Meeting Notes
Accreditation Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, April 4, 2013, 10:00 am, President's Conference Room, Suite 1900 IIT Tower

Participants: David Baker (*External Affairs*), Siva Balasubramanian (Chair, *Stuart School of Business*), Carol Emmons (*Staff Lead, Office of Institutional Research*), Walter Hazlitt (*General Counsel's Office*), Anijo Mathew (*Institute of Design*), Jim Meyer (*Office of Technology Services*), Jamshid Mohammadi (*Graduate College*), George Schipporeit (*College of Architecture*), Phil Troyk (*Armour College of Engineering*), John Twombly (*Stuart School of Busin*ess), Charles Uth (*Galvin Library*).

1. Approval of Meeting Notes from 3/7/13 Meeting

   Siva Balasubramanian sought approval of the meeting notes from the last meeting on March 7, 2013. Siva asked whether anyone had any changes to the meeting notes. There were no changes. Siva then asked whether anyone wished to move that the meeting notes from March 7, 2013 be approved. David Baker made the motion and John Twombly seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, and all those present voted in favor of approving the version of the meeting notes distributed by Siva a few days ago.

2. Subcommittee Reports

   Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee

   Carol Emmons discussed the draft Template for Student Learning Assessment that was distributed prior to the meeting (and distributed along with these meeting notes as Attachment 1). The template was designed by the Assessment Subcommittee as a tool to help academic units that have not been conducting any student learning assessment get started on creating a simple process. No one suggested any changes to the template.

   Siva Balasubramanian also shared two examples of the Student Learning Assessment document in current use at the Stuart School (these are distributed along with these meeting notes as Attachments 2 and 3). The important take away from these template documents is that they have the potential to significantly reduce the effort of other units that need to develop a student learning assessment document by Fall 2013. In other words, the template documents indicate sample program goals, objectives, measurement instrument and related rubrics. They also showcase how the assessment score is computed.

   Anijo Matthews asked about the number of courses in which assessment measures must be used. Siva Balasubramanian replied that, based on his conversations with HLC staff, it appears that an acceptable number is quite small. Siva gave as an example, using just a single capstone course to collect all measures of student learning. Phil Troyk observed that the accreditation criteria used by ABET for engineering focus on just the mastery of knowledge and skills. According to Phil, "ABET doesn't care how the student acquired this mastery, they just want to see the student able to demonstrate it." Phil asked how this compared to the HLC's focus. Carol Emmons replied that the HLC would like to see an assessment process that identifies both opportunities to acquire skills or knowledge and opportunities to demonstrate mastery of the skills or knowledge.

Jamshid Mohammadi pointed out that unless we do both, we won't know what to fix when students fail to demonstrate mastery.

Phil Troyk also commented that in the information sessions about accreditation and assessment that he conducted with faculty in Armour College, faculty expressed confusion about how to assess student learning in graduate programs. (ABET accredits only undergraduate programs.) Those present agreed that this would be a good topic for an assessment workshop at IIT.

Siva Balasubramanian stated our goal should be 100 percent of the academic programs at IIT actively conducting assessment as of Fall 2013, and invited suggestions for how to achieve this goal. Siva noted that he will be making a presentation about assessment at the Spring Faculty Meeting on April 25. David Baker expressed the strong belief that it is necessary for the Assessment Subcommittee to compile the data from the recent survey of faculty assessment coordinators about the assessment activities that are occurring at IIT, and share this information with Provost. Then enlist the help of the Provost's office to "lean on" those programs that have no assessment processes to get up to speed by a specified deadline.

David thought it would also be a good idea to offer faculty an assessment workshop to "jump start" their efforts. Carol Emmons didn't think a workshop could be pulled together before the end of April. Phil Troyk suggested hiring an outside consultant to conduct a workshop. David Baker suggested setting a hard deadline for an assessment plan, and then conducting the workshop early in the Fall to provide feedback to programs on their plans. Carol Emmons asked how we would staff this workshop effort. Siva Balasubramanian suggested working with the Associate Deans for each academic unit.

There then ensued a discussion of assessment of IIT's general education program. Siva Balasubramanian reported that the IIT Undergraduate Studies Committee had communicated to him that they don't have the resources to conduct Gen Ed assessment. Phil Troyk, who attended the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting at which this was discussed, explained that Undergraduate Studies Committee members agreed that it would be inefficient and wasteful to use a de-centralized model in which each academic program assessed general education goals. However, a centralized model would require more resources than currently available.

