Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee
Minutes of Meeting
January 30, 2007

The Assessment Committee met in the Doc Bryan Student Services Center on Tuesday, January 30, 2007 at 1:45 pm. Members present were Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Rob Schwartz, Dr. Susan Underwood, Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ron Hutain, Wyatt Watson, Phil Covington, & Sarah Judy. Also attending: Kyle Harris

Approval of Minutes
Dr. Schwartz moved to approve minutes as amended. Ron Hutain seconded.

Old Business
General Education Goals
Dr. Roberts presented the committee with the compiled general education goals from Academic Affairs. Dr. Roberts wanted to make it very clear that these were not strictly from the University Assessment Committee but compiled from the Assessment Committee, Faculty Senate, and the Curriculum Committee then decided upon by Academic Affairs. Dr. Roberts noted that Academic Affairs did agree with the Univeristy Assessment Committee that the diversity goal can be folded into Goal 5 with humanities and that the word "Health" could be taken out of goal 6. However, Academic Affairs did not accept the word "analytical" in goal 4. Dr. Roberts said these are the goals that will be placed into the academic catalogs after a final discussion with the Faculty Senate.
1)Communicate Effectively
2)Think Critically
3)Develop Ethical Perspectives
4)Apply Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning
5)Demonstrate Knowledge of the Arts and Humanities
6)Understand Wellness Concepts

New Business
Assessment Reports
Dr. Roberts reported that virtually all Assessment Reports have been submitted. Dr. Roberts explained how reports are reviewed by committee members and evaluated. He also explained that departments want feedback from the reports and stressed the importance of proper wording. Dr. Roberts noted that the main problems currently with these reports are:
Lack of feedback on reports
Little to no change from previous reports
Lack of knowledge on the part of the report reviewers
He also noted the strengths currently are:
Some programs are greatly improved by their assessment
Nearly all programs and admin. units are regularly reporting assessment data
It was suggested by Dr. Roberts that he and Kyle Harris review all the reports first, make recommendations, then everyone else.
Dr. Roberts suggested making a series of options to improve assessing or improving program.
Dr. Roberts suggested committee start giving specific suggestions.
It was suggested in discussion that when feedback is given that committee members volunteer to go and provide answers to feedback to department heads.
Dr. Schwartz questioned whether or not reviewers should be named specifically on the report. It

was suggested to meet with department heads first before deans to address the reports. Dr. Bullock and Dr. Schwartz both agreed with that. Dean Covington still questioned whether or not the Dean should be involved or not in meeting. Dr. Watson suggested sending the Dean a blurb about each department's report.

Dr. Roberts brought up discussion regarding improving the way that information is submitted and ways to improve Rubric of Assessment Reports.

Discussion enjoyed about the efficacy of reports if goals were met so effectively every time.

Dr. Roberts pointed out that the best case scenario is when the report leads to next year's goals and objectives. Dr. Lasey asked if departments change objectives every year, and discussion was held regarding whether they do or do not. It was pointed out that not every goal should be changed every year. There was also discussion regarding thinking too narrowly or too broadly on goals.

Dr. Watson suggested to do away with columns, but to do it in a report form. Ron Hutain pointed out the importance of not picking objectives that you are good at. It is about finding out what you need to improve on and that is the objective.

Discussion was held regarding whether to make a form on major weaknesses that needed improvement on. Discussion on whether or not people are willing to improve without overwhelming them.

Dr. Susan Underwood suggested asking departments what sort of feedback are they looking for and giving them the opportunity to have a rebuttal. Dr. Watson also suggested having all goals listed, not just the ones being assessed on the reports.

Dr. Underwood suggested using a web survey to department heads and Deans regarding feedback on reports. Dr. Watson suggested making an announcement at the Academic Council meeting on the survey.

Dr. Roberts wanted to clarify that the Committee is not re-writing reports, just giving suggestions and options for improvement.

Several members suggested that the Curriculum Committee revisit the General Education Goals every three years. Dean Covington made a motion that given the HLC requirements that the Curriculum Committee review General Education Goals <u>every 3 years</u>. Dr. Watson seconded the motion. It was passed by committee.

Assessment Repository
Dr. Roberts started discussion regarding an Assessment Data Repository. Wyatt Watson discussed the advantage of creating a database and making a web interface for department heads and committee members to enter information into it. Dr. Watson suggested having a computer class develop the database for assessment.

Dr. Roberts said that he wants assessment information readily available to anyone who wants it. Dr. Lasey questioned the consistency of information that would be posted and it was discussed that it should be primarily numerical data. Wyatt Watson said that there are plans for different exams scores such as CSI, MFAT, Praxis, etc, be available in Banner. He said the main problem will be time to get information and confirm correct information then upload it into the system. Wyatt Watson also discussed advantage of creating own database to conform to assessment goals specific to Arkansas Tech University vs. buying a database program from somewhere else.

Dr. Roberts appointed Wyatt Watson and Dr. Bullock to the Database Development Sub-committee and would ask Dr. Holeyfield to join as well.

	Luminous Group

	Dr. Roberts suggested using the discussion board on the Assessment Committee Group page for post-meeting discussion. It was also discussed that calendars be made available so that future meeting times could be worked out.
	Assessment Grants Dr. Roberts reported that all four of the grants were disbursed. March 1st is the Spring Deadline for grants. Dr. Underwood questioned when the deadline for spending grant money on spring grants was. Dr. Roberts did not know specifically if it ran through the summer or not. He will find out and report back to the committee.
	Extra Business Dr. Lasey reported that she will be attending a FYE conference on retention. Discussion was held regarding whether or not conferences should be attended by administrative personnel on how to do assessment in Administration Units. It was suggested speaking to Dr. Cleary and Dr. David Underwood first and gain their insight on subject.
3:01 p.m. Meeting Adjourned	Meeting adjourned by motion of Dr. Watson

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee
Minutes of Meeting
March 20, 2007

The Assessment Committee met in the Doc Bryan Student Services Center on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 at 3:00 pm. Members present were Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ron Hutain, Wyatt Watson, Phil Covington, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Carol Trusty, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, & Sarah Judy. Also attending: Kyle Harris

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Lasey moved to suspend reading of the minutes. Dean Covington seconded the motion. Ron Hutain moved to approve minutes. Dr. Montgomery seconded the motion.

Old Business

Assessment Repository

Dr. Roberts discussed the previous meeting and the idea of creating a database system for university assessment. He discussed all the trouble that the Center for Leadership & Learning dealt with when they tried to create a unique assessment repository. Dr. Roberts and Wyatt Watson opened discussion regarding the idea of purchasing TracDat software package. They discussed how it is specifically designed for university assessment and that the price for the program, training, and annual upkeep would be approximately $50,000. Discussion opened up to committee regarding acquiring TracDat. Questions were asked regarding what types of data would be used and who would be responsible for entering information into the system. Dr. Roach discussed the Sedonia program used by the School of Business and asked questions regarding the similarities between the two. Benefits were discussed about using TracDat and the training involved with it.

