Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
January 29, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber Room

The Assessment Committee met in the SGA Senate Chamber Room on Tuesday, January 29, 2008; at 1:00 p.m. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Richard Ihde, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Wyatt Watson, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol Trusty, and Dr. John Watson.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	After the Committee corrected one error, Dr. Susan Underwood moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Robin Lasey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Introduction of New Members	The new year brought several changes to the Committee's membership: ➢ Dr. Rick Ihde was welcomed as the replacement for Dr. Elizabeth Gray. He was also placed on the non-academic assessment sub-committee. ➢ Dr. Jerry Forbes was welcomed as the replacement for Mr. Phil Covington and congratulated on his promotion to Dean of Students.
Gen Ed Assessment	The Gen Ed sub-committee was composed of Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Dave Roach, and Dr. Carey Roberts. Last semester the committee decided on the best places to introduce Gen Ed assessment measures within the curriculum. The sub-committee members reported on their progress to the Assessment Committee: ➢ Dr. Jenkins (Humanities) obtained questions and results from course-embedded measures in Art, Theatre, and Music courses. Philosophy and Intro to Film courses will be addressed this semester. ➢ Dr. Lasey (Scientific Reasoning) introduced a common exercise in Biology labs, for which the scores have not been analyzed. Questions for Math and Physical Science courses are still being developed. ➢ Dr. Norton (Communication) obtained the assessment for Speech courses from the appropriate faculty, but it was developed too late for implementation in the Fall 2007 semester. ➢ Dr. Roberts reported for Dr. Roach (Critical Thinking) that US American Government courses had questions embedded in the Fall 2007 semester, but results have not been returned yet.

	➢ Dr. Montgomery (Ethical Perspectives) determined a number of indirect measures associated with three areas of ethics, focusing on positive information (not tracking things like crime statistics). ➢ The English department is working with an ETS essay analysis program. Discussion is ongoing on how to integrate this assessment with the appropriate Gen Ed goals. The Gen Ed sub-committee will meet again in the Spring 2008 semester to determine indirect measures to supplement the current direct measures.
Assessment Grant Proposals	Math Department grant for remote-control response units. ➢ The grant was provisionally approved in December 2007. ➢ The Bookstore has created a window for students to buy the new clickers beginning the second week of the semester. After that window closes, they will determine which students bought clickers for Math courses and send a bill to the Assessment Committee. **Proposal 1: Social Sciences Major Field Testing** The Social Sciences and Philosophy Dept. requested $2800 for major field testing of senior-level students. The Committee had several concerns about this proposal: ➢ It had a $200 additional expense that was unexplained in the proposal. ➢ It made no mention of reporting results to the Committee. ➢ It did not follow either the old or revised Assessment Grant formats. Dr. Norton moved to send the proposal back for reformatting and resubmission. Dr. Lasey seconded. The motion to delay action and request resubmission was passed unanimously. **Proposal 2: Student Satisfaction Inventory** Student Services sent in a proposal for funding of the SSI, which the Committee has funded two times previously. The Committee had several questions, which were answered by Dr. Jerry Forbes: ➢ The previous surveys have led to real changes for the university, including additional parking and 150 additional seats in the cafeteria. • Dr. Underwood mentioned that it might encourage student participation if these results were included in the SSI advertising. ➢ The line item for student incentives, which was rejected in the last proposal, was eliminated from the current request. ➢ 22% of the student body responded to the last SSI.

