Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) Meeting Minutes

November 28, 2018 2:00-4:00 pm

Members present: Marijana Boone, Jeri Cabot (acting chair), Jim Deavor, Meredith English Perrone, Michelle Futrell, Godfrey Gibbison, Jon Hakkila, Zack Hartje, Courtney Howard, Michelle McGrew, Beth Meyer-Bernstein, John Morris, Marcia Snyder, Kendra Stewart, Suzette Stille, and Kelley White

Ex-officio: Divya Bhati, Karin Roof, Josh Bloodworth, Meghan Graham

I. Opening Remarks, OIEP Divya Bhati

Divya welcomed everyone and explained that Business Affairs would not be presenting. She prompted the EVP several times and there was no response to who would present. Divya will discuss several handouts with the committee after the remaining presentations are completed.

II. 11/28 Presentations

a. School of Education, Health and Human Performance – Courtney Howard and Kelley White

Courtney explained some details about their reviewing bodies CAPE and MCAPE and about their internal review process and community outreach. She moved into rubrics and noted that their 2017-2018 results had better numbers than their 2018-2019 plans. There was improvement in 2017-2018; fewer programs were in emerging.

Kelley White presented the highlighted program, Early Childhood Program. She focused on the outcome regarding the ability to plan and teach lessons. She discussed two measures. Measure 1 dealt with field courses, lessons plans, and the lesson plan approval process. Measure 2 uses a modified South Carolina Teaching Standards 4.0 rubric to score students. There is growth over time; the majority of students met targets. The program revised the sequence of materials presented in the methods courses and students are required to spend more time in the field. Results are positive. They are keeping the outcomes the same in their 2018-2019 plan because they want to see more of the same.

There were no questions asked of Courtney or Kelley. Jeri asked for a vote of approval for the report. The committee approved the report.

b. Information Technology – Zack Hartje

Zack explained the College realigned IT in the past year so that the division reports directly to the President and not Business Affairs. He explained their review process: coordinators work with staff to create plans, and then groups review those plans and results, and they complete the rubrics regarding the plans and results.

2017-2018 results, the number of units changed from two units to eight units. Zack chose to highlight PLCs, Professional Learning Clubs, which operate on a yearlong basis.
The outcome he focused on is faculty will reflect and integrate new strategies into their teaching. He had two measures. Measure 1 stated that 75% of participants would complete a mid-semester report that showed goals and reflective practices. Measure 2 stated the same target but for the end-of-year report. Results showed 75% did show reflection (37% yes and 50% mostly, so actually higher if both tiers are used). Because the program is so individualized, it can be hard to assess as a whole because each goal is so different. Zack is going to change the program so that facilitators work closer and provide stronger guidance to their faculty; Zack wants them to take on a larger facilitation role. The 2018-2019 plan will keep the same outcomes and have similar target goals. The mid-year report will have an increased target of 100% to help raise the end-of-year report completion percentage.

Jeri asked if self-identified goals would help how facilitators are doing facilitation. Specially, she asked if the program assesses facilitators along with the participants. Zack said yes and no. It is important for faculty to identify their goals. Facilitators can definitely do a better job.

There were no further questions asked. Jeri asked for a vote of approval for the report. The committee approved the report.

c. North Campus – Godfrey Gibbison

Godfrey explained that Continuing Education, School of Professional Studies, and the Low County Graduate Center make up North Campus. Each area does a plan for their administrative units and academic programs. Godfrey did not have his rubrics completed, but he noted that most would fall into emerging because many of the programs do not have rubrics uploaded into Compliance Assist.

He chose to highlight the BA of Professional Studies. The outcome is that the program will grow in a manner that is responsive to the community workforce. Measure 1 states that program will increase by student demand. Measure 2 targets enrollment growth with 70 students as the goal. Measure 3 states that there will be improved applicants to admit into the program. They hired a recruiter to help get people to finish submitting their paperwork. Legal Studies is pushing some of these goals. There is a growing trend for paralegals to have bachelor’s degrees and not a certificate or associate’s degrees. The program yield increased to 64% from 50%, but it did not hit the target.

