

HLC Criterion IV committee

Agenda

4/24/2018

Present: Kate Larson, Colleen Greer, Nancy Hall, Jessica LeTexier, Misty Wilkie, Randy Westhoff

1. Review of minutes 4/16 [minutes 4 16](#)
 - a. Minutes approved
2. Role of committee review
 - a. Nancy, Kiersten, and Colleen visited to discuss the role of the committee, see what is there, identify and describe it and then share the information with the steering committee
 - b. Our focus should be on if we cannot find the data, the committee just reports the data can't be found, here's what we think the next steps are, but not our concern to make the implement change or fixing anything.
3. Plan for writing first draft- Nancy and Colleen
 - a. First draft will be available for 4A and 4B, by end of the semester. The steering committee would like a draft of the entire 4 criterion by the "start of summer"
4. Conference ideas to assist us- Nancy and Colleen
 - a. Colleen attended the Peer Reviewer training to re-up her training
 - b. What constitutes "solid evidence", some examples:
 - i. To what extent are we able to write into our report anything about "Personnel"
 1. Assessment Director: Randy Westhoff (is it in his job description)
 2. Jill Stackhouse (Geology) Janice Neworth (Music) are their department specific people (are they in Taskstream)
 3. Administrators: Assessment committee
 4. Students participate: to what extent are students involved in assessing the assessment information (co-curricular may be an area that students are involved in assessment). As we structured HLC committees we attempted to include students on committees (Criterion 4)
 - ii. Financial Resources
 1. Line Item Budget: Randy
 2. Training support: Peer reviewer training, HLC academy, any other trainings, Gardner Institute
 3. How do assessment results feed into the annual budget?
 - a. Need to consider how to frame it. Successful student outcomes factor into the budget
 4. Strategic or unit planning decisions
 - a. Financial perspective, not direct student learning assessment e.g. see gap in student learning within a course, how are we talking about the expertise of the faculty person we're trying to hire, the documentaries we're trying to purchase
 - b. Could look at rationale for requests for purchases
 - c. Majors Field Test (Psychology) performed poorly in certain areas so hired specific faculty to fill the knowledge gap (Dr. Ricks)
5. Documentation
 - a. Assessment Plan
 - b. Policies procedures

- c. Communication Plan: how do we communicate to the university as a whole about the assessment process.
 - d. Curriculum maps ok for majors, lacking for liberal education
 - e. Assessment handbook (needs to be located)
 - f. Syllabi: need to have course learning outcomes on syllabi (day before spring semester started CPD sent out)
 - g. Program learning outcomes: clear
 - h. Gen ed outcomes: are clear in catalogue
 - 6. Processes
 - a. We are aware of what we need to do for this area
 - 7. Training
 - a. Specific to assessment training, people who are interested in attending the trainings are supported, but there hasn't been an overall plan for how we are going to do routine training
 - i. Randy provided one during Fall start-up
 - ii. Previously had one assessment coordinator per college, then people gained understanding and Taskstream was implemented so role went away
 - 8. Communication
 - a. Assessment Committee reviews
 - b. Governing board: trustees. Because we are part of such a large system, our governing board doesn't get into the details of BSU, they stick to policy at the broader level (Other criterion are writing that piece)
 - c. Advisory Boards: nursing
 - 9. Co-Curricular
 - a. Retention, persistence, and completion. Michelle Frenzel has mapped out goals for us through 2020.
- 5. Sub group reports- 4B
 - a. Dimensions of student learning were meant for majors, not able to be applied to liberal education
 - i. Theme-based models: Portland State, Tennessee, Colorado
 - ii. Liberal education committee minutes: is there a repository
 - b. Full assessment structure and financial issues—relationship, how we're tying budgets to assessment information. Decision-making around hiring and expenditures need to be reviewed, as they are loosely tied.
 - c. 4B1:
 - o Liberal education:
 - Minnesota transfer curriculum
 - Dimensions of student learning (mapped in Taskstream, need to review how recently they were reviewed, and ensure they are more visible)
 - o Co-curriculars:
 - was mapped to the Journey Plan, and now student affairs areas of mapped to the 7 wellness dimensions (right now it exists in an Excel spreadsheet, working to get it linked)
 - d. 4B2
 - i. Liberal education: CCTST, rubrics, asking for additional information

- ii. Co-curriculars: findings, and closing the loop found in Taskstream
 - iii. Program:
 - e. 4B3: Self-study speaks to this, as well as the Taskstream report
 - i. 5 year self-studies may reveal assessment findings and action plans
 - 1. Psychology has a good example
 - 2. Chemistry also has standardized exams they give
 - 3. Accredited programs (Professional Education, Nursing, Business/TAD, social work, Music, Chemistry, Technology, see 5 year plan)
 - 4. Geography
 - 5. Music
 - 6. May not be standardized across the university
 - ii. Co-curriculars are found in Taskstream, need to map to the 7 wellness Dimensions
 - 4B4: Assessment of student learning shows that faculty are the people who are involved in the process
 - a. Process is described in the Assessment Planning Document
 - b. Assessment Handbook DOES exist on the Academic Affairs website
1. Update 4A
 2. Preview 4C
 - a. Appears to be a strong area, based on all of the work by the institution up to this point

Meeting minutes are available for curriculum committee, assessment committee, and faculty senate