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I. Members
Gary Rabe/Lenore Koczon (non-voting member)
Kris Warmoth (non-voting member)
Kathy Hintz
Lisa Borden-King
Katy Kilroy
Thomas Seymour
Erik Kana (chair)
Cari Olson (non-voting member)
Ismail Hassan (student)

II. General Education Assessment
In response to a Faculty Senate Charge, the Academic Assessment Committee discussed the General Education Assessment (Developmental) as a primary focus of our meetings. In preparation for our Spring 2016 Assessment Day, discussion centered around the ultimate effectiveness of the GE assessment as it is currently done.

The consensus of our committee is that the current model does not provide data that is useful in determining whether or not students who graduate from Minot State University possess the critical dispositions and skills targeted by the GE program (Developmental). Data may possibly inform us of the extent to which a student is able to think critically at a particular point in time but the data is not currently an assessment of an overall institutional general education program.

Our Spring Assessment Day activities included an open forum for faculty to gather to discuss the general education assessment and its effectiveness. The notes from that open forum are included in this report; but four models of general education assessment were discussed:

1. Current model of choosing randomly courses to be assessed and assessing using one assignment and rubric from those courses.
2. Individual student assessment using rubrics in which instructors would submit evaluations on every student in the course.
3. A pre/post test that is already designed.
4. Designing a pre/post test to be used at Minot State University.
The Academic Assessment Committee determined that more open forums in the fall would help flesh out faculty’s thoughts on future direction for GE assessment.

III. Program Assessment Reports
Charged by the Faculty Senate, the Academic Assessment Committee invited faculty from a variety of programs/departments to share their assessment reports (usually authored on or around Fall Assessment Day). Those who shared their reports include:

- Dr. Nikki Roed, Nursing
- Dr. Laurie Geller, Math & Computer Science
- Dr. Lori Willoughby, BIT
- Dr. Dan Ringrose, Social Science
- Dr. Vicki Michels, Addiction Studies, Psychology, & Social Work
- Dr. Heather Golly, Athletic Training
- Dr. Robert Kibler, English

The committee found that departments are using the assessment report and writing process in relevant ways. The majority of the departments/programs that presented to the committee are using a four column format (goals, data to be collected, data results, future directions), with some variation in the format as required by accrediting bodies. This uniformity is viewed as a good thing, but the committee contemplated if even more uniformity might be required by HLC.

Finally, it is unclear the extent to which the writing of these individual program reports really informs the university in relation to overall university-wide assessment. It would appear that individual programs and departments are finding the report-writing and data-gathering useful, and are even making programmatic, instructional, or curricular changes based on what is discovered in the process. However, these individual reports do not seem to address more global, broader goals of the institution (whatever they might be).

IV. Election of Chair for 2016/2017 Academic Year
Kathy Hintz was elected chair for the upcoming academic year.

Respectfully submitted,
Erik Kana
Summary of Discussion held on Spring Assessment Day 2016

During our discussion on Assessment Day regarding assessment of the general education program, we discussed four different models for assessment of our general education program. We are sending out a summary of those four models, and the thoughts of the faculty who attended the session regarding drawbacks and benefits of each model, in order to receive some additional feedback. Please email lisa.bordenking@minotstateu.edu with any additional comments. The Assessment Committee will be discussing the feedback provided at our next meeting and then intend to hold campus wide discussions to arrive at a final assessment model.

Model One- Current Model/Current model fixed: Our current model for general education assessment uses common rubrics for each of the components of our program (IP, PSR, CCS) and requires that randomly selected faculty (who teach courses approved as general education within those categories) complete those rubrics on a designated assignment/assessment, average the scores for all freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, and submit that averaged data. Required and foundational content within the general education program are currently not assessed.