Dr. Lasey asked if this was the only program that was looked at or if there were other programs out there. Wyatt mentioned that this was the major program out there for assessment. Dr. Roberts also mentioned that Banner and TracDat are working towards integrating in the future. Dr. Roach moved to buy the program, Dr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

Assessment Reports

Dr. Roberts discussed the letter drafted for each department which included strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement for their assessment reports. He also mentioned the checklist provided was created to help with the reviewing of the assessment reports. Discussion was held regarding how to review assessment reports, especially regarding academic or. non-academic units. Dr. Roberts discussed going through each report using the checklist and departmental letter to gauge whether the report meets requirements. He stressed that the checklist should be used, too, if additional comments are in order. Dr. Roberts opened discussion regarding the checklists. He wanted to clarify all the checks on the list and answer any questions. Discussion was held clarifying each point for the reviewers.

Committee members discussed standardized testing in programs with multiple majors and minors. Clarification between the 2005-06 reports and the 2006-07 reports was made.

Dr. Roberts also discussed the non-academic unit checklist and the difference between the two checklists. He stressed that non-academic units are alsol working towards student learning but that satisfaction in these units is an important measure in non-academic units and should be considered for those.

| New Business | **CAAP Exam** |
| | Dr. Roberts reported that the CAAP exam is no longer legally required by state law. The committee raised concerns over dropping the only current Gen-Ed assessment tool. Wyatt Watson suggested that assessment fees not be reduced or eliminated if the university drops the CAAP exam, so something else can be used. Discussion was held suggesting the flexibility of the CAAP exam now that it is not state required, including the possibility of offering student incentives to increase involvement and positive participation on the exam. |

Arkansas Assessment Association Meeting

Dr. Roberts reported that the inaugural meeting of the Arkansas Assessment Association will take place at Arkansas State University on April 5, 2007. Dr. Roberts asked for people interested in attending the meeting. Ron Hutain, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, and Dr. Daniel Bullock have all voiced interest in attending. It was suggested that absent members of committee be contacted to see if they are interested.

Extra Business

Dr. Roberts reported that the Department Heads will be having a workshop in May and that he would like to have all the Assessment Reports back to them by then.

Only one new assessment grant application was submitted for the Spring 2007 semester. It was decided that it would be discussed at the next meeting, since only one member of the subcommittee was present. The committee discussed the possibility that the assessment grant applications may increase as assessment reports are reviewed and improved.

Dean Covington reported that the NSSE survey and the EBI survey that Dr. Forbes and Marty Sabolo are conducting respectively are progressing well and should be completed in April. Dean Covington also brought up to the committee the idea of sending people to a non-academic assessment conference. Dr. Roberts reported that he would be attending the Higher Learning Commission's annual meeting and would attempt to sit on the non-academic assessment workshops there. The committee discussed holding a workshop for non-academic units. Dr. Roberts suggested that Wyatt Watson and Dean Covington work on this. The committee discussed the difficulty of this because of ongoing Banner training and the sensitivity of timing involved.

| 4:12 p.m. Meeting Adjourned | Meeting adjourned by motion of Wyatt Watson |

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee
Minutes of Meeting
May 10, 2007

The Assessment Committee met in the Doc Bryan Student Services Center on Thursday May 10, 2007, at 10:00 am. Members present were Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ron Hutain, Wyatt Watson, Phil Covington, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Carol Trusty, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Rob Schwartz, Dr. Dan Bullock, & Sarah Judy. Also attending: Kyle Harris & Jason Brown

Approval of Minutes	Dr. Jenkins moved to dispense reading of the minutes, Dean Covington seconded the motion. Dr. Schwartz moved to approve minutes as written. Wyatt Watson seconded the motion.
Old Business	**Assessment Reports** Dr. Roberts asked that all committee feedback be turned in to Committee Chair as soon as possible. Dr. Roach suggested sending examples of good assessment reports with learning objectives and multiple measures to department heads with copies of the Assessment Committee Rubric/Checklist to show guidelines for reports. Wyatt Watson suggested that a common problem occurring in the reports was that too often the measurements would actually be goals/objectives and that the Objective Column too often had broad or vague objectives. Dr. Roach agreed with Wyatt Watson. Dean Covington raised questions regarding what to do if numbers are included in measurements, but not results. Discussion was held regarding this issue. Dr. Roberts reminded that changes to assessment reporting will take place next year with the addition of Trac-Dat.
New Business	**Assessment Grants** Dr. Bullock submitted a proposal for an Assessment Mini-grant. He reported that he wants to assess senior physics students in a variety of areas, including lab skills, research skills, writing and presentation skills. He has requested $5000 for this project, to include supplies, conference expenses, and misc. equipment. Discussion was held regarding this grant. Dr. Jenkins reported that the Grant Sub-committee recommended approval. Dr. Watson raised questions regarding using grant money for equipment that will be available to everyone outside of assessment grant project. Committee discussed restricting use of supplies to project participants. Dr. Jenkins moved to approve grant with a "supplies purchased for grant" restriction stipulation until completion of project. Carol Trusty seconded motion. Committee approved. Dr. Jenkins and Dr. Roberts reported that the English Department had submitted a proposal for an assessment grant for $6000 over 3 years. Dr. Jenkins reported that Grant Sub-committee recommended approval. Dr. Watson suggested requiring completed first year report by a certain date. Dean Covington raised questions about funding a grant over $5000. Committee discussed approving 1st year only, including supplies, equipment, and training, and then waiting for annual presentation before funding subsequent years. Dr. Jenkins moved to approve $2000 to the English Department Assessment Grant, Dr. Roach seconded. **General Announcements** Dr. Roberts reported that Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Rob Schwartz, and Sarah Judy will all be leaving the committee at the end of the academic year. Hannah Norton will be replacing Dr. Montgomery as the Faculty Senate representative. Dr. Roberts also announced that Jason Brown will be taking over the graduate assistantship from Kyle Harris and will start in the Fall. Dr. Roberts asked that the Committee meet over the summer as time allows, for discussion of non-academic unit assessment. **General Recommendations** CAPP Exam Dr. Roberts would like committee to make a recommendation regarding continuation of CAAP exam for general education assessment. Dr. Roberts reported that ETS has devised a new exam

called the CLA (what does this stand for?).

Dr. Roach suggested keeping the CAPP until something better comes along. The Committee discussed providing incentives, including remediation, if certain scores were not met. Dr. Montgomery also suggested positive reinforcement instead of remediation as an incentive. Dr. Watson raised questions regarding the use of the CAAP exam in general education assessment. Dr. Roberts talked about what the CAPP has been used for in the past.

Dr. Watson discussed the Higher Learning Commission visit and assessment using general education data. Discussion was held regarding CAAP exam scoring. Dr. Lasey suggested breaking into small groups and looking at sub-sections of the CAAP for comparison of test to general education goals. Dr. Watson agreed and discussed the dangers of shaping curriculum to fit standardized exam. Further discussion about student involvement with CAPP.

Dr. Schwartz asked what other universities are doing for general education assessment. Dr. Roberts discussed how other universities do a variety of different things, for example using course-imbedded documents and grades. Dr. Roberts discussed how quite a few of general education professors are offering cumulative finals here at ATU and that those exams can be used to supplement general education assessment.