	➢ Results have been reported to the committee for prior grants for the SSI. Mr. Wyatt Watson made a motion to approve funding for this grant. Dr. Montgomery seconded. The motion to approve was passed unanimously. Discussion on the Grant Proposal process: ➢ Suggestions were made for a revision to the grant proposal form to require that applicants submitting repeat requests show the outcomes of the previous grant and describe any changes made as a result. ➢ The grant proposal form should make it clear that Assessment Grants are for "special projects in assessment," not funding for regular assessment efforts. Funding for the latter should come from the departments or Academic Affairs, especially since elimination of the CAPP exam should have resulted in making available some assessment funds. ➢ As the committee receives more assessment grant proposals, the requirements for issuing funds must become more stringent. The Committee decided that the reasons given for rejecting a proposal need to be based on the guidelines given to those requesting grants, rather than an internal standard or rubric. Assessment Workshop ➢ The recent assessment forum went exceptionally well; however, the Committee has yet to receive a report on its effectiveness, as assessment was to be performed by mailed survey rather than on-site evaluation. ➢ Dr. Roberts proposed that monthly Assessment luncheons for about 30 people from 12–1:30 pm be scheduled with the participation of the Hospitality department. These would be funded by a new grant proposal for about $250 per luncheon.
Curriculum Committee	The Curriculum Committee was in the middle of streamlining the curriculum change process, but there remains a question on where assessment fits into the process. Dr. Roberts proposed two questions that need to be answered in a curriculum change request: 1) What assessment information is being used to support this proposal? 2) How will the change continue to be monitored by the current assessment activities? The Assessment Committee cannot hold up the curriculum approval

	process while insuring that these questions are addressed, and the Curriculum Committee/Faculty Senate cannot be asked to evaluate the answers if these questions are included on the proposals. For this reason, Dr. Roberts proposed that the Chair of the Assessment Committee add his signature to the curriculum change form and, while not having the power to reject the change, will thus maintain a clearer perspective on assessment activities at ATU. Given the circumstances, this may be the best solution available.
Non-Academic Assessment	Discussion of implementation of non-academic assessment was delayed until the Committee's February meeting. The Committee may want to send a team (including two members of the Committee) to the International Assessment and Retention Conference 2008 being run by NASPA. Dr. Forbes and Mr. Phil Covington had both attended before and recommended it, although Dr. Forbes described as expensive and somewhat narrowly focused. No decision was reached on this conference by the Committee.
Ozark Implementation	Ozark implementation into Tracdat and Gen Ed assessment will begin as soon as possible during the semester.
TracDat	Training of every Dept. Head has been completed. Ozark implementation has yet to begin. Non-academic implementation is still pending.
AAALC (Arkansas Association for the Assessment of Collegiate Learning) Conference	The conference will be held at ATU on April 22. This two-day meeting at ATU was being planned and organized. ➢ One of Dr. Montgomery's Hospitality classes will organize and run the meeting. ➢ A speaker will be brought in to speak at the conference and also to Tech's Dept. Heads and the Assessment Committee. ➢ Hopes were that the cost could be held at $5000 (paid out of the Assessment Grant funds).
Adjournment	Dr. Roberts made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Jenkins seconded. Motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 2:08 pm.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
February 12, 2008
Doc Bryan Multi-Purpose Room 242

The Assessment Committee met in the Doc Bryan Multi-Purpose Room 242 on Tuesday, February 12, 2008; at 1:00 p.m. Members present were Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Richard Ihde, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. John Watson, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach and Mr. Wyatt Watson.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	After noting a few mistakes, Dr. Susan Underwood moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Brenda Montgomery seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Assessment Grant Proposals	Dr. Roberts reported that all grant proposals currently under committee consideration were recommended by Dr. Daniel Bullock. **Proposal 1: Social Sciences Major Field Testing** Dr. Rogers of the Social Sciences and Philosophy Department requested $2800 for Major Field Examinations from ETS. $2600 was for the tests themselves and $200 for other ETS services and postage, with $160 dollars in matching funds from the department for labor. The Committee unanimously approved this grant for $2800. **Proposal 2: iSkills Technology Testing (Dr. Batch's revision)** Dr. Alice Batch of the Business and Economics Department requested a revision to her previously approved assessment grant of $1500 for iSkills tests. The original sum would have covered the expected enrollment in the subject class, but additional enrollment caused there to be a shortfall. Dr. Batch

