# Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee – Draft minutes

#### October 13th, 2021 – TEAMS meeting

Members: Laurence Amoureux, Darcee Caron, Christine Tomasek, Carla Canelas Tobar, Olivia Grobocopatel, Manuel Caballer, and Claudio Piani.

1. Welcome members present (apologies).
2. Approval of **agenda**. Approved.
3. Approval of **Minutes** IESC meeting 15th September 2021. Approved.
4. **Manuel’s proposal for a standardized course assessment process:**

Manuel’s idea for an automatized assessment is to use blackboard to link assignments (exams, exam questions, etc.) to specific learning outcomes. This would be optional as not all faculty use blackboard. Blackboard would automatically take results from the assignments and produce the assessment of the learning outcome. Manuel thinks this might be developed with the help of the IT department. With time all of us will be doing evaluation in the same system. It might work for courses that do not change their assignments very often or those courses that have many different sections.

Claudio thinks that Blackboard already has a tool that creates rubrics. However, he thinks it might be hard to sell it to faculty. Manuel will try to set it up for his mid-terms and see if it works. The rubric tool cannot be used retroactively. Manuel will then contact Raphael as the French department might be interested.

1. **Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness (Manuel’s report):**

Claudio asked Manuel to help him with the assessment report. This is not assessment of assessment of assessment. It is assessment of Institutional effectiveness. 3 is the minimum acceptable grade.

* + **Design.** All of our departments and administrative units’ departments conduct assessment systematically. Furthermore, assessment results inform leadership planning through an established process (reporting by the Dean to the Leadership Team and the Board of Trustees, as well as contributing directly to the Strategic Plan Dashboard KPIs and Deliverables). However most planned actions at the unit level do not identify a task leader or a timeline nor do they give evidence of departmental consultation. Grade: 3.5
	+ **Objectives.** Unit objectives and program learning outcomes require little if any attention. The learning outcomes are clearly articulated and adequate in number for all programs. Almost all learning outcomes are assessable with a mix of direct and indirect methods available to the faculty delivering the program. All learning outcomes are aligned with one or more of the University’s Core Capabilities while every Core Capability is aligned with two or more of the program’s learning outcomes. All but a few alignments are clearly articulated. All learning outcomes are the result of a department-wide, or multi-department-wide for cross-disciplinary programs, consultation process. Unit objectives are clearly articulated and adequate in number for the Unit. Grade: 4
	+ **Alignment.** AUP has a single Institutional Alignment Registry (IAR) with the missions and objectives of all departments, and programs. For every department or program, an alignment table clearly and generously articulates how the objectives align with individual strategic objectives, and/or core values (AUP Core Capabilities). The IAR is regularly updated by the departments and the up-to-date IAR is available online. Grade: 4

**Olivia and Claudio will check the IAR document to make sure it is updated.**

* + **Progressive Implementation.** The implementation plan of the new Institutional Effectiveness process was described in the last Institutional Effectiveness Report though many of the Institutional stakeholders may not have read it. Milestones and timelines where allocated and all items fell under the purview of the Dean IRAE. Progress of the implementation was continuously monitored and is now mostly complete. This Element of the rubric should be removed henceforth. Grade: 4

**No more tracking of this element in the future.**

* + **Assessment Methods**. All objectives and learning outcomes are assessed with a mix of direct and indirect methods. Most methods are valid, reliable, and fair. that is they do not discriminate against vulnerable demographics (race, religion, wealth, etc.). Most methods are summative, and although formative assessment does occur, little reporting of it is done. Grade: 3
	+ **Results and Conclusions**. In many, but not all cases, results are gathered from a mix of available assessment methods. Often conclusions are generously articulated and objective. Though most chairs and unit leaders claim that assessment results are discussed in department meetings, little evidence is given. Planned actions are justified by the conclusions and reasonably achievable. Planned action are rarely given a measure by which to determine if the action was successful (assessment method and/or expected outcome). Grade: 2.5

Academic departments do not discuss results systematically.

* + **Communication**. Assessment results are owned by the relevant department and shared only within sectors. Data might be shared with other units but only on a need-to-know basis. Results are shared across departments and units only on specific occasions like Outcomes Assessment Day. Public disclosure of appropriate assessment data is limited. Grade: 2.5

We do this via the institutional effectiveness report. And during outcome assessment day. But that is occasional. Not all year round. Departments do not talk to each other about their assessment results. One idea is to ask departments to present during the Outcome Assessment Day.

* + **Operational Planning**. Strategic planning and budgeting are based on the systematic collection and analysis of objective data. However, there may be some gaps in the evidence. Grade: 3

There are no budget allocations based on assessment results. This should be brought to the leadership team.

* + **Follow up**. All actions planned from prior years are implemented or being implemented according to the associated timeline. Most implemented actions are appropriately assessed. Grade: 3

The actions planned do not mention timeline and responsible person.

The overall grade (3.3 out of 4) constitutes one of the KPIs of the Strategic Plan Dashboard.

1. **Is there assessment grumbling?**

Stephanie gave Christine the heads up that CSE members talked about workload associated with assessment and how complicated it is for people to manage. The initiatives we talk about here are oriented to leverage technology and simplify assessment. We need to figure out a way to see what is complicated and make it easier. All have own ways of doing things.

We need to visit the departments. Ask what they think about making it more manageable. The idea of the digital tool is a big improvement. But we also need to pass the message that we hear them and that we are taking actions.

Darcee suggests doing something about designing and planning of assessment.

Christine suggests maybe standardizing some assessment methods.

Claudio thinks we need to work both on the workload and the perception of the workload. Last year was a hard year. We had to implement necessary changes in an intense way. We need to make sure that we are trying to make everyone’s life easier.