Dr. Roach raised discussion regarding backdating information for assessment.

Discussion regarding why ATU does not administer the critical thinking component of the CAAP exam. Dr. Roach discussed changing administration of the exam instead of incentives as well as discussed the difference between individual evaluation and program assessment.

Dr. Watson suggested using a set of common questions on general education course finals. Discussion was held regarding having pre- and post-tests on general education goals such as critical thinking.

Wyatt Watson discussed the difference between the CLA and the CAPP exams, including pricing and test subjects and administration methods for the exams.

Dr. Roach moved to maintain administering a nationally normed exam to assess the general education goals. Dr. Montgomery seconded the motion.

Assessment Goals

Dr. Roberts discussed recommending that all academic departments display their learning goals on their website. Discussion was held regarding this. Dr. Lasey moved to reaffirm posting learning goals on departmental website by December 2007. Dr. Montgomery seconded the motion.

Extra Business

Dr. Roberts raised discussion that the Assessment Committee has been approached to become more involved in departmental accreditation. He reported that 2 departments have lost accreditation this last year. Dr. Roberts was asked if committee should assist in collecting data and assisting departmental assessment. Dr. Roach said that the committee should assist in feedback on assessment practice and learning outcomes, but not on collecting data for department. Dr. Montgomery discussed that accreditation requires faculty buy-in and splitting up responsibilities for department accreditation.

Dean Covington reported that he will be attending a conference on Non-Academic unit assessment this summer.

Meeting   Meeting adjourned by motion of Wyatt Watson at 11:35 a.m.
Adjourned

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
August 21, 2007
Williamson Dining Room

The Assessment Committee met in the Williamson Dining Room on Tuesday, August 21, 2007; at 12:05 p.m. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Mr. Phil Covington, Dr. Beth Gray, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. John Watson, Mr. Wyatt Watson, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Ms. Tammy Rhodes and Dr. Eldon Clary. The Committee welcomed as guests Dr. David Underwood and Ms. Sarah Redford.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 12:05 and joined the TracDat webinar already in progress.
TracDat Presentation	Denise Raney, presenter for Nuventive, introduced TracDat Version Four to the members by walking them through its interface.
	TracDat v4 will be completely customizable to the needs of the university, allowing specific entry fields to be created and organized to simplify both data entry and analysis. The system may be further customized to promote assessment of more than the student body, such as non-academic offices and departmental faculties.
	Assessment information was divided into three distinct levels: University, Reporting Units (Branches or Schools) and Assessment Units (Departments). Each level included a summary page that allowed users to quickly identify the goals and objectives of the given level as well as the efforts being pursued to achieve those objectives.
	On the Assessment Unit / Departmental level, "Course Assessment Plans" may be designed and clarified for easy perusal. The strength of connections between objectives and outcomes will be immediately clear to the supervising TracDat user, who may then post his or her "observations" for additional comment by the faculty member or other TracDat users.

	At the conclusion of the presentation, Dr. Roberts asked the members if there were any questions about TracDat for Denise Rainey. As there were none, Dr. Roberts dispensed with the question and answer segment of the webinar.
	
	Dr. Roberts stated several potential benefits of TracDat to the Committee, proposing that it will:
	    1) Allow for more detailed assessment reports.
	    2) Be a more effective tool for Department Heads.
	    3) Necessitate the reporting of assessment data and allow reporting faculty to obtain direct feedback for contributions.
	    4) Correlate and integrate assessment data within the University.
	    5) Simplify accreditation by collecting the necessary data and organizing it using downloadable accrediting body report templates.
	
	Dr. David Underwood stated that Henderson State had great success with this program and he hoped that it would succeed in making assessment more integrated with action at ATU.

TracDat Implementation	Dr. Roberts presented the proposed timeline for the implementation of TracDat across the University:
	    ➢ On September 5-6, 2007, there will be a training seminar on TracDat. Following that seminar, Mr. Wyatt Watson and others will begin customizing the TracDat for ATU and imputing already collected assessment data.
	    ➢ October 1, 2007, has been set as a "Hardfast" deadline for the delivery of 06-07 reports and 07-08 goals, so that the data may be imputed into TracDat in a timely manner.
	    ➢ In October and November, Department Heads will be trained in how to input data into the program.
	    ➢ In Spring 2008, Department Heads will be trained on how to use TracDat to assess and perfect their respective Departments.
	    ➢ Non-Academic Units will not be included in the program during Fall 2007; their personnel will be trained to input data during Spring 2008.

	Recognizing the importance of protecting assessment data, Dr. Roberts will serve as the gatekeeper for TracDat. Administrative access will be maintained by as few as possible. Due to the flexibility of the program, usernames and passwords will match those used for OneTech access.

Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Roberts opened discussion of the minutes by recognizing several members of the Committee:
	  ➢ Dr. David Underwood (Associate VP of Academic Affairs), Mr. Bruce Sikes (Chief Academic Officer at the Ozark campus) and Ms. Sarah Redford (Dr. Underwood's Assistant) were recognized and welcomed.
	  ➢ Faculty Senate president-elect Dr. Hanna Norton will serve as the Senate's liaison to the Committee.
	  ➢ Dr. Rob Swartz has been replaced by Dr. Elizabeth Gray.
	  ➢ System Science will now be represented by Dr. Brenda Montgomery rather than Mr. Ron Hutain.
	  ➢ Mr. Jason Brown will serve as Graduate Assistant to the Committee.
	
	Dr. Roberts also recognized a milestone for assessment at ATU, as academic year 06-07 was the first time 100% of all departments and non-academic units provided assessment data to the Committee.
	
	Dr. John Watson proposed that future minutes include whether proposals were passed. Dr. Roberts noted this for correction.
	
	Dr. Roberts made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Dr. Susan Underwood seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

Old Business – General Education	Dr. Roberts informed the Committee that the State Legislature had eliminated the regulations requiring a formal "rising junior exam" for all university students.

	Dr. David Underwood stated that this freed the Assessment Committee to explore other options for assessing student learning in the general education courses. He proposed that the questions now before the Committee were: 1) What needs to be assessed (our Gen Ed goals)? 2) What is the best way to assess achievement in those goals? Dr. Roberts recognized that the Legislature's action did not eliminate the CAAP exam, it simply ended the requirement that every rising junior take it. He reminded the committee that the CAAP's main strength is the wealth of historical data already collected for it, which may be important for University accreditation in 2010. The September Committee meeting agenda will focus on issues related to general education.
Old Business – Grant Proposals	Mr. Phil Covington asked when updates were to be given on previously-issued grants. These updates were scheduled for the Committee's October meeting. Members giving updates are requested to prepare short oral reports and be ready for questions from the other members.
Meeting Times for Assessment Committee	For the Fall 2007 semester, the Assessment Committee will meet on Tuesdays at 1 pm in Doc Bryan's SGA Senate Room. Dates: Sept. 11 Oct. 9 Nov. 6 Dec. 4
Adjournment	Dr. Roberts made a motion to adjourn. Dr. Montgomery seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
September 11, 2007
Mary Anne Salmon S.G.A. Chamber Senate Room

