Institutional Assessment Committee Minutes

February 22, 2024

Committee Co-Chairs: Tanda Emanuel, Instructor/Program Coordinator, Electronic Health Records/Health, Division of Health Sciences; Carlee Ranalli, Dean, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Committee Members: Brandon Brereton, Jessica Miller, David Grimes, Erin Murray, Mike Schmidt, Taylor Rigsby, Laura Scafide, Alison Preston (optional)

Committee Members Present: Tanda Emanuel, Dr. Carlee Ranalli, David Grimes, Erin Murray, Mike Schmidt, Taylor Rigsby, Laura Scafide, Alison Preston

Absent: Jessica Miller

I. **Approval of Minutes** – The October 2023 minutes were approved by Mike Schmidt and Erin Murray

II. **Discussion:**

a. Non-academic assessment: Dr. Ranalli started the February meeting by discussing non-academic assessment and some ideas she had floating around. Since PIE is working on the academic side to put more assessments on a cycle, she wondered whether the same should be done for non-academic assessments. She is thinking about listing the nonacademic areas by cost center similar to unit planning, then having a list of 5 or 10 areas that undergo some type of assessment each year, and then depending on how many there are putting them on a 3-5 year cycle. She would have the nonacademic areas do a deeper dive than what is done for unit planning such as setting goals and reporting back on data, but is wondering if there is more to do. For example, is Financial Aid meeting their goals and are students satisfied with the service? She proposes doing a regular check-in, similar to the academic areas and the IAC group would be involved in the process. She opened the floor for suggestions. The process would involve assessing 5 areas, they would write a report and IAC would have the opportunity to read the report, discuss, and learn from what some of the other areas are doing. She does not know if IAC would get involved in the review, so she wants to get suggestions. For

example, some type of assessment would be done for LT. With their support, they would decide which areas to assess such as student surveys, and gather data on a regular cycle. Another example, Workforce Solution/ConEd, would be assessed either as one big group or in different program areas. PIE is currently in the process of gathering some of the survey data. Dr. Ranalli thinks it would be a great learning experience, never punitive in nature. Since LT is always looking for more support, this data would support what they do and how well they are doing it. Again, this assessment would be deeper than unit planning.

Mike questioned if the assessment for WSCE would include students. Carlee responded that the WSCE assessment would focus on students and processes within WSCE because as an example, Retention does not fully understand how WSCE works; therefore, getting data in each area would be informative. She addressed Laura Scafide's area and stated that her area would be a more standard assessment.

Erin Miller commented that in her area, it is hard to collect data because they don't know what people want data on. She commented that since her area is a support staff unit if someone requests data, they do it. Even for unit planning, her unit ponders if the data they collect is useful. Dr. Ranalli commented that that was a great question. What data is useful for different audiences? What data can we collect? She commented that PIE is looking to help to support the units in what they are doing.

David commented that LSC has similar struggles as they respond to demand and try to create demand by making students aware of their services. Dr. Ranalli also commented that PIE as well needs an assessment of that division because she has no idea if they are doing a great job.

Tanda Emanuel asked if other divisions set goals. Dr. Ranalli responded that they do but it is very different. Tanda asked about what data was requested in the past and is the data collected in the past still relevant. Erin Murray commented on her division's goals. She asked a question about whether KPI consolidation was done and the result of that. Carlee responded that they have not found a way to incorporate KPIs with the strategic plan, so it is on hold. Erin also

noted that it is hard to find technology-related items on the strategic plan that they can match up.

Carlee asked the group if they got any feedback from other institutions on how they assess non-academic assessments. No responses.

III. **Spring Survey Updates:**

Dr. Ranalli commented that Taylor has been watching the Campus Climate Sexual Assault survey and is struggling to get students to respond to a survey. PIE is having discussions on how to get that out to the students. Carlee thinks it is an email issue where the students are not seeing the email to participate in the survey. Carlee commented that it is an MHEC requirement that this survey be done every 2 years. Last count only 6 responses out of 2,630. It was sent to current students 18+ and not higher schoolers. PIE is working with faculty to get the word out and has contacted Eric Schwartz to address faculty assembly to alert their students to fill out the survey. PIE is thinking of putting an alert in D2L. Because the survey is sensitive in nature, Carlee is very cautious about having high school students take the survey.

David Grimes commented that the Promotions Folder needs to be reconsidered because LSC had similar concerns about where the emails are ending up. On the student side, he understands why emails are getting lost in Outlook because, by default, the inbox emails go to 2 places; focused and other, and then the students have a junk mail folder and promotions folder; so there are up to 4 places that they might need to check if they want to make sure they have not missed anything. He commented that most students are not motivated, especially when they are led to think that the other folders are for things that are not important. Carlee responded that we are lucky if they check one place.

Carlee is looking to put some IT questions on the Faculty/Staff survey to gather data that might help them. She is talking to Craig about IT but also wants to include mail services, custodial-type questions, and campus safety. She asked if there were any other areas in which we needed input from faculty and staff. Erin commented that having the

survey not anonymous is better because certain instructors teach in certain rooms, and it was hard to figure out what they were requesting. The survey did not help decide the things that needed to be changed. David commented about asking questions that address gray areas, where the responsible or lead party is not clear.

IV.   **Questions:** No questions were asked.

V.   **Adjournment:** 4:00 pm.