Pros.
-Already exists
-Graded assessment (students more vested)
-No additional cost
-Courses in other department cover the bases
-Objectives clear
-None
-Already in place
-People understand it
-Evaluates to correct use of rubric
-Doesn’t cost
-in use – familiarity
-assesess each gen. ed. area

Cons
-Would need to evaluate and create own rubrics that measure our own goals
-Data doesn’t tell / explain anything
-Need a score for every student
-Data trend appears to go down
- Data doesn’t necessarily coordinate with level expectations of freshman different than seniors
- Inter-rater reliability is (low) (training was non-existent/not robust enough)
- hard to separate pieces of the rubric
- Faculty time
- one exception for development is not development
- ‘random’ was not defined so ended up picking
- Generalized rubric that differs from course to course can’t work
- Lack of standardization in evaluation of performance
- Lack of continuity in assignment (is unavoidable and necessary but can’t easily be compared quantitatively)
- Cumbersome
- Measures courses not program.
- Not an overall gen. ed. assessment; still looking at pieces
- Not certain it is being applied correctly or consistently.
- Not clear in FS minutes what we are supposed to compare (fr/sr/jr/sr or 100,200,300,400 level classes)
- Not testing the same group from freshman year to senior year
- Rubric is subjective
- Small sample size
- ambiguous
- useless data
- no continuity of in assessments
- nothing to compare it to
- very small sample possible
- subjective
- too long to get multi year data for comparison
- Not HLC compatible (if that’s true)
- small sample
- no inter-rater reliability
- no training on rubrics
- unclear on what basis the students are rated on the rubrics
  (i.e. do we compare students to their present level expectation = freshman to freshman or freshman to expected senior level)
- rater bias
- unclear unit of analysis (are the n’s students or classes?)
- reliability concerns

**Modal Two – Individual Student Assessment using rubrics:** This model would function similarly to the current model except that faculty would be expected to submit data for each student in the course (instead of averaging scores). Again, this would not cover assessment of required or foundational content.

**Pros**
- statistical data analysis
- lots of raw data
- no financial cost
- will take care of the lack of random picking b/c have all
- more flexible in how you look at data
- none
- more data
- whole sample included
- increased in data on every student
- doesn’t cost anything
- actually track individual students
- can select sample size to ensure it is significant
- could identify where the largest amount of growth occurred by looking at your to your growth

**Cons**
- faculty time
- inter-rater reliability still a problem
- what are random samples? Mechanics? Collect pre in FYE?
- measures courses not programs
- not overall gen. ed. assessment; still looking at pieces
- more work for assessment committee
- no pre/post comparisons
- same information from current model – useless
- time consuming
- no continuity in assessments
- more time to implement
- subjective
- if the 20-type system, then financial
- some rater bias
- could have all of the same cons as model one (can we assume the problems with model one will be fixed for model two?)
- no standardized results
- reliability concerns
- may not be able to track from beginning to end if student leaves the university
- may not be examining the same things

**Other Comments:**
- Need mission – vision for Gen. Ed beyond the specific descriptors of the developmental categories
- Are we looking for diagnostic data (in order to improve individual students or the general education program) or are we looking for “value added” data that indicates the general education program has an impact on our students?
- We think that a combination of model 2 and model 4 would be effective.
Is Model 2 going to be tested from year to year? Student may put in higher effort because a portfolio would be part of their grade.
Model Three – Pre-Post Test: This model proposes moving to using a standardized test (as a pre/post measure) to assess the general education program. There are at least three such tests already in existence (Collegiate Learning Assessment, the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency, and the ETS Proficiency Profile. Test content would need to reflect our outcomes/goals for the general education program here at MSU. These tests could be administered in the First Year LCs and again in a major capstone course.

**Pros**
- standardized
- validated
- compared to national norms
- less complicated
- truly gives pre and post data
- lack of local control (we disagreed on this)
- external validity
- gives normative data
- reliability
- done in standardized way
- validation
- reliability
- standardized
- Fairly simple to obtain quantitative data
- The only model that assesses quantitative data
- Much easier to administer
- Detailed data provided by company
- Looks at program not just courses.
- Easy
- Quantitative
- have more controlled data
- take pre in UNIV, take post in Senior department class
- what you do well in your discipline and apply outside the discipline
- more general
- With enough time, trend analysis

**Cons**
- cost
- getting students motivated to do their best (i.e. accurate data problem)
- lack of local control (we disagreed on this)
- potential of only teaching to the test
- teaching to exam
- financial cost
- expense
- lack of student participation
- who administers exam?
- costs
- some people do not perform well on a standardized test
- Is it meaningful? (test anxiety, guessing, people don't care)
- Test has time constraints that would not exist in the classroom.
- Does not capture PSR & IP.
- Turnover
- not sure where growth happened (between sophomore & junior)
- no student major?
--Cost!!
- Theoretical arguments against using pre-post–teaching to the test?
- Student buy in
- transfer students??
- May not cover fall developmental content
- Expensive
- How do we force students to take (as seniors)
- takes time from a course
- cost
- doesn’t allow evaluation of PSR/IP
- Students don’t value the test outcome (attitude)
- Faculty don’t value the test outcome
- needs to be tied to a grade for attitude to change
- need to get student buy-in
- external expense
- students don’t take seriously (not graded)