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon S.G.A. Chamber
Senate Room on Tuesday, September 11, 2007; at 1:00 p.m. Members present
were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Mr. Phil Covington, Dr. Annette
Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda
Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol
Trusty, Dr. John Watson, Mr. Wyatt Watson, and Dr. Susan Underwood.
Members absent were Ms. Tammy Rhodes and Dr. Beth Gray.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Motion to approve the May 2007 minutes made by Mr. Hutain. Seconded by Dr. Montgomery. Motion passed unanimously. Motion to approve the August 2007 minutes made by Dr. Underwood. Seconded by Dr. Lasey. Motion passed unanimously.
Old Business: TracDat Implementation	For TracDat training on Sept. 5-6, the Implementation Team included Mr. Jason Brown, Dr. Holeyfield, Dr. David Underwood, Ms. Sarah Redford and Mr. Watson. Dr. Roberts presented the updated timeline for the implementation of TracDat across the University: ➢ In late September, the Assessment Committee members will be trained in using the program. Dr. Roberts and Dr. David Underwood also plan an Academic Council Meeting to demonstrate the program's functions. ➢ October 1, 2007, remains the deadline for the delivery of 06-07 reports and 07-08 goals, for all academic and non-academic divisions. ➢ In early October, Department Heads will be trained in how to input data into the program, using their 06-07 data. ➢ Before the end of the year, TracDat staff will return for another training seminar. The Implementation Team membership will change at this time.

	➢ In Spring 2008, Department Heads will be trained on how to use the TracDat data tools. ➢ Non-Academic Units will not be included in the program during Fall 2007; their personnel will be trained to input data during Spring 2008. The Committee discussed when a major's options were distinct enough to require separate assessment plans. Responding to a question about emphases, Dr. Roberts stated that it depended on the program, noting that some majors' emphases reflect very different programs. While the Committee has previously allowed Department Heads to make this decision, it was suggested that placing this under the Deans might be beneficial. The question was tabled until Spring 2008, as assessment plans for 2007-2008 are due in less than a month. Dr. Roberts repeated his warning about TracDat: 1) It is not a solution to all of ATU's assessment problems. 2) Several bugs have manifest in the system because TracDat Version 4 program is brand new and still being tested by its developers.
HLC Accreditation	Dr. Watson and Dr. Susan Underwood were asked to present the University's preparations for HLC accreditation. ➢ Dr. Watson warned the Committee that because the 2000 visit resulted in a negative evaluation on assessment, the 2010 visit will focus on the University's assessment activities. ➢ The University Self Study – headed by Dr. Michael Tarver – will include five committees of 10-12 people, one for each HLC Criteria. ➢ The Assessment Committee was advised to become involved, as the HLC Criteria now have assessment integrated into them all. ➢ The Self Study will be a campus-wide effort, including assessment committee members. TracDat was recognized as important for this process, with its capability to manage Financial and Strategic Planning, as well as Assessment.

General Education Assessment	Dr. Roberts suggested that standardized tests like PRAXIS may be significant as additional direct measures for General Education, as they are already in use and have parts that correspond to ATU's Gen Ed goals. CAAP Discussion: ➢ Administration of the CAAP will not be continued, at least not as it has been when required by the State. ➢ The question was asked whether all the CAAP historical data from 1995-2006 could be formatted so the Committee could use the data. Mr. Watson was confident that it could be done, but stated that such a table would have a number of issues with validity. ➢ The CAAP's value was brought into question as no examples of its results being used to affect a positive change in the curriculum could be remembered. Course Embedded Measures ➢ The Committee showed great interest in increased use of embedding measures to assess Gen Ed, especially as test questions added into cumulative exams. ➢ The debate centered on when to implement the questions: too soon, and the questions and format may need significant revision; too late, and the university would miss a full year of Gen Ed assessment data. ➢ It was concluded that although haste should be present in implementing these measures, the uselessness of CAAP historical data made missing a semester of data a minor price for an assessment plan that would work. **Motion:** To create a sub-committee for each of the Gen Ed goals (six in all, chaired by Assessment Committee members and including selected members of the faculty). These sub-committees would be charged with proposing where course-embedded measures might be added into the curriculum. **Amendment:** The chairs would form a six-member sub-committee to communicate and promote implementation with the faculty. Dr. Lasey made the motion. Dr. Watson added the amendment and seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

	Sub-Committee Chairs Communicate Effectively: Dr. Hanna Norton Think Critically: Dr. David Roach Ethical Perspectives: Dr. Brenda Montgomery Scientific Reasoning: Dr. Robin Lasey Humanities: Dr. Jan Jenkins Wellness/Health: Dr. Annette Holeyfield The General Education Sub-Committee was scheduled to meet on Tuesday, Sept. 18. Dr. Roberts will preside as de facto chair during the meeting.
Fall Assessment Workshops	The Center for Teaching and Learning has planned a series of Fall Assessment Workshops to be held in November. Dr. Roberts suggested that this might be a good time to give updates on assessment grants to the university's faculty.
Other Considerations	The Committee recognized the birthday of Dr. Jenkins in song. For the Fall 2007 semester, the Assessment Committee will meet on Tuesdays at 1 pm in Doc Bryan's SGA Chamber Senate Room. Dates: Oct. 9 Nov. 6 Dec. 4
Adjournment	Dr. Roberts made a motion to adjourn. Dr. Watson seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
October 9, 2007
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber Room

The Assessment Committee met in the SGA Senate Chamber Room on Tuesday,
October 9, 2007; at 1:00 p.m. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Annette
Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr.
Carey Roberts, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. John Watson and Dr. Susan Underwood.
Members absent were Mr. Phil Covington, Dr. Beth Gray, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Ms.
Tammy Rhodes, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Dr. Eldon Clary and Mr. Wyatt Watson.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Lasey made a motion to approve the September minutes. Dr. Norton seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Old Business: General Education Assessment	Gen Ed Sub-Committee ➢ The Gen Ed Sub-Committee met twice during September to discuss how to assess the Gen Ed goals and where to embed measures into the curriculum. ➢ Dr. Roberts reported that most members were ready to begin discussions on direct course-embedded measures with the appropriate Department Heads. The topic of replacing the CAAP was briefly raised. ➢ The MAPP exam was suggested as an alternative, as it could assess the same information as the CAAP, but in a 40 minute test period. ➢ The difficulty of motivating students to apply themselves on such exams remains an unresolved issue.
Old Business: 2006 – 2007 Reports	Only a few assessment reports for the 06-07 academic year had been turned in at the time of the meeting. Although October 1st was the deadline, reminder emails had not been sent out because Banner implementation took precedence.

New Business: Dr. Bishop's Proposal for an Assessment Forum	Because of the proposed early November date for the Assessment Forum, the proposal from Parks, Recreation and Hospitality bypassed examination by the Grant Sub-Committee and was brought directly to the full Committee by Dr. Roberts.
	