Godfrey wants to focus on making the recruiter permanent. He also wants to create a BPS with Trident Tech. The Provost needs to adopt a final copy of the MOU and then it will move to CHE. He wants the agreement to be with all 16 colleges in South Carolina.

The 2018-2019 plan is going to keep the same outcome. He wants to revise the BPS to align with the current workforce. He also wants to allow the recruiter to ask for transcripts on behalf of the students (a signed waver should work here). He also wants
to improve the matriculation rate from 50% to 60%. The plan is a two-year transfer program. He is waiting on approval of the agreement and then he will be able to promote the program to the technical colleges in South Carolina.

There were no questions asked. Jeri asked for a vote of approval for the report. The committee approved the report.

d. Academic Affairs – Michelle McGrew

Michelle explained that Academic Affairs really has two roles in assessment: to provide leadership and to supervise academic centers. There is no measurable data to use because the assessment coordinator has been on leave since the beginning of the semester. The office facilitates faculty recruitment and retention; drafts, revises, and implements academic policies; offers and sponsors meaningful professional development; provides support for curriculum development; and promotes community engagement.

Michelle focused on the Center for International Education. The outcome is to increase the number of ethnically diverse students in study abroad programs. Measure 1 states that 129 minority students did study abroad in 2017-2018. Several students did not disclose their ethnicity. The number of male students seems to match the national average. Students cite financial need and class schedules as the main reasons they did not participate. Student diversity was hard to track, so there will be some changes and the office will begin tracking students receiving PELL grants that do study abroad. Software will better track students. Michelle also noted that they would start to use marketing to promote scholarships.

Another highlighted program was the Sustainable Learning Institute (SLI) and the integration of those principles into curriculum. Measure 1 tracked the attendance of professional development opportunities; 102 people attended professional development. Measure 2 tracked a pre- and post-survey for professional development attendees; attendees took the survey only at May training. Measure 3 discussed the need for more SF/SR courses. Some changes to the program are 1) a certificate to recognize SLI course completion within the College, and 2) a formal pre- and post-survey does not work for tracking purposes so something else will be implemented, possibly a smaller three-question survey. They are not going to change measures because they like what they see; they just want more of it.

No one asked questions. Jeri asked for a vote of approval for the report. The committee approved the report.

e. President’s Division – Kendra Stewart

Kendra explained that she took over from Evie Nadal. The President’s Division meets regularly and will be meeting soon.
Kendra highlighted the Office of Institutional Diversity. The outcome involves the Crossing the Cistern Initiative, a new program. Measure 1 discusses acquiring financial resources to sustain the program. Measure 2 states that 66% of the GPAs of students in the program will increase. Actually, 75% of students’ GPAs increased.

The 2018-2019 plan will include the Crossing the Cistern initiative as a larger part of the Sustainable Initiatives Outcome. The CLC initiative will include targets that are more rigorous and involve more community involvement. The Office of Institutional Diversity is using Foundation money to strengthen the program.

There was one question: how did OID increase the number of students with higher GPAs from 66% to 75%? They looked at before and after data. Tutoring and mentoring were involved and they offered interventions for students.

No one else asked questions. Jeri asked for a vote of approval for the report. The committee approved the report.

**Handouts**

Some committee members brought up concerns about the Dual Enrollment Policy (DEP). There is a problem for instructors of not knowing when there is a high school student enrolled. Instructors often do not know until the end of the course who is a dually-enrolled high school student and who is a regular college student. Divya said that she will look into this to see if there is a solution.

**III. Planning for Next Assessment Cycle – Josh Bloodworth**

Josh gave some tips on how to complete the results and plans in Compliance Assist. Specifically, he noted #6 Relevant Assessment Instruments does not have to be rubrics.

Jon Hakkila suggested that because his coordinators change so much (rotates coordinators in and out) that the new coordinators need some training on how to complete the template.

Divya talked about revising the template and rubrics. There was not much revision. Compliance Assist says that anything in the text can change. They are folding the rubrics into the template.

John Morris asked about training sessions for new program directors. Karin pointed out to him that there are videos on their website for the rubrics. The Helpdesk may be able to help as well.