**Model Four – Pre & Post Assessment(s) designed on campus:** For this model, we would formulate our overall goals/objectives/outcomes for general education at MSU and then design a single instrument/experience/activity to assess GE, along a pre-test/post-test model. It does not have to be a test; it can be a survey, it can be a seminar, it can be a forum, it can be student work--but a single thing that we look at in year first and year last. This can/should be thought of along the lines of an entrance experience/requirement and an exit experience/requirement.

**Pros**
- pre and post test
- can make your own instrument
- faculty expertise to create
- comprehensive evaluation
- individual students
- doesn’t cost
- looks at the Gen. Ed. as a whole
- Finally Gen. Ed. goals and outcomes would be articulated
- Relevant data, useful
- Fits HLC requirements for assessment of a program
- Bigger picture
- MSU developed
- provide both diagnostic and value added information
- potential

**Cons**
- rater bias
- lack of reliability if everyone makes their own instrument
- would need lots of training
- time intensive
- not external
- too subjective
- test development
- who administers exam?
- administrative support for additional employee time and money
- time intensive
- take 4 years to get results
- how to objectively assess the portfolio
- do not have enough information
- Development internally - a lot of work up front
- Cost for development; timeline for creation
- Need a person to be in charge of assessment for campus. (Not necessarily a con from faculty perspective)
- Not of how it is implemented?
- Don’t fall into same hole as #1 – tasks and numbers
- develop our own tool
- who assesses the portfolio / capstone
- takes time to develop
- where does the time come to assess.

**Other Comments**

- Assumes standardized test will translate to career outcomes
- Profession driven careers don’t always understand General Ed
- Can they pass their national accreditation exams (nursing)
- can they get into grad school (CD)
Academic Assessment Committee
Monday, November 16, 11:00 a.m., Jones Room

Members present: Kathy Hintz, Tom Seymour, Kristen Warmoth, Cari Olson, Lenore Koczon, Lisa Borden-King, Erik Kana

1) Presentation of program assessment reports
   Dr. Lori Willoughby – BIT – presented regarding program assessment reports (the data they collect and where it is found).

   We will continue asking other departments to attend and talk about their program assessment reports.

2) Charge from Faculty Senate

   Cari Olson – will send out the assessment template

   Goals and campus wide assessment – Do we have this? Is it really happening?

   General Education – closing the loop; is it happening?
   What is the plan for the final part of the charge?

3) Peer institutions’ general education assessment reports

   Committee members briefly talked about what they found at the following institutions:

   Northern State University, Midwestern State University, Indiana University – South Bend, Metropolitan State University, MSU-Moorhead, Southwest Minnesota State University, Slippery Rock, UM-Morris, Montana State University – Billings, University of Wisconsin – River Falls, Northern Michigan University
Academic Assessment Committee  
Monday, September 14, 2015, 11:00 a.m., Jones Room  

Members present: Lisa Borden-King, Thomas Seymour, Lenore Koczon, Kristen Warmoth, Jacob Sowers, Erik Kana  

Members absent: Kathy Hintz, Katy Kilroy  

1) Welcome and announcements  
   September 21st, 2 p.m., training on Sharepoint for faculty and administrative assistants. Those being assessed Fall 2015 will be notified, as well as chairs and administrative assistants.  

2) Spring 2015 and Summer 2015 assessment report discussion  
   General conversations about concerns with the Developmental General Education course assessment as we currently do it.  
   Erik talked about the usefulness of the data, sometimes termed “closing the loop.” What do we do with the data now that we have it? Is assessing individual courses the way to go?  
   We are averaging averages.  
   The data is unclear: do the objectives match the rubric?  
   Do we need a General Education committee representative on our committee? Before we talk, we probably need to visit with the MSU HLC coordinators to make sure we all working towards a common goal, using the same language, etc.  
   Scores go consistently up. According to the data collected for spring and summer, looking across developmental categories, there is an upward trend when you compare lower-classes with upper-classes (freshman vs. seniors, for example).  
   CLA: some sort of standardized exam might be a better tool to assess our general education model.  