	has now requested an additional $450 to order a total of 78 exams. The Committee unanimously approved this revised grant for $1950, canceling the previously approved grant. **Proposal 3: iSkills Technology Testing (Dr. Pam Carr)** Dr. Pam Carr of the Accounting Department requested $1050 for 42 iSkills exams. She wants to give the test to her accounting students, none of whom are taking the classes Dr. Batch is testing. The Committee unanimously approved this grant for $1050. Related Discussion: ➢ Although Proposals 2 and 3 were in the old grant proposal format, no future grants will be considered if they are not in the revised grant proposal format (discussed December 2007). ➢ The Assessment Committee is in the business of funding pilot projects, not continuing assessment efforts. This should be clearly stated to applicants. ➢ Just because an assessment project has never been funded by the Assessment Committee does not mean it is a pilot. Grant Report Format: ➢ The Committee had not received written reports for any of the assessment grants issued since the fund was established. ➢ The Committee made several changes to the form (see below). **Unanimous Decision:** The deadline for report submissions should be thirty days after a funded project's conclusion (thirty days from delivery of this form for past grants). **Motion:** To approve the Grant Report Format with noted changes. 1st – Dr. Underwood; 2nd – Dr. Robin Lasey. Motion was passed unanimously.

Deans' Role in Assessment	Note prior information on this topic from December 2007 Minutes. The sub-committee on the Deans' role in assessment included Dr. Underwood, Dr. Eldon Clary, and Dr. John Watson. Each dean will take one of two roles in assessment: 1. They will oversee assessment efforts within their schools according to University Assessment Committee initiatives. 2. They will directly assess whether school goals are reflected in their departments' assessment plans (following accreditation agency standards). These new oversight roles will probably have quite a positive affect on the quality of assessment plans, as direct superiors will now be responsible for holding Department Heads accountable. The goal is to have this system implemented by Fall 2008.
General Education Assessment	Looking over the questions and sub-goals created by the Gen Ed sub-committee to assess the University's Gen Ed goals, the Assessment Committee had an extensive discussion on Gen Ed assessment. There were no conclusions reached on these, but listed below are the main questions debated: ➢ If the Assessment Committee criticizes faculty-submitted questions on the basis of content, it will turn faculty off to continuing to work with on Gen Ed. Yet if a question is inherently invalid, then it must be eliminated somehow. ➢ The proposed problem with one question was its specificity, not being general enough. The options for answers to a multiple-choice question should assess general knowledge, not memorized percentages or narrowly-defined facts. Argument: some facts are valuable as general knowledge. ➢ Who is responsible for determining the content and form of questions? Is it the Committee, which needs valid results, or the faculty, who have to write the questions? Are Committee members even qualified to judge the

	quality of questions written by specialists in their fields? ➢ Question on whether the problem is with the lack of clear guidelines for what the Committee wants from the faculty. ➢ The faculty should be encouraged to become more involved in this process; for example, those working on questions might get together to discuss how Gen Ed questions should be written. This collaboration may help eliminate the single faculty member vs. the impersonal Assessment Committee dynamic.
Non-Academic Assessment	The committee was asked to read over Mr. Wyatt Watson's document and reply by email to Dr. Roberts with comments (see below).
TracDat Implementation	In the month of February, Dr. Roberts and Mr. Jason Brown are meeting with Department Heads to help them acclimate to TracDat.
AAACL State Meeting (April 21-22)	The AAACL 1st state meeting is scheduled for April 22. The speaker will be Dr. Janice Denton, who has worked with HLC and was Director of Assessment at the University of Cincinnati. She now works as a full-time faculty member teaching Chemistry. On April 21st, there will be a dinner for Department Heads and Deans associated with assessment, with a presentation on Gen Ed by Dr. Denton. Assessment Committee members may either attend this dinner or the AAACL luncheon on the 22nd.
Additional Business	The March meeting of the Assessment Committee will be scheduled for a morning, in hopes of increased attendance by the members who are otherwise occupied in the afternoones.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Hanna Norton. Dr. Underwood seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

	The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm.

Assessment Final Report Guidelines

A copy of the final written report may be submitted electronically to Dr. Daniel Bullock at dbullock@atu.edu. Assessment Grant recipients will not be eligible for future grants until the final report is received and acknowledged. The assessment final report must follow the indicated format:

Comment [j1]: Eliminate whole sentence as it is unclear, difficult to enforce, and the Committee has never enforced it anyway.

A. Title Page (Include title of project, principal investigators, contact information)

B. Restatement of assessment project

Comment [j2]: Change to: "Restatement of Purpose and Objectives."

C. Brief summary of the assessment procedure used

Comment [j3]: Change to: "Brief summary of the assessment methods used."