	The proposal requested $1775 from the Assessment Committee to sponsor an Assessment Forum on the afternoon of November 5, 2007. This forum would bring speakers from around the university to talk about their efforts in university assessment and facilitate discussion on using assessment data to improve student learning.
	
	Although the Committee was supportive of the proposal, the discussion did raise a few suggestions.
	    ➢ The refreshments budget seemed a little conservative and may need to be expanded.
	    ➢ The expense of producing "presentation notes" packets seemed prohibitive. Such costs could be avoided by putting the notes online (to be printed by attendees) or by handing them out on CDs.
	
	Motion: To approve the grant proposal with latitude to move funds around amongst the budgeted categories. Motion made by Dr. Jenkins. Seconded by Dr. Clary. Motion passed unanimously.

New Business: Sub-Committee Assignments	Dr. Roberts proposed that smaller groups may be more effective at promoting university assessment than the whole Committee, so the Assessment Committee would be split up into sub-committees. **Sub-Com:** Program Directors **Goal:** To clarify the role that Deans play in University Assessment **Members:** Drs. Clary, Susan Underwood and Watson **Sub-Com:** Ozark Campus **Goal:** To facilitate Gen Ed assessment and Tracdat implementation at the Ozark campus **Members:** Mr. Hutain and Dr. Sikes

	Sub-Com: Non-Academic Units **Goal:** To tailor university assessment initiatives to the non-academic assessment units. **Members:** Mr. Covington, Ms. Rhodes, Ms. Trusty, and Mr. Watson **Sub-Com:** General Education **Goal:** To identify ways to assess the Gen Ed goals and facilitate the embedding of measures into the curriculum. **Members:** Drs. Lasey, Jenkins, Norton, Holeyfield, Montgomery Because of his experience in applying successfully for and making use of Assessment Mini-Grants, Dr. Bullock was selected to take charge of Assessment Grants. His task was defined as publicizing grant proposals and tutoring new applicants through the process.

Other Considerations	Non-Academic Assessment
	  ➢ Ms. Trusty pointed out the need for an assessment forum specifically designed for non-academic assessment units.
	  ➢ Dr. Roberts agreed that more support needed to be extended to the non-academic units.
	
	Math Grant Proposal
	  ➢ Dr. Watson requested an update on the Math Department's $5000 grant proposal for equipment.
	  ➢ The proposal was received by Dr. Roberts too late to be included in this meeting, so it would have to be addressed outside the regular Committee meetings, probably via e-mail.
	
	For the Fall 2007 semester, the Assessment Committee will meet on Tuesdays at 1 pm in Doc Bryan's SGA Senate Chamber Room.
	Dates: ~~Nov. 6~~ Cancelled, Dec. 4

Adjournment	Dr. Roberts made a motion to adjourn. Dr. Watson seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
December 4, 2007
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber Room

The Assessment Committee met in the SGA Senate Chamber Room on Tuesday,
December 4, 2007; at 1:00 p.m. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon
Clary, Mr. Phil Covington, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr.
Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Ms.
Tammy Rhodes, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. John Watson, Mr. Wyatt Watson and Dr. Susan
Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Beth Gray and Mr. Bruce Sikes.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	After the Committee accepted several changes, Mr. Ron Hutain moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Susan Underwood seconded. Motion was passed unanimously.
Assessment Grant Proposals	The assessment grant sub-committee was dissolved in October with its responsibilities being given over to Dr. Daniel Bullock. **Proposal 1: iSkills** The Business Dept. requested funds to purchase the iSkills test of communication skills in technology. The Committee made several stipulations to its approval: ➢ The date for presenting results to the committee must be moved to May 2008 or earlier, since the committee does not meet in June. ➢ The Business Dept. must clarify the differences between the iSkills test and the NFAT. Approval for the $1500 grant with these stipulations was approved unanimously. **Proposal 2: "clickers"** The Math Dept. requested $5000 dollars to subsidize the student purchase of "clickers" for several Math courses, dropping the expense to students to $10 a clicker. The Committee had extensive concerns regarding this proposal. 1) What does this proposal have to do with Assessment?

	➢ Dr. Roberts explained that the Assessment Committee's job has extended beyond its original boundaries, so a direct connection to assessment is not necessary for approval. 2) What other expenses might there be if the proposal were approved? ➢ The classroom equipment was being supplied free-of-charge by the clicker manufacturer. ➢ Another $15,000 of funding for this proposal was being derived from other sources, so the Assessment Committee will not bear responsibility for additional charges. 3) The Strategic Planning Committee has been considering making these clickers a universal requirement. ➢ If the Committee funded clickers for some students, what happens when the next group requests subsidies for their clickers? ➢ This was a pilot program for the Math Dept., so the Committee would be supplying the funding for implementation and not be responsible for funding its continuation. ➢ Dr. Carol Trusty made it clear that although the Bookstore currently will not buy back the proposed clickers, they will find a way to buy them back if they become a universal requirement. She also expressed the Bookstore's committed support of the University's use of the clicker technology. 4) Two problems were left unsettled regarding the Bookstore's management of the clickers. ➢ No plan has been established by the Bookstore to sell discounted clickers to qualifying Math students and full price clickers to all others, but this might be necessary, since the Math classes in question are not the only courses that will use them. ➢ Unsold clickers might not be returnable to the manufacturer for a refund, meaning that grant funds might be spent but left unused for the proposed pilot program. 5) What was the relationship between the students and the subsidized clickers? ➢ The earlier brand of clicker was not sturdy enough to be bought back by the Bookstore. This new brand is reportedly higher quality and <u>may not</u> have the same issue. ➢ Renting the clickers would not be possible because they would be difficult to keep up with, and the unit

cost is prohibitively expensive.

6) If the clickers were subsidized, and the students keep them after one semester's use, what long-term benefits does the Committee get for their $5000 investment?
   - The Committee members disagreed about the students keeping the clickers bought with grant money. Some considered it a misuse of the Committee's limited funds, while others considered the initial program's benefits and the student's continuing use of the clickers to be sufficient return.
   - Dr. Watson could not guarantee the Math Dept.'s commitment to using the clickers after this initial pilot, given the current lack of data on their impact.
   - Mr. Phil Covington pointed out that the clickers would be used extensively to help students complete the Developmental Mathematics and College Algebra courses. As success in those courses strongly correlates with success in college, use of the clickers has great potential benefits for a minimal $5000 expense.

Motion
Dr. Roberts made a motion that the Committee would be "willing to fund $11.90 per clicker up to $5000 for math students."
The motion was passed.