3) Selection of Spring 2016 courses to be assessed – Erik will be working the Jean-Francois Mondon to complete this task soon.  

4) Email regarding ideas for assessment. A faculty member emailed some ideas regarding a better way to assess general education.  
   Discussion about making sure that all distance and adjunct and dual credit instructors have proper training.  
   The CLA was used and could have been meaningful in some ways. Relates to pre/post test ideas from assessment. In the development of the general education model, there was a capstone experience that would have been used as a post test.
Maybe we should look at other regional institutions to determine what they are doing in terms of assessing their general education systems. Erik will get a list of peers and divide up.

5) Other

Program assessment reports: What do program assessment reports look like across campus? Tom recommended visiting with various departments to see what they're doing. What data? How are they collecting it? How are they using it? What are they doing with it? Erik will visit with Nikki Roed and Laurie Geller to see if they want to share their program assessment reports from Nursing and Math.
Assessment Committee  
Monday, October 12, 2015, 11:00 a.m.  
Jones Room  

Members Present: Tom Seymour, Katy Kilroy, Lenore Kozcon, Cari Olson, Erik Kana  

Members Absent: Jacob Sowers, Lisa Borden-King, Kathy Hintz, Kristen Warmoth  

1) Dr. Nikki Roed, Nursing Department, discussed the nursing department’s program assessment reports/assessment day activities.  

2) Dr. Laurie Geller, Math Department, discussed the math department’s program assessment reports/assessment day activities.  

3) Identification of other departments to invite for our next/future meetings. Dr. Dan Ringrose from Social Science and Dr. Lori Willoughby from business will be asked to present on their program reports/assessment day activities.  

4) Reports on the peer institutions and their general education assessment Because of the large number of members absent, we will postpone reporting on our findings until our next meeting.  

Meeting adjourned.
Academic Assessment Committee
December 7, 2015 Minutes
11:00, Jones Room

Members Present: Kathy Hintz, Kristen Warmoth, Lenore Koczon, Tom Seymour, Cari Olson, Erik Kana

Members Absent: Katy Kilroy, Lisa Borden-King

1. Program Assessment Reports
   Dan Ringrose – Social Science shared program assessment reports
   Vicki Michels – Addiction Studies, Psychology, Social Work shared program assessment reports

2. Update on Spring Gen Ed courses to be assessed.
   Sharepoint training today

3. Continue discussion about General Education assessment and the Faculty Senate charge

4. Spring Assessment Day – February 23 (Tuesday)
   What will we do?
   an open forum?
   spend an afternoon or morning in conversations.
   conference center availability?

5. Spring meeting dates
   Erik will develop
Academic Assessment Committee
Agenda / Wednesday, January 20, 2016, 11:00 a.m., Souris Room

Members Present: Tom Seymour, Lisa Borden-King, Kathy Hintz, Erik Kana

1) Assessment Day (Feb. 23) Activities
   Detailed plans were discussed. Faculty open forum will be held in the Swain Hall 3rd floor atrium. Lisa and Kathy will lead the discussion on general education assessment.

2) Assessment Day dates for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017
   Erik will notify Celeste with the dates.

Adjournment
Assessment Committee Meeting / Wednesday, April 20th / 11:00 / Jones Room

Members Present: Kathy Hintz, Cari Olson, Erik Kana, Lisa Borden-King

1) Future movement on Gen Ed Assessment
Schedule one or more open forums to talk about the results from our assessment day. There was some talk on bringing back the CLA as a measure of the effectiveness of GE assessment. We recommend that next year someone from the general education committee comes to our meeting, and one member from our committee goes to their committee.

2) Findings from our year long look at department assessment reports
Departments are using it and finding it a relevant process. Trying to find a way to do a university-wide assessment via the assessment reports. Departments that showed up generally follow a four or five column format, some based on their accrediting body’s requirement. Formats were somewhat the same, but not exactly the same - and does this matter for HLC?

3) Election of chair for 2016/2017 academic year
Kathy Hintz

Adjournment