Participants:
Siva Balasubramanian (Chair*, Stuart School of Business*), David Baker (*External Affairs*), J. Kemp Ellington (*Lewis College of Human Sciences*), Carol Emmons (*Assessment*), Virginia Foster (*Federal Compliance*), Ed Harris (*Chicago-Kent College of Law*), Devin Savage (*Galvin Library*), Charles Uth (*Galvin Library*), Liad Wagman (*Stuart School of Business*) and Lauren Woods (*IIT Online*).

Approval of Draft Meeting Notes for meeting on March 11, 2015:

Members unanimously approved the draft meeting notes for the last committee meeting (March 11, 2015) that was previously distributed.

Discussion

Siva Balasubramanian indicated that a key agenda item for this meeting was to discuss the progress being made on the Criterion subcommittees on the assurance document.

Criterion 1 Subcommittee

David Baker said that he has uploaded a draft to the assurance website. Carol Emmons mentioned that HLC does not want a link to a website to be simply embedded in the assurance argument. On the page for creating folders for the evidence, at the very bottom, there is a list of 5 URLs which are the only ones where a link can be inserted, and this applies to every criteria. Liad Wagman mentioned that he has setup a folder on Google Drive and everyone who is a part of the committee will have access to it.

Criterion 2 subcommittee

Since Walter Hazlitt was not present at the meeting, Siva indicated that an update on this subcommittee will be shared later.

Criterion 3 Subcommittee

Lauren Woods mentioned that the subcommittee has created a division of work amongst the members, especially given the number of topics to be addressed in Criterion 3. So this subcommittee will need help from a lot of different people with respect to evidence.

Siva and David acknowledged that Criterion 3 is a very important and extensive criterion. Lauren commented that at another institution, the Criterion 3 section of the assurance document was very long (around 68 pages). Several members pointed out the length limitations built into the HLC Assurance System, so that the overall word limit will constrain any subsection of the document from being too long.

Siva mentioned that each criterion subcommittee will submit their document to the google website after extensive discussion and review within that subcommittee. The Assurance Document Steering Committee will then evaluate the documents submitted by each of the five criterion subcommittees. As suggested by John Kallend in the March 2015 meeting, it is desirable to have a representative from

Marketing and Communications on the Assurance Document Steering Committee. David Baker indicated that Chelsea Jackson served as the representative from Marketing and Communications in the previous Reaccreditation cycle. David Baker requested Siva to discuss this with Jeanne Hartig.

Criterion 4 and Criterion 5 Subcommittees

Carol Emmons said that her subcommittee had completed approximately 80% of what needs to be discussed about Criterion 4, along with related evidence. David Baker said that Criterion 5 is also more or less done, but the only thing that has to be done is that at the very end there is a couple of sophisticated but short sub-criteria that need to be written and then it needs to be reviewed by senior leadership. Tasks that remain, however, include the review of the appropriate language to be used, and to upload related evidence in the proper manner required by HLC.

Student Persistence and Completion Subcommittee

Devin Savage described a library initiative to manage/access educational materials that (studies have shown) has a material impact on retention and persistence especially for students who do not purchase prescribed textbooks for a course. This helps assure that all the students would start on the same page in any given class. These open education initiatives have occurred on other university campuses across the country, and evidence indicates that they improve students' retention and persistence. Essentially, Open Education is a way that faculty provide free materials for students to use instead of having to buy a very expensive text book. These materials will need a place to be hosted and would need licensing support and the development support. The Library would facilitate such support.

Since the library has partnered with faculty and student groups to launch this, Siva indicated that this subcommittee will integrate this Library effort into its report to the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion.

With regards to IIT's participation in the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion, Siva reported that the subcommittee has to provide a report to the academy that is due on April 15, 2015. HLC mentors will review this report and provide helpful feedback in order to facilitate or guide the implementation of our agenda with regard to student persistence and completion. The subcommittee has completed some analysis (including Discriminant Analysis), and the results look encouraging. This analysis actually predicts student persistence behavior with 96% accuracy. However, it is able to only predict non-persistence behavior with 83% accuracy. The subcommittee is considering steps to improve the accuracy of predictions. A major challenge in this regard is that our database has a lot of missing values.

Assessment Subcommittee

Carol Emmons mentioned that focus is now on the blackboard outcomes assessment. Two academic programs (Bachelor's degree in Chemistry and Master's degree in Finance) are participating in the pilot test for collecting student artefacts. A third program is not yet confirmed (Biomedical Engineering) because it appears that they would have to change their process quite a bit in order to use the blackboard.

Siva said that there are 143 programs on campus and everybody has an assessment plan which is good progress. Carol also indicated that with few exceptions, all these programs are gathering and evaluating assessment data.

Meeting adjourned.