Meeting Notes
Accreditation Advisory Committee Meeting
November 8, 2012 - President's Conference Room, Suite 1900 IIT Tower

Participants: David Baker (External Affairs), Siva Balasubramanian (Chair, Stuart School of Business), Matt Bauer (College of Science & Letters), Anthony D'Amato (General Counsel), Carol Emmons (Staff Lead, Institutional Research), Noreen Kozak (Provost's Office), Anijo Mathew (School of Design), George Schipporeit (Architecture), Kristin Standaert (IIT Libraries), Ray Trygstad (School of Applied Technology), David Ulaszek (Office of Finance)

1. Draft Accreditation Planning Progress Report

Siva Balasubramanian distributed a draft report summarizing the progress of two of the three subcommittees (found at the end of these meeting notes). Siva explained that he plans to use this subcommittee goal/accomplishment format for the progress report requested by Provost Alan Cramb. Siva also reminded the Committee that Alan Cramb will be attending the next meeting on December 6, 2012.

2. Subcommittee Reports

Quality Improvement Initiative Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Ray Trygstad summarized the meeting on November 1, 2012 (see the Subcommittee minutes at the end of this document). The Subcommittee discussed a proposal submitted by Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Mike Gosz.

Mike's proposal for a quality improvement initiative focuses on using technology (namely the Degree Works system) to improve 6-year graduation rates by asking students to create a 4-year plan in Degree Works. Degree Works leads to graduation in a specific time period. Its query-able database has the potential to guarantee that each plan is fulfilled. Mike is examining whether the software can be configured to alert students to the impact of changes in their plan on their expected graduation date.

Mike observed that improving undergraduate retention and graduation rates has been a key focus at IIT and that a number of initiatives are already in place (such as the Retention Committee, the Kedge Program and the SAP process) to improve undergraduate retention.   Creating a four-year plan is expected to further improve graduation rates by focusing students on the shortest path to graduation and the cost/time implications of deviations from that path. He mentioned that sophomore students at Swarthmore create a plan that includes all academic courses and extra-curricular activities.

Mike noted that increasing IIT's 6-year graduation rate will also improve IIT's *US News and World Report* ranking, thereby helping to advance the university's goal of increasing undergraduate enrollment. Finally, Mike mentioned that the Registrar, Peter Zachocki, is working to create a more rational process to optimize class sizes. Having students' four-year plans will greatly facilitate planning (keeping tabs on class sizes well in advance).

Ray Trygstad asked Mike to ask the Graduate College to use Degree Works in the same way to capture graduate student plans.

There followed a discussion of the role of advising in student retention and graduation. Matt Bauer observed that improved retention stimulates higher enrollment which in turn will lead to hiring more faculty. Matt also noted that faculty advisors should help students develop their four-year plans, or there will need to be a central support function for students. Mike Gosz interjected that the Provost is willing to provide central support for the student plan initiative.

Carol Emmons suggested that faculty might be induced to spend more time advising students if this activity was rewarded by the university. Mike Gosz responded that he would like to see the Stryker Award used to reward good advising. Anijo Mathew observed that faculty don't mind advising students on career planning, but they don't like to help students with course selection. Siva Balasubramanian described efforts in the Stuart School of Business to have trained staff advise graduate students regarding course selection, thereby focusing faculty attention to tasks that advance students' career-oriented activities.

George Schipporeit noted that to effectively help students select courses, faculty advisors need to be able to easily check the recommended course sequence for every degree program and know when particular courses will be offered.   George further insisted that students should be required to get their advisor's approval to drop a course. Matt Bauer disagreed with this, saying that it should be the student not the advisor who has control over the student's degree progress. Mike Gosz suggested that students might be less likely to make decisions that significantly delay graduation if a warning popped up on the student's computer screen telling the student that dropping this course will delay their graduation.

Assessment Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Carol Emmons summarized the Assessment Subcommittee meeting on October 17, 2012 (see Assessment subcommittee meeting notes at the end of this document).   The Subcommittee's goals for the 2012-13 academic year are to establish a system for monitoring assessment activities across the university, develop a way to share best practices and figure out how to get faculty "buy in" for assessment. The Subcommittee is planning to meet three more times during the Fall term to work on achieving these goals.

Matt Bauer, a member of the Assessment Subcommittee, described a separate initiative to inform faculty who teach courses that fulfill the general education communication requirement (known as "C" courses) about the communication learning goals for these courses. Greg Pulliam will inform faculty about these goals. Matt also suggested pilot testing some new functionality in the current version of BlackBoard that captures course learning goals. Matt added that because this functionality appears somewhat cumbersome to use, it may be wise to test it out on just a small number of courses, such as the Gen Ed courses.

