aware that general education assessment is one of the areas of improvement. The current assessment process focuses on course-specific learning outcomes and is not effective for assessing student learning across multiple general education courses. ACAA members were informed of ongoing collaborative efforts involving the University Requirements Curriculum Committee, which oversees general education assessment. This committee includes representatives from Faculty Senate, and the Office of the Provost that work together to improve general education assessment. This spring, for example, the Office of the Provost, working with the Center for Teaching and Learning, provided support for a group of faculty to attend the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) conference in New Orleans and learn about the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) model for general education assessment as well as the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics for assessing learning. In addition, the Office of the Provost will provide support for a group of faculty to enroll in the Higher Learning
Commission’s Assessment Academy. This group of faculty will work with the HLC on various initiatives on behalf of the University including revamping the general education curriculum and infusing LEAP rubrics into the University’s assessment process for general education.

III. The University’s Assessment Plan
The conceptual model for the university’s assessment plan was discussed. Members provided input on the various elements of the assessment plan. The visual graphic of the assessment plan captures all that is currently being done as it relates to assessment. The end goal is to make this model interactive so users can click on a link and learn about all the activities associated with the components of the model.

Components of the Model

- AAL – a lot of the efforts related to centralization of assessment fall within the responsibilities of the AAL office.
- Strategic Plan – being mission-driven means that the University’s strategic plan guides all of our efforts.
- The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning – this involves things that promote the scholarship of teaching and learning including professional development, assessment grants, etc. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides a central place where faculty can access resources for professional development and supports student learning as well.
- ACAA – the Committee has one representative from each academic college. Members return to their colleges and communicate the deliberations of the Committee as it relates to improving assessment efforts.
- Systems Portfolio Committee assists with nonacademic assessment. They also helped with the writing of the Systems Portfolio (AQIP Self-Study) which now, under the Open Pathway, will be submitted to HLC as the university’s Assurance Argument.
- In addition to non-academic assessment, the president would like to develop a way to capture assessment information for divisions. In the past we have used divisional assessment templates similar to programmatic assessment templates. There are intentions of meeting with the President’s Office to obtain a clear picture of all the divisional assessment information which needs to be captured. This also includes co-curricular student learning outcomes related to student experiences such as internships, externships, experiential learning, etc.
- Institutional Effectiveness – helps with closing the loop efforts. For example, the DFW University Initiative utilizes data to identify courses that have a high rate of Ds, Fs, or withdrawals and works to reduce this rate. Another example of data driven decision making is the Foundations of Excellence, which utilized classroom data to determine needs for classroom enhancement. Institutional Effectiveness assists with collecting, assessing and communicating results.
IV. Discussion

- Members provided updates on efforts in their units focused on improving and centralizing assessment efforts.

- Dr. Crawford noted that the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Learning is now charged with coordinating program reviews for the University, and explained the program review process.

- Dr. Crawford provided a recap of the University’s annual assessment reporting process, and explained priorities the ACAA will focus on next year to enhance closing the loop efforts:
  - The Committee will look to re-establish and integrate a rubric into the programmatic reporting process for evaluating annual assessment reports. Kathy Spicer explained that prior to 2012, the Committee had developed a rubric for evaluating programmatic assessment plans. The Committee used the rubric to provide programs with feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses of their assessment plan. Kathy also provided an update on the AMS acquisition process.
  - Dr. Crawford indicated that the Office of the Provost is looking to re-establish assessment grants to encourage and support assessment efforts at the university. The ACAA will discuss criteria for awarding assessment grants in the fall of 2016.

The meeting was concluded by Dr. Crawford.