

Meeting Notes

Accreditation Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 2, 2013, 10:00 am, 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*), Russell Betts (*College of Science & Letters*), Ralph Brill (*Chicago-Kent College of Law*), Carol Emmons (*Staff Lead, Office of Institutional Research*), Walter Hazlitt (*General Counsel's Office*), Noreen Kozak (*Office of the Provost*), Anijo Mathew (*Institute of Design*), Jim Meyer (*Office of Technology Services*), Jamshid Mohammadi (*Graduate College*), George Schipporeit (*College of Architecture*), Ray Trygstad (*School of Applied Technology*), John Twombly (*Stuart School of Business*), David Ulaszek (*Financial Affairs*), Charles Uth (*Galvin Library*).

1. Approval of Meeting Notes from 4/4/13 Meeting

Siva Balasubramanian opened the meeting by asking for approval of the meeting notes from the last meeting on April 4, 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 Ulaszek made the motion and Jamshid Mohammadi 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 prior to today's meeting.

2. Subcommittee Reports

Student Learning Assessment Subcommittee

Carol Emmons distributed a handout (appended to the end of these meeting notes) that summarized some preliminary results from the Fall 2012 Assessment Survey. The survey was sent to 40 faculty members who were identified by the Deans as "faculty program assessment coordinators" in their colleges. Thirty (75%) of these faculty responded to the survey and reported on 90 (58%) of IIT's 156 degree programs. Of the programs reported on, assessment is occurring in a higher proportion of the undergraduate programs than the graduate programs.

Carol Emmons said that she was generally encouraged by these results because they demonstrate that it's possible to collect information about assessment activities at IIT and that there is a lot of assessment already occurring.

There ensued a discussion about how to get the rest of the faculty program assessment coordinators to respond to the survey. John Twombly offered to speak with Rick Bonaccorsi's replacement. Noreen Kozak offered to talk to Provost Alan Cramb about sending an email to the Deans about this. Carol Emmons will draft a message and send it, along with the names of the non-responding faculty, to Noreen.

Anijo Matthew noted that faculty would benefit from workshops on how to conduct student learning assessment. Carol Emmons described a session she attended at the recent HLC conference about an assessment "boot camp" for faculty that one school had conducted. Carol knows the presenter and will follow up with her to request copies of the boot camp agenda, exercises and other materials. Carol asked the group whether they thought it would be better to

invite faculty to one all-day event, or several briefer events. There was general agreement that the workshop needs to be long enough to allow time to get work done (e.g., draft learning goals), and should include food. Earlier in the day (e.g., breakfast through 3 pm or so) was also seen as better than later in the day.

Siva Balasubramanian noted that the HLC views the publication of program learning goals in the course bulletins as a "best practice," and encouraged the Assessment Subcommittee to work with Academic Affairs to adopt this practice at IIT.

Siva also mentioned that, as the committee moves forward with its goal to bring about a widespread culture of assessment practice at IIT, more targeted deployment of university resources will be necessary to support the student learning assessment process across campus. Siva reminded that group that the need for additional resources for assessment was a topic of discussion at our last meeting. Siva will share more details on this as soon as they become available.

Administrative Criteria Subcommittee

David Baker reported that the May 2013 Board of Trustees meeting will be used as a "pivot point" for the new Strategic Plan. Final approval of the plan is expected at the October 2013 Board meeting. Russell Betts interjected that the six goals from the plan were discussed at a recent meeting of the Provost and Deans. Russell noted that that the Deans had suggested significant changes to these goals.

David Baker also reported that the Subcommittee plans to use the summer to identify each type of evidence that will be used to support IIT's Assurance Argument, and establish a process for archiving these. He suggested that Carol Emmons, Noreen Kozak and himself meet soon to discuss evidence from the recent strategic planning process.

Quality Improvement Initiative Subcommittee

Siva Balasubramanian reported that the HLC recently changed their template for the Quality Improvement Initiative proposal. The new template has caused the Subcommittee to revisit the two proposals in an effort to combine/integrate the two while also trying to simplify the narrative.

Siva Balasubramanian noted that the proposal initially developed by Mike Gosz was focused on control of graduation rates with the discipline imposed through a plan. The second proposal focused on improving the student learning experience. The committee needs to develop an integrated proposal that highlights/promotes both these desirable quality improvement goals while avoiding conflict.

