EMPORIA STATE
U N I V E R S I T Y

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT
1 KELLOGG CIRCLE
CAMPUS BOX 4074
EMPORIA, KS 66801-5087
620-341-5103
WWW.EMPORIA.EDU.OIRA

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT COUNCIL
Minutes
October 25, 2016
4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Allan Comstock, Roy Briggeman, Cynthia Kane, Matt Seimears, Shawn Keough, Brian Hollenbeck, Kevin Rabas, Shawna Shane, Linda Adams-Wendling, Michael Smith, Steve Catt, Rich Sleezer, Eric Yang, Joan Brewer, and JoLanna Kord

Members Absent: Lynn Hobson, Jim Walther, Dan Stiffler, Ellen Hansen, Alfredo Montalvo, Jim Persinger, Kim Simons, Gary Wyatt, Katrina Miller, and Eric Conrad

1. The September 27, 2016 meeting minutes were distributed and reviewed. Matt Seimears motioned to approve the minutes, Brian Hollenbeck seconded the motion. No comments were made during discussion. A call for voice vote showed all approved, no disapprovals, with one abstention.

2. The Assessment Knowledge Share was by Allan Comstock – Chair of the Music department. The department faculty have employed a rubric to score Music Major juried reviews for applied lessons. These reviews are the equivalent of the final examination. The department transitioned from a qualitative reflective review format to the rubric format for a variety of reasons including improved feedback to students, improved inter-rater reliability of juried scoring, and a refined mechanism to rate student performance based upon the set of characteristics deemed important to quality music performance. The rubric system has been used for 15 years, but recently some changes were made to add in additional levels of scoring and to align with the rubric used by the KSHAA. This has served the department well as those students who will matriculate into the education profession will be knowledgeable about the KSHAA rubric used in music education and also with how the tool is used. The rubric is used uniformly across all of the applied lesson courses regardless of performance type. It can be adjusted for course level (100-200, 300-400, Capstone) to allow for students to progress through the quality of learning levels. It has two variable categories that can be used to apply performance attributes to match the type of assessments being done (voice, performance, instrument groups) that makes it flexible to match all the applied lessons assessments. Within the past year, the music faculty have transitioned the rubric to electronic format where comments can be entered as the assessment is occurring and the compilation of the data is a much more efficient process. Throughout this entire process, the value added has been the ability to provide students with consistent, reliable, and timely feedback on their learning. In addition, this tool has helped faculty provide numerical representation of their assessment efforts with the ability to summarize data across multiple applied learning courses. In addition to this rubric assessment process, students are invited to engage in peer evaluation every two to three weeks to grow their critiquing skills. Faculty and students also work together to provide performance reviews in efforts to provide students experience for performing in front of different audiences and to share in the exchange of ideas on ways to enhance performances, etc. This continuous cycle of both faculty and peer mentoring and critique is valuable in building student performance skills and self-confidence. Personal comments from the Assistant Provost promote this as a great model for improving student learning as it incorporates a common scoring mechanism, multiple opportunities for feedback, faculty involvement in the entire process, includes students in the feedback and communication loops, and it provides students with an applicable tool they can use as music professionals.

3. Assessment Knowledge Share Schedule
    a. The Assessment Knowledge Share schedule has been set for the 2017 academic year.

SLAC Meeting Date	Knowledge Share Leader
August 23, 2016	Steve Catt
September 27, 2016	Michael Smith
October 25, 2016 – Up Next	Allan Comstock
November 29, 2016	Matt Seimears
December 13, 2016	Alfredo Montalvo
January 24, 2017	Cynthia Kane
February 28, 2017	Ellen Hansen/Mallory Koci
March 28, 2017	Kevin Rabas
April 25, 2017	Eric Yang
May 23, 2017	Linda Adams-Wendling
June 27, 2017	Jim Persinger
July 25, 2017	Steve Catt

