Meeting Notes

Accreditation Advisory Committee Meeting

11/14/11

Participants: David Baker (External Affairs), Siva Balasubramanian (Stuart School of Business, Committee Chair), Matt Bauer (College of Science & Letters), Anthony D'Amato (Office of General Counsel), Carol Emmons (Staff Lead, Office of Institutional Information), Mike Gosz (Undergraduate Affairs), Noreen Kozak (Office of the Provost), Scott Morris (College of Psychology), Sudhakar Nair (Graduate Academic Affairs), George Schipporeit (College of Architecture), Kristin Standaert (Galvin Library), Margaret Stewart (Chicago-Kent College of Law), Ophir Trigalo (Office of Technology Services).

1. Meetings (Siva)

   A. Recent Meetings:

      1) Following a suggestion from Ophir Trigalo to explore Blackboard as a potential vehicle for assessing learning outcomes, a conference call was held with Blackboard on October 31, 2011. Participants included Carol Emmons, Matt Bauer, James Meyer and Blackboard representative Nick LaRusso.

      2) Armour Chairs' Meeting: Carol Emmons spoke to the Armour Chairs about re-accreditation on November 2, 2011.

   B. Future Meetings:

      1) MMAE Faculty Meeting: Carol Emmons and Siva Balasubramanian will speak with the MMAE faculty on November 18.

      2) A demo of the Blackboard Outcomes module is scheduled for November 21, 2011 at 10 am – 11:30 am. This module is specifically designed to help schools collect and store evidence for student learning assessment. The demo will be conducted as a webinar. Interested Committee members are invited to participate. Carol Emmons will email the Committee members instructions for joining the webinar.

      3) A meeting with Jeanne Hartig, VP of Marketing & Communications is being scheduled to discuss a comprehensive campus-wide communication strategy, along the lines suggested by David Baker.

      4) Deans' Council Meeting: Siva Balasubramanian and Carol Emmons will make a presentation at the Deans' Council on January 10, 2012, along the lines suggested by Ali Cinar.

   C. Discussion:

      1) Our objective is to stimulate awareness and involvement across the entire IIT community with the accreditation process and assurance of learning/outcome

assessments. Given this, what should be the content and organization of presentations focused on accreditation at faculty meetings?

2) The process for assessing learning outcomes may differ across colleges. It will therefore help to communicate with IIT faculty at multiple levels. Welcome your thoughts on how Siva and Carol could work with the committee representative from each College to develop tailored presentations to faculty members in that College.

2. Student Learning Assessment

A. Assessment Practices Survey

Carol Emmons distributed a draft survey designed to capture information about current student learning assessment practices in the academic departments.   The plan is to ask the chair or other knowledgeable person in each academic department to complete the questionnaire for their department. Matt Bauer suggested that questions about general education learning goals be added to the survey. All committee members are asked to review the questionnaire and forward comments to Carol (emmons@iit.edu). Carol will prepare a final version for the next Committee meeting on December 12, 2011.

B. Assessment Resources on Committee Website

Siva Balasubramanian discussed the assessment documents posted on our Google+ site. There are documents used by Stuart School of Business and other documents used by the department of Computer Science.   There is also a document, "A Basic, No Frills Approach to Student Learning Assessment," that is recommended reading for academic units that are currently not doing student learning assessment.

3. Process for Selecting a Quality Improvement Initiative

A. Siva reminded the group about our target dates:

1) Jan/Feb 2012: Determine and document process for selecting a quality improvement initiative
2) May 2012: Quality Improvement Initiative selected.
3) September 2012: Submit Quality Improvement Initiative proposal to the HLC.

B. Carol Emmons distributed a worksheet (attached) to help focus the discussion on discrete parts of the process for selecting a quality improvement initiative.

1) **Who can nominate a project?** The general consensus was that faculty, staff and students should all be allowed to nominate projects. To keep things manageable, we need a filtering process. One suggestion is an online form. The ideas would then be reviewed by the Committee and some of the submitters would be invited to forward a formal proposal. Scott Morris suggested that inputs from Deans and the Provost may serve as the filtering mechanism.

David Baker suggested talking to President Anderson about what he thinks the role of the Board of Trustees (e.g., its Academic Committee) should be in this process. He also suggested that we find a way to bring the Faculty Council into the process. Another suggestion was to consider student government participation. It was agreed that these groups will probably want roles in shaping the final project.

2) **What characteristics should the project have?** There was general consensus that the project should be academically related and also related to IIT's Strategic Plan. The project should also have broad impact (university wide as opposed to impacting one or few academic units).

George Schipporeit asked whether anyone had done an evaluation of the iPad initiative that was started two years ago, in which every incoming undergraduate student is given a free iPad. Ophir responded that OTS has Blackboard usage data that suggests that the iPads significantly increased Blackboard usage among students. Mike Gosz has observed changes in student behavior (e.g., iPads replacing laptop computers), but there has not been a formal evaluation of the initiative. Carol Emmons noted that we may be asked about this initiative as part of the re-accreditation process. Therefore, this Committee should recommend and support a formal evaluation of the iPad initiative.

3) **What form should the nomination take?** There was general agreement that an online form should be used to gather ideas. These could then be reviewed by the Committee to identify those for which we want to invite formal proposals.

4) **What should the process be for submitting an idea/proposal?** To be discussed at the next meeting.

5) **How will the Committee solicit ideas/proposals?** To be discussed at the next meeting.

6) **How will we select a winner?** To be discussed at the next meeting.

4. Homework

A. Arrange to have a discussion of the NCA accreditation included on the agenda for an (the) upcoming faculty meeting(s) in your college. Think about what should be included in that discussion.

B. Review the draft Assessment Practices Survey distributed by Carol Emmons at the meeting (and also attached to these minutes), and send Carol your feedback. Carol will prepare a final draft of the survey for the next meeting on December 12, 2011.

C. Review the assessment materials posted on our Google+ site.