D. Summary of findings

Conclusions and recommendations (include how your findings will be used to enhance student learning)

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 10 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 Applicant **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. Repeated request

Is this assessment project a repeat request? If so, please describe, in detail how the results from similar projects have been used to enhance student learning.

Comment [j4]: Change to: "Has this Department or program received funds from a previous assessment grant?"

Comment [j5]: Change to: "previous"

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. Detailed 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:

Itemized Proposed Budget

Equipment

	Unit Price	Quantity	Total
Classroom Receivers	$100.00	2	200.00
RF Transmitters	$50.00	100	500.00
Total Equipment Requested			**250.00**
Supplies			
MFAT Exams	$100.00	30	3000.00
Scantrons	$25.00	1 pack	25.00
Total Supplies Requested			**3025.00**
Personnel			
Student Labor	$5.25	20 hours	105.00
Total Labor Requested			**105.00**
Travel			
Travel to assessment conference	$175.00	1	175.00
Total Travel Requested			**175.00**
TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET			**3555.00**
TOTAL MATCHING FROM DEPARTMENT			**1500.00**
TOTAL REQUESTED FROM ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE			**2055.00**

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											
Presentation											

Non-Academic Assessment (Draft)

1. What is assessment and why is it necessary?

For non-academic departments, assessment is determining whether or not your department does what is expected of it and completes all of these tasks in an efficient and effective manner; assessment is basically a systematic method of finding ways for your department to become more efficient, effective, and just plain better. The key question is how do you know if your department does in fact complete everything that is expected in an efficient and effective manner; how do you know when a procedure or process is no longer working and needs to be changed? Assessment is also a collaborative effort that includes all employees in your department as well as any direct or indirect constituents that either have an impact on your department or are impacted by your department. Most commonly, assessment is a process by which you measure your department against a pre-defined set of goals or objectives. An Assessment process will enable faculty and staff to answer important questions asked by students, parents, employers, accrediting bodies, and legislators about what it is that we do and why we do things our way. Assessment also allows everyone involved to become a part of the whole system and to have an influence in policy and procedural methods adopted by every department on campus.

2. If this is assessment, what is it not?

Assessment is not about collecting data, repeatedly sending surveys to everyone, or making your department conform to one particular business model that seems to work at some other school. Assessment is not always quantifiable, nor is it measuring the effectiveness of a single person; assessment is NOT a performance evaluation of any single person; it is a performance evaluation of the department. The performance of a department does not reflect the performance of an individual; for example, if a department had so many tasks expected of them that there were no way they would all get done; then the department assessment report should point these things out and note that the reason some performance seems to be lacking is that there are not enough hours in the day; the individuals working in the department may very well be some of the best employees on campus – again assessment is NOT performance of a person. Assessment is not just something that we are forced to do, nor is it just “busy” work; assessment results are extremely valuable in providing evidence for change; in the example above, the departments assessment report cold be used as justification for asking for new positions to be approved.

3. Who does assessment? I thought that this was something that only faculty had to worry about?

Everybody does assessment in some form or fashion. In higher education, everybody from the administration to the students perform assessment. Our goal is to ensure that assessment is a collaborative effort between faculty, staff, and administration. It should never be the case that an "assessment guru" exists in your department and he/she has the sole responsibility of creating and maintaining the department's assessment plan and report. Assessment only works properly when as many people are involved as possible. Assessment is also not just for faculty; every department at ATU has room for improvement; assessment should point out places that need improvement as well as possible ways to accomplish this improvement. Quite often you will hear the words "Student Learning" when assessment is being discussed; rest assured that you do affect student learning in some form; it does not matter what department you work in; you DO affect student learning; however, there is big difference in how faculty do assessment and how non-academic departments do assessment.