4. GAP Analysis – HLC Criterion Three and Four – Handouts Criteria for Accreditation and Preparing for the HLC Assurance Argument and Site Visit in Fall 2018.
    a. The SLAC was encouraged to read and absorb the information contained in Criterion Three and Four as it relates to the work of the Council and the implementation of assessment efforts across the institution. As we progress through the year, this document will be used to align what we are doing with meeting the expectations of the criterion for accreditation. Keep the document handy.
    b. The GAP analysis provided a snapshot of what has been accomplished since the self-study and site visit in the Spring of 2015. The one-page document also includes direction for continued work (paragraph three Gaps to Close on current Program Level Assessment practices). The SLAC was given the directive to meet with their respective faculty to decide on what a sustainable, manageable, and informative assessment cycle would look like for each of the programs in their departments. Some programs may already have this process in place and have practiced it for many years, so review what you are doing to confirm existing practices. The AP recognized that not all program assessment cycles would be the same because there are variables such as size of the program, number of faculty, directives from external accreditors, etc. that all influence assessment practices. The point of importance is that not every program will have the same assessment cycle, but that all programs must participate. Everyone is all in. It was also noted that included in the assessment cycle plans will be a way to intentionally document progress on using assessment data to inform change and improve student learning. This is one of the areas which not enough attention to detail is being made. In essence, we are doing much more than we are documenting and we can do a better job of explaining how we are using the data we are collecting.
    c. Some chairs expressed interest in additional information and models to guide their efforts, this information will be put together and distributed the SLAC to use as a reference, if desired.
5. Upcoming Year Assessment Plans
    a. As a reminder, the template updated and ready to go and so far a couple of individuals have competed their updates. The October 10th deadline was extended due to the interface not being ready for updates until the middle of October. Please try to complete updates by November 5th.
    b. The November 15th deadline for uploading of Fall 2016 syllabi is quickly approaching.

Table 1: Updates Timeline for Faculty Qualifications in SKYBOX and Assessment Reports in Compliance Assist

Faculty Vitae for **Fall** Term **new hires**	**September 5**
Faculty Vitae for **Spring** Term **new hires**	**February 5**
Faculty Vitae **Annual Update** (current faculty)	**Annually by: February 1-15**

Syllabi for **Fall** Term Courses	**Annually by: November 15**
Syllabi for **Spring** Term Courses	**Annually by: March 15**
Syllabi for **Summer** Term Courses	**Annually by June 15**
Curriculum Maps (Program)	**Any Revisions by: May 15**
Describe Annual Assessment Plans for upcoming year – Section to be completed in Compliance Assist	**Annually by: October 10: November 5th for Fall 2016!**
Complete Assessment Template in Compliance Assist	**Annually by: May 25**

6. Workshop schedule for Fall 2016 will include two sessions, one for General Education Course Embedded Assessment and the other for Course Embedded Assessment (any course, any level). Please make date/time recommendations to the Assistant Provost ASAP as the workshops should be completed prior to Thanksgiving break.
7. The AP is designing an Assessment Professional Development Course in Canvas with multiple modules addressing a variety of assessment topics. Input is being sought on topics of interest to faculty, please ask your faculty of their professional development preferences and share the information. Also, it is anticipated that faculty completing all modules of the course will receive recognition of their accomplishment of assessment expertise with a credential for their faculty evaluation and permanent employment folders.
8. **** The SLAC members led a discussion on the rationale for reducing the meeting schedule for the Council. The AP recommends that a council sub-committee draft a proposal addressing the topic (perhaps Shawna and Steve can take the lead). Please let the proposal include a specific request for meetings inclusive of months/dates as deemed appropriate. Please also include in the rationale, a statement that supports the argument that the change will improve the abilities of the Council to carry out its charge. We will vote on the proposal at the next meeting on November 29th. The AP will abstain from the vote and if it passes, the proposal will be presented to the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs.
9. Meeting Adjourned 5:15 p.m. – Next Meeting Date: **Tuesday, November 29th, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. MU-Blue Key Room**