Other Proposals from Dr. Bullock
1) Revisions were proposed for the "Application Guidelines for Assessment Project Grants" document
   - Several changes to the revised document were proposed by the members.
   - The revised document with changes was unanimously accepted by the Committee.
2) A written report should be given after each grant's duration is completed, instead of the oral report previously required.
   - Passed for discussion in January.
3) Proposals or entire grant applications should be placed online.
   - Passed for discussion in January.
4) The ATU Assessment webpage should be given its own website, rather than remaining a part of the Institutional Research site
   - Mr. Wyatt Watson stated that the problem with the Assessment webpage was not an issue of

	availability, but one of prominence. His solution was to create a quicklink to the Assessment webpage on the main ATU site. ➢ Dr. Roberts added that as the currently planned Assessment efforts at ATU were implemented, the assessment webpage would have to be overhauled to make relevant information more readily available to the public.
Dean's Role in Assessment	The Dean's sub-committee concluded that in the "deans will assume administrative responsibility for the assessment program in their schools. This can be accomplished by adopting one or both of the following models. "Model A: The Dean will develop and implement a school-wide assessment program. The program will include the formation of effective school level assessment objectives, the utilization of appropriate measures, and the use of results to improve the learning for students within the school. "Model B: The Dean will use university assessment criteria to evaluate and guide program level assessment efforts." The Committee unanimously agreed to this new, more active role for the Deans in assessment, while acknowledging that this suggested role should be clearly expressed to the Deans.
TracDat Update	Other than Liberal and Fine Arts, all Schools' Dept. Heads had been partially trained in TracDat at the time of this meeting. Liberal and Fine Arts training was scheduled to occur before Christmas break. The schedule for TracDat implementation in Spring 2008: ➢ Another Nuventive-led training session for the Implementation team will be held early 2008 to complete their training. ➢ Reporting Units (representing the standards set out by the many accrediting agencies used throughout campus) will be entered into the program in January and February.

	➢ Dept. Head training sessions will be held again in April, May, and possibly in the summer to fine-tune the system and complete their training. Major questions still remain: ➢ Non-Academic addition into TracDat is on indefinite hold, pending clarification on assessment of Non-Academic offices under the new system. ➢ The Deans' participation in TracDat remains on hold pending clarification of their new role in assessment.
Gen Ed Assessment	**Gen Ed Sub-Committee Report** The Gen Ed Subcommittee moved beyond its original charge to determine how and where to assess the Gen Ed goals and began to pursue implementation actively, for which it received a fair amount of cooperation from the University's faculty. The process followed by the sub-committee's members was to separate the goals into sub-categories, which were then presented to the appropriate faculty, who designed questions or assessments addressing these sub-categories. ➢ The sub-committee did not create the content of the questions, simply the categories. ➢ The reported scores are to be binary, providing either a positive or negative response regarding the student's understanding of the desired information. Assessments may be scaled, but the student's answer again must be reported in a binary fashion (e.g. having achieved a desired cut-off score). In the long term, the results of Gen Ed assessment will be stored according to student T-Numbers. ➢ This will allow the university to analyze Gen Ed performance according to specific majors at ATU and the students' demographic data. Several problems currently make meaningfully linking

	relevant scores with T-Numbers impossible: ➢ The faculty-driven model for implementing Gen Ed assessment has forced the committee to assess each goal in a unique way, affecting both the form of the assessment methods used and the results being derived (some batch, some individualized and some a combination of the two). ➢ Banner is currently unable to reliably and efficiently allow the entry of such individualized information. **Additional Issues raised by Dr. Eldon Clary** The University Mission Statement is currently being rewritten. ➢ As the Gen Ed goals stem directly from the Mission Statement, the Committee needed to ensure that the new Gen Ed goals could be related back to the revised Mission Statement. ➢ It was suggested that the drafting committee should look at the Gen Ed goals (which have been under discussion for years) while drafting the new Mission Statement, so that there would be no confusion or negation regarding the current Gen Ed assessment efforts. The Gen Ed goals relate to transfer students as well. ➢ The goals theoretically state what makes an ATU graduate distinctive, meaning that the focus of Gen Ed involves all students who end their academic careers at Tech, regardless of where they began. ➢ As many transfer students take few Gen Ed courses, Gen Ed teaching and assessment must occur in upper-level courses as well as lower-level courses.
Non-Academic Assessment	The Non-Academic Assessment sub-committee developed several goals for Non-Academic programs, but the drafting of these was still ongoing at the time of this meeting.
Ozark	Ozark implementation of TracDat and other ATU

Implementation	assessment initiatives has not been completed and was postponed to the Spring semester.
Assessment and the Curriculum Committee	At the previous Curriculum Committee meeting, it was decided that: ➢ The minutes will go up on their website. ➢ All proposals as edited by the C. Committee will be scanned and uploaded to their website. ➢ The curriculum change form will be reexamined. There was extensive discussion regarding the assessment section of the curriculum change form. ➢ One member questioned whether courses offered for "the enrichment of the student's soul" would be required to be submitted with an assessment plan on the curriculum change form. ➢ Another argued that every course should have a justification given on the form, stating exactly why the faculty proposed the curriculum change. ➢ It was agreed that the main problem was that no one knew exactly what the assessment section on the form requests. As all curriculum changes develop out of perceived weakness in a program, assessment must be occurring to identify that weakness. So assessment is occurring but not being clearly articulated on the forms being submitted.
AAALC (Arkansas Association for the Assessment of Collegiate Learning)	The first meeting of the Association is still planned for April. This two-day meeting at ATU still needed to be planned and organized. ➢ Dr. Montgomery offered her Hospitality class to organize and run the meeting. Her offer was enthusiastically accepted.

HLC Examiner Training	Dr. Roberts requested that the members examine pages 312 and 315 in the handouts and provide their thoughts at the January Assessment Committee meeting. Report on the HLC's Intensive Writing conference: ➤ Assessment remains important to HLC, but they are becoming more interested in mission statements, the context of the university and clear evidence that criteria are being met. HLC doesn't care how one meets the criteria, just the evidence of that achievement.
Additional Issues	There was a request for an update on the grant given for Dr. Bishop's Assessment Forum. As of this meeting, nothing had developed from the grant's approval.
Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned by unanimous agreement at 2:37 pm.

APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT PROJECT GRANTS

Applicant: Alice Batch	Email: abatch@atu.edu
Department: Business & Economics	Phone: 968-0496
Title of Project: Technology Skills Assessment	

PART 1 -- BUDGET & SIGNATURES
DETAILED
ITEMIZED BUDGET

Requested From ATU Assessment Committee	Item 60 ETS iSkills exams	Unit matching support (if available)
Amount ($5,000 max.) $1,500.00		*Amount*
$	Equipment [1]	$
$	Supplies	$
$	Personnel [2]	$
$	Travel [3]	$
$	Services	$
$ 60 tests at $25 a test	Other	$ 1,500.00
$ 1,500.00	= TOTAL amount requested from ATU Assessment Committee	

REQUIRED SIGNATURES

Applicant: Alice Batch	Date: 10-16-07
Applicant:	Date:
Applicant:	Date:

PRIOR FUNDING
Have you received funds from the ATU Assessment Committee previously?
___Yes _X__No
If yes, please attach a copy of your final report from that project and, if appropriate, explain how this endeavor is related to the previous project.
A brief final report must be filed with the committee upon completion of the project, or as part of an annual assessment report.

PART 2 – PRESENTATION DATE
Please indicate the date by which you plan to attend a University Assessment Committee meeting and present your findings [1]. __June 2008_____
In addition to the presentation itself, a written report must be submitted to the Committee prior to, or immediately after the presentation.