There was agreement that Gen Ed assessment should be an important component. Carol Emmons suggested placing responsibility for Gen Ed assessment in the colleges that teach the Gen Ed courses, namely the new College of Science and the new Lewis College of Human Sciences. Several members expressed support for this idea, and no one expressed disagreement. A synopsis of these discussions will be conveyed to Provost Cramb.

Siva Balasubramanian summarized the assessment discussion as follows:

- We need to analyze the assessment survey data to create a clear picture of current assessment activities at IIT.

- We need to establish a hard deadline for academic programs to design and begin implementing an assessment process the meets clearly-defined requirements.

- We need to enlist the Provost's help in getting compliance from all academic programs.

- We need to discuss Gen Ed assessment with Provost Cramb.

Jim Meyer announced that Campus Labs will be at IIT on April 10 to demonstrate two of their products that are designed to support accreditation and assessment. Jim noted that Campus Labs is a partner of the HLC and built the system that the HLC will require schools to use to input their Assurance Argument and upload pdf evidence files under the new Pathways model of accreditation. Jim invited all interested members to attend. He thinks that it will be a good opportunity to obtain some guidance on a process we might use, based on Campus Labs' experience working with other schools. The demo will begin at 9:55 am in room 2028 at 3424 S. State St.

Quality Improvement Initiative Subcommittee

Charles Uth, George Schipporeit and Anijo Mathew reported that the Quality Improvement Initiative Subcommittee has begun work on combining the two proposals that were approved by the Deans into a single proposal, and making this document conform to the format required by the HLC. The goal is to complete this version and send it the President and Provost for approval by the end of the month.

George Schipporeit expressed some concern about how to get the initiative launched, once it is approved. The initiative, which includes moving IPRO to undergraduate students' first year, setting up a speaker series, and implementing planning software to help students stay on track and graduate in four years, will require the involvement of many individuals and groups at IIT. How will we orchestrate all this activity to accomplish our goals?

It was noted that the Quality Initiative Institutional Proposal Template document requires the identification of specific individuals that will be responsible/involved in the implementation of the quality initiative. This document is currently being completed in consultation with several individuals on campus. Therefore, specific answers to the above questions should become available as soon as this document is completed.

Administrative Criteria Subcommittee

David Baker reported that the Strategic Planning process continues to go well. In addition to engaging a broad sample of the IIT community, this process has also engaged the external community. Six priorities or smart goals have been identified. These include some aggressive placement goals for our graduates. The next step, is to develop detailed objectives under each goal.

David Baker also reported that he and David Ulaszek will work this summer to develop a "game plan" for drafting the assurance argument and compiling the evidence documents for the three administrative criteria.

3. Next Meeting

   The next meeting will be May 2, 2013.

4. Post-meeting Discussion (presented below as an informative summary)

   > Several committee members continued talking after the meeting adjourned. The focus of their discussion was on the proposed quality improvement initiative.

   > Phil Troyk discussed how Armour College might respond to the current Quality Initiative proposal and establish a competitive niche in engineering education. His first response

was that it may not only be faculty who are reluctant to change but also students because some of them are still programmed for a predictable textbook expectation. Another experience on campus of bringing in more interactive student participation had a similar pushback. However, the faculty's second attempt had been more successful and when the first students were interviewed a year later, they had changed their position. They now realized the value of the course and considered it the best at IIT. The transition question then became how to provide the leadership to transform the educational program. It was suggested that we are simply not nurturing the potential of the Camras Scholars Program and other scholarship students and we should bring them together within the distinction of an Honors Program. From the freshman year and forward, they would become the "path" for the new coursework and a 4-year disciplined graduation rate. Based on these university learning experiences, the broader field of curriculum changes could then be processed.

Critical to these objectives is the recognition that there must be a cultural change at IIT. The university's existence is not based on how they can support the faculty. Instead, the students are the priority and the faculty's role is how they can support the university. In this new culture of shared values, recognition must be given to the faculty who drive this educational phase of innovation and the student leadership would be given the priorities for special research, career support, internships, etc. Perhaps the best related case study was briefly described by Siva after our March 7 meeting. Historically, the Finance program at the Stuart School has established a good working relationship with Chicago-based financial firms. Feedback from these firms on the appropriate set of graduate skills and educational principles were incorporated into the finance graduate program. This approach is well received by faculty because it increases relevance of what is learned, and the students acquire greater confidence that they were being prepared for a realistic career path. Finally, future employers are reassured by the benefits of this type of involvement, and its likelihood of enhancing the credibility of their new hires.