4. How do I begin an assessment plan for our department?

The first thing is for you to determine what your department's responsibilities are. This can most easily be accomplished by looking at job descriptions or duties of employees as well as departmental responsibilities; if your department has a vision or mission statement then that should be the corner stone of your assessment. Once you have determined the overall responsibilities of your department; you will need to decide on a set of clear and concise goals or objectives, these objectives should be directly related to your department's responsibilities and mission/vision statement if it exists. After you decide on your goals or objectives, then you need to determine if these goals or objectives are being met. This involves measurement, but such measurements need not always be quantitative. It is impossible to say what you will learn from these measurements. If the department easily meets all of the goals, perhaps they are too low. Remember that it is OK if your department does not meet all of your goals every year. Assessment data should be looked at over time, just because some goals are not met this year does not necessarily mean that anything needs to change; you should look at trends over time. If over time, goals are consistently not met, then some action may need to be taken. Regardless, goals do matter and meeting those goals matter more than simply going through the steps. Too often, employees are told that "measuring" and reporting "measurements" are what really matter. Being obsessed with the process of assessment is never a substitute for improving your department.

5. What about "Student Learning"; do I have to relate everything I am assessing to how it impacts student learning?

NO; you do not have to relate everything that you are assessing to student learning. This is the big difference between how faculty and staff do assessment. If what your department does directly affects student learning then you can mention this in your assessment plan; but in general, non-academic departments do not need to mention student learning.

6. What role does my administrator play in assessment?

Since each student learning does not need to be mentioned in every non-academic departmental assessment report, it is the recommendation of the Assessment Committee that department heads and directors create their assessment plans and reports; and then selected ATU administrators with titles such as Associate Vice President or Vice President will be responsible for managing these assessment plans and reports and for describing how each of the departments that they oversee affect student learning and how that ties into the departments plan and report. Effectively, most ATU administrators do not have an assessment plan for their own office; their assessment plan is a compilation of all the plans for the departments that report to them and how their departments affect student learning.

7. How do I encourage my employees to participate in assessment?

Knowledge of the purpose and goals of assessment usually encourages staff to participate, this is the best way to make improvements and to ensure that all staff in your department have a say. The main way we can encourage is if we respond to the results and show everyone involved that their participation is making a difference. The best way department heads or directors can encourage their staff is by setting aside a separate time in each department meeting where assessment issues are discussed.

8. What do we measure and what kinds of information do we collect?

What you measure is a simple question to answer; just evaluate whatever your general job duties require as well as anything that comes from your mission or vision statement. What kinds of information to collect is more difficult; this varies tremendously by department; you can use things such as audit reports; student surveys, faculty/staff surveys; meeting minutes, etc..

9. What kinds of things make for good assessment measures, and how many do you need?

Third party observations, self-administered questionnaires, or interviews with students, faculty, and/or staff, external assessment instruments (Audit reports, Federal or State report, etc.). How many measures you need is greatly dependant upon the type of goal or objective you have and the available measures for that goal or objective. In general, you only need one measure if it is a direct measure; if all that are available are indirect measures then you may need more than one. For more help on this topic please talk to a member of the Assessment Committee with your specific examples.

10. What is the difference between direct and indirect measurements?

11. Can't we just resubmit the same report as we did last year since we didn't do anything different?

Each year the departments benefit from assessment in some way, whether it is from changes made as a result of their own assessments or from those made as a result of a past year's assessments. Some changes can be made immediately. Other changes will take more time. The short answer to this question is, "no, of course not." Nobody denies that good assessment can reveal consistent trends. If staff are tempted to produce the same report each year with only minor modifications, then it could mean that you and your employees are overly concerned with the process of assessment rather than using it in a meaningful way. Always remember, your assessment report is not your goal. You should be ensuring that your department is doing all that is expected in the most efficient way possible with the tools and resources available. It is very likely that your assessment goals or objectives will remain constant from year to year; but the report should not.

12. Should we consistently meet all of our goals each year?

If every goal is met consistently from year to year, it may mean that the goals are set too low. Purposefully setting goals that are easily met defeats the purpose for having an assessment plan. On the other hand, usually you do not want to set goals that are impossible to reach. It is expected that sometimes you will meet some or all of your goals and sometimes you will not meet all of them.

13. How does our departmental assessment plan relate to the four column report provided to the Assessment Committee and what is the due date for my assessment plan and report?

The 4 column template has been replaced with an assessment tracking software package called TracDat. From now on, all assessment plans, reports, and data will be entered into TracDat. The appropriate senior level administrator will decide when the assessment plans and reports are due for all departments that report to them; for some departments; April 1 is the most logical due date, for other departments, October 1 may be the most appropriate due date. The Assessment Committee should be notified of all due dates; the committee recommends using one of the following as a due date: January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1.