Administrative Criteria Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair David Baker announced that a new Strategic Plan Committee has been formed and will have its first meeting on November 20, 2012. The focus of this committee will be on the quality of the student's academic experience at IIT. He noted that the updated strategic plan would be established well before 2016 (the year of NCA visit to IIT).

David Baker also noted that General Counsel Anthony D'Amato has been asked to establish a Compliance Committee. Anthony also chairs the Diversity Committee. David invited Anthony to describe the work of these committees.

Anthony D'Amato stated that the purpose of the Compliance Committee is to provide a venue for university employees to raise issues concerning noncompliance with Federal requirements.   Anthony pointed out that no university is 100 percent compliant with all government regulations.   Nevertheless, what the government wants to see is that the university is making a good faith effort to be compliant and the university provides a venue for employees to raise compliance issues and concerns.

As for the Diversity Committee, Anthony D'Amato described a series of focus groups that had been conducted by an external facilitator with students, staff and faculty about diversity issues at IIT. The themes that emerged from every focus group included: the need for more cultural sensitivity and the desire for greater respect in the way members of the university community treat one another. The Diversity Committee is working on providing programming to address these issues.

David Baker then highlighted the community-related aspects of the subcommittee's discussions. He indicated that this includes a 5 to 15 year long process for engaging the community around IIT. He reported that IIT will be entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Chicago that will characterize how IIT will develop in the future in conjunction with the City.   David also noted that IIT wants to work with the surrounding community on economic development, as well as get community input on changes that take place on campus.   From the City's perspective, key items include the launch of the Innovation Center and figuring out a solution for Main Building.   Also, the City is accelerating building permits for schools that use minority contractors, and the adoption of a high school. IIT already has a long-standing history of collaboration with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS), but is nevertheless doubling its efforts with CPS.

David Ulaszek reported that the university planning and budgeting process is underway and expressed the hope that all units will submit their draft budgets before the Thanksgiving holiday.

3. Next Meeting

Thursday, December 6, 2012 at 10:00 am in the President's conference room.

Attachment 1

Meeting Notes - November 1, 2012
Quality Improvement Initiative Subcommittee of NCA Accreditation Advisory Committee

Members Present:
George Schipporeit, Anijo Mathew, Ray Trygstad (co-Chair), Charles Uth (co-Chair)

Also attending:
Siva Balasubramanian

Ray Trygstad and Charles Uth were unanimously elected co-chairs of this subcommittee.

Members reviewed the themes from My Perfect IIT Survey conducted in Spring 2012. There was consensus that the subcommittee needed to develop three quality improvement initiative proposals (1-2 pages each) by the end of November 2012. The first of these proposals has already been developed by Mike Gosz, who could not attend today.

Members reviewed Mike Gosz's proposal and there was enthusiastic support for using DegreeWorks to develop a tailored plan for each student that leads to a degree within a specified time frame. The reported high correlation between retention rate and historic graduation rates is very interesting. However, some members expressed concern about the historically low 6 year graduation rates at IIT. George Schipporeit suggested that IIT should consider the 4 year graduation rate also. A notable aspect of this proposal is the focus on several expected desirable outcomes from the proposed initiative. Charles Uth observed that, while it is important to improve the quality of admitted students, we may not be able to attract a large number of high quality students if we were not ranked high in the popular rankings. Therefore, it is very desirable to improve a metric such as 6 year graduation rate if that was a critical input in these rankings to assess IIT's perception/performance relative to other institutions. Members indicated support for Mike Gosz's proposal and suggested that a revised version of this proposal should be included the final set to be advanced to the full NCA Accreditation Advisory Committee.

The discussion next turned to other ideas/themes for quality improvement initiative proposals. Ray Trygstad observed that many of the themes listed from the My Perfect IIT survey were already under different stages of implementation.

   Teaching and Learning Center – Announced by the President and the Provost at the student Open Forum, Tuesday, October 23rd, 2012, funded by an Alumni donor and to be operational within five years.

   Offer Varsity Sports – Transition to NCAA Division 3 and expansion of sports offered is currently in progress.

   Invite Guest Speakers/Visiting Dignitaries – Done though creation of the President's Lecture series; Ray Trygstad will submit a proposal on how to enhance attractiveness of this program to

prospective speakers.

Improve the IIT Website – Conversion of the IIT Web presence from an unwieldy vendor-supplied pseudo-Content Management System to a true open-source CMS, Drupal, is currently in progress.

Simpler and Easier Business Processes – The new Student One-Stop has opened with this as a very specific goal.