Matt Bauer noted that there is evidence that having a plan helps. But he saw the two proposals as inherently inconsistent. Carol Emmons agreed that the proposals appear inconsistent because using the first year to explore majors may lengthen the time to graduation rather than shorten it. However, if handled the right way, there may be no inherent inconsistency and this needs to be explained in IIT's proposal. George Schipporeit insisted that there is no inherent inconsistency because students waste more time "shopping around" for a major during their first four years than they would if the first year were more focused on helping them choose the right major. Charles Uth also noted that the current proposal does not say that students cannot choose a major and build a 4-year plan around that major in the first year, just that students will not be required to.

Carol Emmons observed that when she pulls data for fourth and fifth-year undergraduates, she has noticed that many have accumulated significantly more credits than they need to graduate. Jamshid Mohammadi wondered whether this was more true of transfer students than students who started at IIT. John Twombly pointed out that, alternatively, students may just take advantage of the fact that there is no additional tuition charge for anything over 12 credit hours.

Matt responded by saying that he thought the Subcommittee working on the proposal should look at data about the percentage of IIT undergraduates who change majors and the primary reasons why they change majors. Matt also noted that Dean Ellen Mitchell has a program in the new Lewis College of Human Sciences for undergraduates to explore majors in their first year. Matt suggested that the Subcommittee talk to Ellen about this program.

Carol Emmons described a study done by Caryn Schnierle a few years ago, that looked at the proportion of IIT undergraduate students who changed majors and the effects of changing one's major on student retention. Carol will follow up with Caryn to get a copy of the study and share it with the Subcommittee.

George Schipporeit asked whether the group thought it necessary to conduct a pilot project on these proposals before submitting a formal proposal to the HLC. There was general agreement that a pilot project was not necessary for the HLC, but might be a good way to launch the quality improvement initiatives more quickly.

George made another pitch for an Honors Program at IIT, noting that we are missing an opportunity to create something that will attract additional highly qualified students.

3. Summer Subcommittee Activities

Siva Balasubramanian asked each subcommittee chair to describe activities their subcommittee will engage in during the summer.

Carol Emmons and Matt Bauer said that the Assessment Subcommittee will work on following up with the faculty program assessment coordinators who have not responded to the survey, drill into the survey data in more detail to determine what faculty are doing to assess each program, and conduct at least one assessment workshop for faculty.

David Baker said that the Administrative Criteria Subcommittee will review the new criteria and begin building an evidence file. David Ulaszek added that he had picked up a paper at the recent HLC conference that listed examples of admissible evidence for each of the new criteria. He emailed the paper to Siva Balasubramanian and Carol Emmons. Carol will post it on the Open Pathway Google site.

Siva Balasubramanian ascertained that Charles Uth, Ray Trygstad, George Schipporeit, and Anijo Matthew would be available over the summer to continue work on the Quality Improvement Initiative proposal in a manner that integrates the perspectives discussed above.

4. Other Topics

David Ulaszek responded to the following question from a Committee member about the recent HLC conference: What is the HLC's position on instructors using content from the internet, specifically lectures from massive open online courses (MOOCs) offered by another university? David spoke to IIT's Vice President for Accreditation Relations at the HLC, Andrew Lootens-

White. According to Lootens-White, if the course instructor is employed by IIT and evaluates the content to be correct and appropriate for the course, the HLC does not have a problem with the instructor using the content.

5. Next Meeting

Siva Balasubramanian will work with Noreen Kozak on the schedule for next year's meetings.

Fall 2012 Assessment Survey Preliminary Results

Prepared by Carol Emmons, 5/2/2013

Survey Population:

- 156 degree programs
 - 34 Undergraduate programs
 - 122 Graduate programs
- 40 faculty program Assessment Coordinators
 - 30 (75%) responded to survey
 - 26 responded for all their programs
 - 4 responded for only some of their programs (19/40 programs)
 - 10 did not respond to survey

Survey Results:

- 90 programs reported on in survey
 - 63 (52%) of the graduate programs
 - 27 (79%) of the undergraduate programs
- The table below summarizes the number of programs reported as having each main component of assessment:

Assessment Components	Graduate	Undergraduate
Learning Goals	35/63 (56%)	22/27 (82%)
Curriculum Map	31/63 (49%)	18/27 (67%)
Assessment Plan	32/63 (51%)	16/27 (59%)
Have used results	28/63 (44%)	11/27 (41%)
Have documented changes	0/63 (0%)	1/27 (4%)