14. What resources can the University Assessment Committee offer to us?

Knowledge, experience, and examples of assessment. The Committee also offers grants of up to $5,000 to cover innovative assessment projects other than what you would normally do.

15. What if we don't have time for assessment?

Everybody has time for assessment. Assessment is essential for a department to stay focused on their mission and to stay current with Federal, State, or University policy. It is necessary to make assessment a top priority in order for a department to know if they are consistently performing at or above what is expected and needed.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
March 13, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Thursday, March 13, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. Members present were Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Dr. John Watson, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Dr. David Underwood joined the meeting as the Committee's guest.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Susan Underwood moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Robin Lasey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Recognition of Membership	Change in Membership: ➢ Dr. Richard Ihde replaced by Ms. Annette Stuckey as the representative of the School of Community Education. Promotions and Honors: ➢ Dr. Jan Jenkins was promoted to the rank of full professor. ➢ Dr. Susan Underwood was granted tenure. ➢ Dr. Hanna Norton has been given the Outstanding Faculty Academic Advising Award by the Arkansas Academic Advising Network.
AAACL State Meeting (April 21-22)	The AAACL 1st state meeting is scheduled for April 22. The Committee is currently receiving registration forms on a daily basis. The speaker, Dr. Janice Denton, will also speak on General Education on the April 21 at a 6 pm dinner for Department Heads and Deans. The Committee members will be invited to the conference or the dinner. Dr. Lasey suggested that they should attend the

	presentation focused on Gen Ed assessment.
General Education Assessment	The Gen Ed sub-committee finalized direct measures and wording of sub-goals and presented these to the Assessment Committee (see below). ➢ The courses listed are those with course-embedded measures, selected because all students or almost all students must take them. ➢ By April, the sub-committee hopes to submit indirect measures for the Gen Ed goals. ➢ Written Communication: these sub-goals have been matched to the ETS Criterion service. Direct Assessments: ➢ Eventually these may be mixed across the goals (e.g. Thinking Critically, Writing and Scientific Reasoning share similar elements). ➢ Once results start coming in, these measures will have to be analyzed to ensure that they are statistically valid and consistently applied. • This could be achieved by random sampling. Graduate Assistantships ➢ G.A.s could be trained to analyze the assessments and enter data into Tracdat, as Dr. Dave Roach assures the Committee that they could do as well as trained faculty. ➢ Dr. Roach requested three or four assistantships. ➢ These positions could be summer assignments, either independent or extensions of nine-month assignments. ➢ There are plenty of applications for graduate assistantships every year, so it would simply be an issue of funding the positions. ➢ Another option is to integrate this analysis into the College Student Personnel assessment course, giving the students valuable experience and saving the Assessment Committee money. Drs. Eldon Clary, David Underwood, Roach, and Roberts will

	collaborate on the Graduate Assistantship question.
Dean's Assessment Checklist	The Assessment Committee is to take the roles the Deans sub-committee clarified and transfer them into a checklist as the Committee did in previous years for Department Heads. Dr. Stuckey will join the Deans sub-committee to aid in this effort.
HLC Criterion 3 Team Support	How can the Committee help the Criterion 3 Team? ➢ Dr. J. Michael Tarver is the source of all communications from the Criterion teams to prevent repeated requests. ➢ In short, the Committee may be asked to provide information but can do little to help actively (most of the Committee members are assigned to teams anyway).
Non-Academic Assessment	The conference discussed in an earlier meeting will not be attended by ATU staff because the AAACL is planning a non-academic assessment conference in Fall 2008. The Higher Learning Commission will be sending a speaker to the conference.
Future Grant Distribution	The focus of the Assessment Grant fund, hereafter, will be to fund assessment testing of students (even if the tests are given out annually), but this is not to eliminate funding for innovative projects. ➢ Solution: $10,000 a year will be set aside to fund innovative projects. The rest will be spent on assessment testing. ➢ There will not be a separate application for repeated testing, as the present form requires applicants to document the results of the funded project.

