Members in Attendance:

I. Introductions
Kathy Spicer welcomed members and asked everyone to introduce themselves due to the many new members that were present. She also revisited the purpose of the ACAA and the charge to its members. The minutes from the meeting held on April, 26 2016 were presented and will be accepted after the revision, suggested by Mary Ann Haley, is made.

II. Taskstream update and brief overview
Kathy Spicer gave an overview of the status of the Taskstream implementation and the products that Kent State University (KSU) has purchased: Accountability Management Software (AMS) and Learning Assessment Tools (LAT). She further explained some of the functions of the AMS and how this will help to facilitate KSU’s assessment goals and benefit programs with specialized accreditation. The LAT product was also described and examples of features which may be used by faculty and students were discussed. There was a brief demonstration of the AMS system by Kathy Spicer. The status of identifying early adopters and the role they will play was also described.

III. Overview of year: tasks to be accomplished
a. Pat Vermeersch continued the meeting with information regarding tasks planned for this academic year. The first task is the implementation of utilizing a rubric for feedback to academic programs regarding student learning outcome assessment plans. In order to implement this process, rubrics will need to be developed and a timeline and implementation process identified. She called for the following subcommittees to be formed: Assessment Plan Rubric, Findings Rubric, Implementation Plan Rubric and Timeline and Process subcommittees.
A ballot was passed out to the members present that allowed each member to specify which subcommittee they would prefer to work with.

A question was asked regarding the training that each of these subcommittees would receive and the concern of consistency was raised. Kathy Spicer addressed this by sharing how the evaluation process was managed in the past and also best practice resources that are available to guide this process. Pat Vermeersch also pointed out that the development of this evaluative process has two stages: first developing the rubric and second, instructing evaluators in use of the rubric. At this point ACAA is more focused on developing the rubric and training to effectively use the rubric will need to be considered as part of the process. Kathy Spicer pointed out that there are existing rubrics within Taskstream that could be utilized as examples for the rubric subcommittees. Ballots were collected.

b. **Input regarding evidence for the Assurance Argument**
Kathy Spicer explained another task of the ACAA committee for this coming year, which is contributing to the Assurance Argument, the university self study in Open Pathway. She went on to explain the difference between the Assurance Argument under Open Pathway and the Systems Portfolio under AQIP. Because the Assurance Argument is constructed with direct evidence that the university meets the Criteria and Core Components, she explained the key role that the ACAA will play in gathering data, relaying key accreditation related information to their respective units, and facilitating the construction of the Assurance Argument. The Higher Learning Commission *Criteria for Accreditation* was distributed to members for future discussion.

Kathy Spicer explained some of the university accreditation requirements and activities that took place over the previous years, including the submission of the required May 2016 Monitoring Report. Paul Gaston reviewed feedback received from HLC regarding this report. Dr. Gaston reviewed five main points of focus pulled from the feedback.

V. **Next meeting – October 4, 2016, Library 222**
Agenda items that were not discussed during today’s meeting time will be added to next month’s meeting agenda. The meeting was adjourned.