Narrative

I am proposing that we use the **Advanced Assessment iSkills Test** from ETS as one measure of the technology skills of our students. This is a web-based test that uses scenarios and simulated environments rather than multiple-choice or true/false questions. The test takes 75 minutes to complete, consists of 14 short (3-5 minute) tasks and 1 longer (15 minute) task, and may be administered over two sessions. There is sufficient information available to support the validity and reliability of the test. In addition, it is being successfully used by at least one peer AACSB school (Landers University).

The test measures seven information and communication technology proficiencies: define, access, manage, integrate, evaluate, create, communicate (see attachment for definitions). The test also measures higher-order problem solving, critical thinking, evaluation, and communication skills in the context of identifying, selecting and using information and information technology to respond to real-world situations. The test simulates websites, web search, databases, office productivity software (including word processing, spreadsheet, database, presentation, email).

The test will be given to our Management Information Systems (senior level) course during the spring 2008 term and if it proves to be useful and effective, we will consider using this assessment tool every 3 years (School of Business time table for technology skills assessment of students). It is hoped that results from this assessment will provide direction for constant improvement of technology skills development of our students.

Pricing Information:

Number of Tests	Price Per Test
1 - 50	$33
51 - 250	$25
251+	$22

Testing Environment Requirements:
- General configuration of desktop lab pcs is sufficient.
- Proctored 75-minute test which may be administered in two separate sessions.
- An additional 20-30 minute registration and background questionnaire which can be administered outside of the testing environment.
- Requires that a Secure Browser and a Flash Player browser plug-in be installed on the lab pcs (and therefore be included in the machine image Computer Services creates for each lab).
- Requires that pop-up blockers be turned off (or hold down the ctrl key when launching the test application).

Assessment Information Provided (Score Reports)

1. **Individual Score Reports** for the iSkills™ assessment will provide students with overall scaled scores and percentile rankings that identify and compare their performance to those of other test takers from the same test administration. Performance feedback is also

provided, by sub-proficiency, to identify strengths and weaknesses for each sub-proficiency area.

2. **Aggregate Task Performance Feedback Reports** consolidate the results of all individual student reports, and provide the numbers and percentages of students who receive the highest score on specific components of each of the seven skill areas. These results are then compared to the reference group's highest scoring response percentage.

3. **Institutional Skill Area Report** will provide institutions with the aggregate results from test takers, and compares your students scores with a reference group. The performance in each ICT literacy skill area is reported and includes two graphical representations of skill area performance relative to the reference group using score distribution and median point analysis.

4. **Institutional Data Files** are provided to allow institutions to aggregate data according to their own analysis needs. Test results help administrators and faculty determine and describe the strengths and weaknesses of individual students, the entire student body or the group.

See sample reports at
http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.1488512ecfd5b8849a77b13bc3921509/?vgnextoid=f3f9af5e44df4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD&vgnextchannel=b86414ee98459010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD

Information below is quoted from the ETS website (2007):
http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.435c0b5cc7bd0ae7015d9510c3921509/?vgnextoid=b8a246f1674f4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD

Description

To succeed in today's information-driven academic environment, students need to know how to find, use, manage, evaluate and convey information efficiently and effectively. As part of the National Higher Education ICT Initiative, ETS and a group of colleges and universities have collaborated to create the iSkills assessment, a comprehensive test of information and communication technology (ICT) proficiency specifically designed for the higher education environment.

ETS defines ICT literacy proficiency as the ability to use digital technology, communication tools and networks appropriately to solve information problems in order to function in an information society. This includes the ability to use technology as a tool to research, organize, evaluate and communicate information, and the possession of a fundamental understanding of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information.

Seven Proficiencies

1. **Define:** The ability to use ICT tools to identify and appropriately represent an information need.

Activities include:
- Creating an academic research topic to fit a particular information need
- Asking questions to clarify a customer's information need
- Completing a concept map

2. **Access:** The ability to collect and retrieve information in digital environments. This includes the ability to identify likely digital information sources and to get the information from those sources.
   Activities include:
   - Searching through databases for information
   - Browsing through linked Web sites for information
   - Locating information through online Help
   - Downloading and installing a (simulated) video player

3. **Manage:** The ability to apply an existing organizational or classification scheme for digital information. This ability focuses on reorganizing existing digital information from a single source using existing organizational formats. It includes the ability to identify existing organization schemes, select appropriate schemes for the current usage, and apply the schemes.
   Activities include:
   - Sorting e-mails into appropriate folders
   - Re-ordering a table to maximize efficiency in two tasks with incompatible requirements
   - Documenting relationships using an organization chart

4. **Integrate:** The ability to interpret and represent digital information. This includes the ability to use ICT tools to synthesize, summarize, compare and contrast information from multiple digital sources.
   Activities include:
   - Synthesizing information from IMs into a word-processing document
   - Comparing and contrasting information from Web pages in a spreadsheet

5. **Evaluate:** The ability to determine the degree to which digital information satisfies the needs of the task in ICT environments. This includes the ability to judge the quality, relevance, authority, point of view/bias, currency, coverage or accuracy of digital information.
   Activities include:
   - Selecting the best database for an information need
   - Determining the sufficiency (or lack) of information in a Web site, given the information need
   - Ranking Web pages in terms of meeting particular criteria
   - Determining the relevance of postings on a Web discussion board

6. **Create:** The ability to generate information by adapting, applying, designing or inventing information in ICT environments.
   Activities include:

- Creating a graph that supports a point of view
- Selecting text and graphics that support a point of view

7. **Communicate:** The ability to communicate information properly in its context of use for ICT environments. This includes the ability to gear electronic information for a particular audience and to communicate knowledge in the appropriate venue.
   Activities include:
   - Formatting a word processing document
   - Recasting an e-mail
   - Adapting presentation slides
   - Preparing a text message for a cell phone

APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT PROJECT GRANTS

Applicant: Dr. Tom Limperis, Interim Head	Email: tlimperis@atu.edu
Department: Mathematics	Phone: 968-0659
Title of Project: **Developmental Mathematics Learning Initiative**	

Completed applications should be addressed to Assessment Project Grants, c/o Dr. David Underwood, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

PART 1 -- BUDGET & SIGNATURES

DETAILED ITEMIZED BUDGET

Requested From ATU Assessment Committee	Item	Unit matching support (if available)	
Amount ($5,000 max.)		**Amount**	
$ 5,000	Equipment[1]	$ 1,510	
$	Supplies	$	
$	Personnel[2]	$	
$	Travel[3]	$	
$	Services	$	
$	Other	$	
$ 5,000	= TOTAL amount requested from ATU Assessment Committee		

[1] The purchase of a computer or other major piece of office equipment would not be approved.

[2] Limited to student labor (faculty salaries or release time would not be approved) . The narrative must demonstrate that the student labor is directly related to the grant proposal only.

[3] Must be directly related to the grant proposal and may be used to fund travel to/participation in conference focusing on assessment. Additional documentation detailing travel expenses must be attached to this application.