Josh continued with his tips on slide 5 of his presentation. He said that when completing the rubric, make sure to use the academic year. Spell out the name of the program or division, at least on the Academic side and especially with new programs. In looking at the blanks, people need to select items. As chairs, you are checking the rubrics before others upload them, so you could catch these.
With Rubric Indicators, 1-6 must be done before you can check 7, 8, or 9.

Josh suggested that the naming schemes of rubrics be consistent and the name be clear; assessment coordinators can discuss this. Jon said that consistency in naming would make it easier to catch all the rubrics. He said he often sees the same person sending the same plan multiple times with different names. Meredith suggested that Josh create the naming system and send it around to everyone. If everyone agrees, then the Committee will adopt the naming system.

Josh asked that the committee members make sure that they are uploading the correct rubric. He has been seeing the wrong years on the rubrics. Make sure to use the drop down menu and select the correct year.

Divya said that we are mandated to have a self-contained system. Compliance Assist can merge text into the software and that way everyone can see what it looks like. There may be a need to have several screens open when trying to do this in the program.

Jon asked if it would be possible to keep the old style and fill in the boxes. He then asked if it is possible to have two screens open in Compliance Assist. Josh said yes and Jon said that might change his mind.

Josh noted that one of the problems with Compliance Assist is that it will not count boxes; however, the entire rubric is on one screen. Compliance Assist will merge the Review Policy and Procedures section with the rubric.

The committee asked if they could pilot the Compliance Assist rubric this year. Divya said that we could launch it and that Compliance Assist says this is the only solution we have. We can pilot 2018-2019 results and 2019-2020 plans.

John asked if they use the Compliance Assist rubrics, are they able to see if the rubric is proficient or developing. Josh said that there are two places. You would be able to tell if you follow the levels and in the rubric rating.

Meredith asked if everyone filling out the rubrics needs access to Compliance Assist. Divya answered yes but that OIEP can give them the credentials if needed.

Josh said that there are issues adding or changing the text in 1-6 versus the text after it. It cannot add up the two sections. Divya stated that she does not know why it will not, but it will not.

Josh said the other option is to go back to the paper solution.

The committee voted 7-1-0 (7 in favor, 1 neutral, and none against) to pilot the rubrics for 2018-2019 results and 2019-2020 plans in Compliance Assist.

Meredith asked if it was possible to include an upload link. Josh said that could be done.

Marcia wanted to know if the software would let her print the rubric. Josh said yes that it would look like the other printed pages.
Josh said that he is willing to train people and Divya stated that OIEP could do a training workshop.

Josh gave a few more tips. When logging in, make sure to click Planning and not Compliance Assist (see slide 13).

The Research and Service button (see slide 14)... make sure to complete this section. Put the onus on the coordinators to complete this.

Relating to CofC Strategic Initiatives, click support and that opens to a screen default with the strategic plan as a landing page. Click the + to add connections. (Slide 15)

Meredith asked if we could push the text over to the side. Josh said no but maybe yes if Compliance Assist can change the text. Have to be diligent to make sure that connections are accurate.

Target dropdowns (slides 16), there is an option to skip this.

The next box (see slide 17) needs to have an explanation: why and explain longitudinal data. Marcia asked if we could have text explaining that above the box. Michelle suggested providing the prior year’s data explained in text above the box.

Beth asked if there are multiple targets (slide 16), should she only say yes to Target Met if ALL targets are met, or should she check it if there is ANY improvement and then explain it. Divya, said check if there is any improvement and explain it.

IV. Closing Remarks – Divya Bhati

Divya thanked the members for their hard work on this year’s assessment cycle. This is the last meeting for 2017-2018 results and 2018-2019 plans.

Divya asked for volunteers for the Education Innovation (EI) Day Poster Subcommittee. Last year there were four members on the committee (two academic, and two administrative), in addition to volunteers and evaluators. The subcommittee will convene in the Spring Semester for EI poster planning purposes.

The committee asked that Meghan send an email to everyone asking for volunteers. That will give members who are present time to look at their schedules and those members not present the ability to volunteer. Meghan stated she would do that.

Suzette Stille said that she would volunteer for the subcommittee.