George Schipporeit reiterated the importance and value of good teaching (and recognizing and rewarding great teachers). He also suggested that we need to consider the Project-based Learning approach. The IPRO 2.0 could be a good format for testing the value of this approach to IIT (relative to traditional approach using a textbook in class). Finally, George noted that a key part of the NCA Accreditation Process at this time is the requirement that each academic program should specify formal learning goals, and then be responsible for providing evidence supporting achievement of those goals.

Anijo Mathew noted the a quality improvement initiative proposal could focus on "visible technology use." One example is a hackathon. George observed that we have now used Ipads for several years to support learning, so we should study how that feature has enhanced student learning experience. Anijo observed that Project Based Learning (PBL) may provide Bottom-up leverage/energy to support student learning, while Visible Technology and New Teaching Approaches (Ipads) may provide Top-down support. Members agreed that it may be worthwhile to begin student involvement in IPRO in the first year instead of waiting for the third year. George observed that our students needed to understand themselves better in the first year before deciding on their major or career goals.

Finally, Siva Balasubramanian reiterated the following immediate tasks for this subcommittee:

(a) to email three quality improvement initiative proposals (one to two pages each) and the final version of meeting notes after each meeting to Siva before the end of November 2012. In early December, these proposals/meeting notes will be distributed to Provost Cramb and all members of the full committee along with documents from other subcommittees.

(b) Siva distributed a list of potential faculty champions for Quality Improvement Initiatives that was prepared during the last summer by Ophir Trigalo and Mike Gosz. The subcommittee may wish to consult with faculty members on this list (or others not on this list as appropriate) in developing the quality improvement initiative proposals.

(c) Siva reviewed the (revised) draft timeline for selecting a Quality Improvement Initiative that was previously emailed to members.

MEETING NOTES
Assessment Subcommittee
10/17/12

Subcommittee Members Present: Matt Bauer, Ralph Brill, Carol Emmons (Chair), Alan Mead, Ophir Trigalo, Phil Troyk.
Also *Present*: : Siva Balasubramanian
Subcommittee Members Not Present: John Twombly (teaching)

1. **Role of Assessment Subcommittee**: We agreed that the role of the Assessment Subcommittee is the following:
   a. To communicate expectations regarding student learning assessment to the Deans and faculty.
   b. To establish a process to monitor and report on student learning assessment activities across the university.
   c. To establish a process for sharing best practices in student learning assessment across the university.

   (Note that assessment of Undergraduate general education is responsibility of UG Studies Committee.)

2. **Guiding Principles for Student Learning Assessment at IIT:**
   a. A student learning assessment process must be continuous in order to be successful.
   b. Faculty acceptance of the importance and benefits of conducting student learning assessment is essential for a student learning assessment process to succeed and be sustainable.
   c. Data collected for the purpose of student learning assessment should *not* be used to evaluate individual faculty for promotion or tenure.
   d. Each college should be the architect of its student learning assessment process.

3. **Subcommittee Goals for the 2012-13 Academic Year**: the current academic year will be used to communicate expectations and establish a reporting process for assessment activities so as to be able to complete two years of data collection (i.e., in 2013-14 and 2014-15) before IIT's next accreditation site visit in 2016. Therefore, the goals for this year are to:
   a. Create a communication plan for student learning assessment which may include email communications to the Deans and Faculty, communication with the Faculty Council and presentations at Faculty meetings.
   b. Design a process to monitor and report on student learning assessment activities across the university (to be completed in draft form by December, 2012).
      i. Determine the data to be collected from the Deans about assessment activities in their college.
      ii. Determine the schedule on which the data are to be collected from the Deans.
      iii. Design a report template for the Deans to use to report on assessment activities.
      iv. Request feedback from the Deans on the draft report template.
   c. Pre-test the reporting process during the Spring, 2013 term.
   d. Design a process for sharing best practices for student learning assessment across the university.
   e. Determine how to get the acceptance (i.e., "buy-in") of the faculty for conducting student learning assessment and using the results to continuously improve IIT's academic programs.

4. **Meeting Schedule**: the Subcommittee agreed to conduct three 2-hour meetings before the end of the Fall term. Carol Emmons will conduct a Doodle Poll to identify the timeslots during which the greatest number of subcommittee members are available.

5. **Action Items**:
    a. Create a Doodle Poll to identify the best times for 3 meetings during the Fall semester and schedule those meetings (Carol Emmons).
    b. Arrange to make a presentation of the work of this subcommittee at the Faculty Council (Siva Balasubramanian).
    c. Schedule an announcement at the University Faculty meeting about our accreditation-related agenda items including Assessment. (Siva Balasubramanian).