

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting

Minutes of the Meeting of October 22, 2019

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

Library - 120

Call to Order

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee was held in Library room 120 on October 22, 2019. The meeting convened at 4:30 pm, with Ms. Bliss Adkison facilitating.

Members in attendance: Ms. Bliss Adkison, Mr. Bishop Alexander, Dr. Sara Lynn Baird, Dr. Joy Borah, Ms. Anita Holcombe, Dr. Molly Mathis, and Dr. Jessica Mitchell

Agenda

1. Vote for additional committee member: Education Technology Support Representative

Motion was made by Mr. Bishop Alexander to approve a vote for an additional committee member from ETS. Motion was seconded by Dr. Sara Lynn Baird. Motion carried to vote for additional committee member.

Bliss Adkison will need to send the recommendation to Shared Governance.

2. Meta Assessment Rubric Review of Criteria

The committee reviewed the meta assessment examples to prevent future disparities on the rubric. This will help in providing effective feedback to academic and non-academic departments. The information will be available electronically.

Bliss Adkison provided instructions for using the rubric. As part of the IE process, data from every academic and non-academic department is reviewed and the input is included in the annual report. They are graded according to this rubric. The IE committee approved this rubric last year for best practices. It is based on the JMU Value Rubric, and best practice within assessment and IE.

Last year, all feedback on the rubric, goals and learning outcomes were inserted on one rubric. Due to some confusion that occurred, there will be two rubrics. One rubric will be green, representing annual goals, and the other rubric will be purple, representing learning outcomes. All academic units will have both the green and purple rubrics. Non-academic units will only have the green rubric. The instructions for each rubric will show how to interpret items A through F and their meaning.

Bliss Adkison reviewed the Learning Outcomes – Purple:

- A. Outcomes should be clear and specific and related to the student. Use action verbs that describe learning outcomes.
- B. Course learning experiences should map to the outcome. The activity should not be random, there needs to be logic and has to be linked to the objective. It should also be linked to competencies as

well. An example of a learning experience may be a pre- post-test; example in non-academic, could be student head count.

- C. Relationships between the measures and the outcomes. The relationship needs to be appropriate, and have sufficient quality.
- D. There are two types of assessment: direct and indirect. The departments have to have at least one direct measure assessed. An example of Indirect could be an attitude survey. Engineering has several direct and indirect assessments for learning outcomes. Some indirect could also be employer satisfaction surveys. Grades are excluded but course assignments are acceptable.
- E. Departments set their own benchmarks. There needs to be justification of the benchmarks, 3-5 per department. The rubric provides a guide. Bliss Adkison will change the criteria to match "D".
- F. Program modifications and improvement - most important. It should show how they are taking the results and how they are improving programs. The important take away is to see student learning improvement, and use of results for change.

3. Meta Assessment Rubric Norming (3 iterations – approx.. one hour)

The committee members deliberated for one hour on the meta assessment rubric examples and submitted their results.

4. Timeline of Review and Submission for Committee Members

The due date for review of Academic and Non-Academic programs is due December 2, 2019. The committee will receive a packet in an email with assigned departments. Each committee member will receive 10 units (5 – academic, 5- non-academic). The rubrics will be saved in a zip file and packets will be sent back out.

5. Progress of 30/30 meetings and renaming Pathfinder events from Strategic Doing Session

Bliss Adkison met with all 73 departments and gave them their scores. They will need to be given an exemplary, this is what you scored, and this is what we expect. The committee expressed that a workshop would be helpful for the department Chairs. Learning outcomes is more important to a SACSCOC reviewer than annual goals. Need to use actual measurable verbs to have good results.

6. Review of General Education Assessment Committee and timeline for review-approve

The Gen Ed committee does the same thing as the IE committee. The IE committee will not have any Gen Ed courses to meta assess. Gen Ed courses go through the same process. The Gen Ed opening meeting will be on October 29th, with a norming session starting in November. Gen Ed packets will be due December 16th, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.