REQUIRED SIGNATURES

Applicant:	Date:
Applicant:	Date:
Applicant:	Date:

Developmental Mathematics Learning Initiative Grant
Arkansas Tech University
Department of Mathematics

Prior Funding from the ATU Assessment Committee: None

Part 2 – Presentation Date:

It is anticipated that a presentation of the findings of this initiative to the University Assessment Committee will be made at the September 2008 meeting. A written report will be submitted to the committee at or prior to the presentation.

Part 3 - Narrative:

The goals of this project are to:

1. Increase learning in developmental mathematics.
2. Increase success rates in developmental mathematics. (Success is defined as a grade of C or higher)
3. Increase University retention rates. Freshman level mathematics has been identified as an area with low success rates, presumably adversely affecting retention.
4. Develop a model of instruction which can also be used in Math 1113 College Algebra and other courses.

Educational research has shown the lecture method to be one of the least efficient methods of instruction, and this is particularly true in mathematics. As is often said by mathematics educators, "mathematics is not a spectator sport". With the funds described in the budget, the department of mathematics intends to implement the use of the ASSY-RF Remote PRS (personal response system) Transmitters, commonly called "clickers", in twelve or more sections of developmental mathematics during the spring 2008 semester. The Arkansas Tech Bookstore sells these devices for $45.50 each. Mathematics instructors have been somewhat reluctant to implement the use of these in the classroom due to the cost. A textbook company promised to insert $20 coupons for the "clickers" into textbooks required for selected fall 2007 courses, but failed to do so in several cases. The mathematics department is working with the textbook representatives to prevent any confusion in future text orders in which coupons are promised. Notwithstanding, Ms Susan Jordan is piloting the use of the "clickers" in one of her classes during the fall 2007 semester. With Ms. Jordan as a resource person concerning use of the "clickers", and the $20 textbook company coupons and the assessment grant funds making the extra cost to students minimal, more instructors will be inclined to participate in the spring semester. After a successful program of use in the targeted spring sections is completed, we

believe that the use of the "clickers" will increase in the summer, fall, and subsequent semesters. Students will be more inclined to bear a greater portion of the cost after demonstration that the "clickers" are effective for increased learning and success rates.

Assessment methods:

Although the effectiveness of this initiative should not be judged based on data from only one semester, the following data will be collected:

1. Comparison of grades in spring 2008 sections using "clickers" versus sections not using them and also compared with historical data.
2. Comparison of success rates of spring 2008 sections using "clickers" versus sections not using them and also compared with historical data.
3. Student survey in sections using the "clickers".

Determination whether university retention rates are improved by this initiative is difficult, if not impossible, to measure after one semester. University retention rates are continually monitored and are affected by many variables. However, it is the hope of the mathematics department that the success and continuation of this initiative will lead to higher retention rates.

Another measure of the success and effectiveness of this initiative will be whether the use of "clickers" spreads to more sections of developmental mathematics and into sections of college algebra. In addition, if this initiative proves successful, it is intended to be implemented on the Ozark campus.

Explanation of Budget:

The budget is based on anticipation of using the "clickers" in twelve sections of developmental mathematics with an average of 35 students per section, for a total of 420 students. We acknowledge that the average per section may be lower, but it is possible that more sections will be involved in this initiative. We believe that students should bear at least some cost for the "clickers" for this initiative.

The cost of the "clickers" will be 420 students times $45.50 per clicker = $19,110

The cost will be covered as follows:

Assessment Grant:	$5,000	
Textbook coupons:	$8,400	(420 times $20)
Department funds:	$1,510	
Students:	$4,200	(420 times $10)
Total:	$19,110	

Arkansas Tech University Assessment Committee

**APPLICATION GUIDELINES FOR
ASSESSMENT PROJECT GRANTS**

The Arkansas Tech University Assessment Committee provides guidance and institutional strategies for the assessment of student learning throughout the University and encourages new and innovative projects that assist academic or academic support units in meeting their educational objectives.

Assessment refers to the collection and interpretation of data (quantitative and/or qualitative), which can be used to determine the extent to which expected goals and objectives are actually being achieved. Assessment involves the description and documentation of methods used, and of progress made, in reaching educational goals or outcomes for the purpose of improving student learning and academic performance. The documentation includes measurement, analysis, and a determination of program effectiveness.

1. Eligibility
An individual or team representing an academic department or academic support unit may submit a proposal for a grant. Academic departments or support units may form a partnership with each other, but each project selected will be funded to a maximum of $5,000 regardless of the number departments or units in the partnership. In the event that a grant is awarded, grantees are required to attend at least one University Assessment Committee meeting and give a brief presentation on the findings of the funded project. This presentation must be made by the date given on the grant application form. Grant applications are due by November 1 during a fall semester and March 1 during a spring semester.

2. Application Process
Each proposal must contain all elements specified below in the required format. Applicants are encouraged to submit their proposals electronically by e-mail to the head of the review committee.

The required elements of the proposal, described below, may not exceed 4 pages, using 12-point type and 1-inch margins. Attachments may be added as needed and do not count towards the page limit.

A. Cover Page
APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT PROJECT GRANTS
Arkansas Tech University Assessment Committee

Project Title:
Date:

Name of Faculty	**Department**	**Phone**	**e-mail**
1.			
2.			

Project Summary:

Budget Summary:

Requested From ATU Assessment Committee	**Item**	**Unit matching support (if available)**	
Amount ($5,000 max.)		**Amount**	
$	Equipment[1]	$	
$	Supplies	$	
$	Personnel[2]	$	
$	Travel[3]	$	
$	Services	$	
$	Other	$	
$	= TOTAL amount requested from ATU Assessment Committee		

[1] The purchase of a computer or other major piece of office equipment would not be approved.

[2] Limited to student labor (faculty salaries or release time would not be approved) . The narrative must demonstrate that the student labor is directly related to the grant proposal only.

[3] Must be directly related to the grant proposal and may be used to fund travel to/participation in conference focusing on assessment. Additional documentation detailing travel expenses must be attached to this application.

B. Abstract

Provide a succinct and accurate overview of the entire project that assists reviewers in understanding the goals and importance of the proposed project.

C. Purpose/Objectives

Please describe the aims, objectives, and measurable outcomes of the proposed project or expectations of knowledge to be gained at conference.

D. Assessment methods to be used for attainment of objectives

Please describe the assessment methods to be incorporated into the proposed project. These may include capstone projects, papers, portfolios, surveys, interviews, focus groups, or other measures (for additional ideas, refer to the Assessment FAQ at http://ir.atu.edu).

E. Enhancing student learning

Please explain how the project findings or conference experience will be used for the improvement of student learning.

F. Budget

Please provide a detailed itemized budget justification (i.e., cost per unit, detailed travel expenditures, etc.) Unallowable budget items include salary, computers; and the costs of major office equipment. The following would be a suggested format for the budget:

G. Gantt Chart

A Gantt chart is a bar chart that illustrates a project schedule. (Below is an example Gantt Chart.)

	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct
Literature review	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				
Ordering supplies and materials		■	■	■	■						
Design Assessment Exam		■	■	■	■	■					
Administer Exam								■	■		
Analyze Data										■	■