	The University needs to do a better job of advertising test results. ➢ Dr. Clary noticed that another university's business department had on a handout in its lobby that showed how their program's MFAT score compared to the national average. ➢ GRE – ATU does not obtain these scores unless the students have them sent to the Graduate School. ➢ MED-CAAP and LSAT tests will only provide pass/fail scores to universities, not the important sub-scores.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Lasey and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am

General Education Sub-Goals

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Scientific:

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their science general education requirement will:

1. Recognize the significance and power of the scientific process as well as its limitations.
2. Formulate hypotheses, identify relevant variables, and design experiments to test hypotheses.
3. Formulate reasonable explanations of natural phenomena based on observations of both quantitative and qualitative data.
4. Use theories and models as unifying principles that help them understand natural phenomena and make predictions.

Quantitative:

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their mathematics general education requirement will:

1. Perform a quantitative analysis of a situation and make a decision based upon the outcome.
2. Understand information presented in graphical format.
3. Create a mathematical model of a real world situation.
4. Use mathematical formulae or processes in real world situations.

Gen Ed Science Courses
- BIOL 1014 – Intro to Biological Science
- BIOL 1114 – Principles of Biology
- PHSC 1013 – Intro to Physical Science
- PHSC 1053 – Astronomy
- CHEM 1114 – Survey of Chemistry
- CHEM 2124 – General Chemistry I
- GEOL 1004 – Essentials of Earth Science
- GEOL 1014 – Physical Geology

Indirect Measures:
- Statistics Courses
  - BUAD 2053 – Business Statistics
  - MATH 2163 – Intro to Statistical Methods
  - SOC 2053 – Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences
- Methodology Courses
  - Secondary Education programs (but not in SEED courses)

Ethical Perspectives

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their general education requirements will:

1. Exhibit integrity and reliability in individual action and institutional activities.
2. Practice principle-centered leadership.
3. Demonstrate responsibility when interacting with new technologies and information.

Indirect Measures:
- Honda Case Study in Business and Engineering (Fall 07)

Understand Wellness Concepts

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their wellness general education requirement will:

1. Describe the current wellness/fitness status of the population.
2. Identify how to improve wellness status.
3. Explain the benefits of a healthy lifestyle.

Activity Courses in PE, RP and WS:

- PE 1051 – Volleyball
- PE 1101 – Folk/Square Dance
- PE 1121 – Social Dance
- PE 1301 – Beginning Ballet I
- PE 1311 – Beginning Ballet II
- PE 1321 – Intermediate Ballet I
- PE 1331 – Intermediate Ballet II
- PE 1341 – Intermediate Ballet III
- PE 1351 – Intermediate Ballet IV
- PE 1361 – Advanced Ballet I
- PE 1371 – Advanced Ballet II
- PE 1401 – Archery/Recreational Games
- PE 1411 – Badminton
- PE 1431 – Bowling
- PE 1481 – Tennis
- PE 1851 – Tennis/Basketball
- PE 1901 – Beginning Swimming
- PE 1911 – Intermediate Swimming
- PE 1991 – Racquetball
- PE 2301 – Beginning Golf
- PE 2861 – Rhythmic Aerobic Activities
- PE 2941 – Scuba Diving I
- PE 2951 – Scuba Diving II
- RP 1002 – Backpacking
- RP 1011 – Sport Hunting
- RP 1021 – Boating Education
- RP 1031 – Introduction to Mountain Biking
- RP 1041 – Principles of Fishing
- WS 1002 – Physical Wellness/Fitness
- WS 1031 – Food, Exercise, Body Composition
- WS 1061 – Muscle Fitness for Women
- WS 1081 – Muscle Fitness for Men
- WS 1091 – Fitness Walking/Jogging

Indirect Measures:

- Tech Fit Usage Statistics
- American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA)

Think Critically

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their general education requirements will:

1. Identify an underlying argument.
2. Make reasonable inferences from an argument.
3. Assess the quality of evidence.
4. Identify the thesis and conclusions in an argument.

Courses:

- HIST 2003 – United States History I
- HIST 2013 – United States History II
- POLS 2003 – American Government

Arts and Humanities

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their Arts and Humanities general education requirement will:

1. identify and analyze diverse cultural and historical factors in the creation of and response to works of art, music, theatre, film, or literature
2. evaluate the global significance of works of art, music, theatre, film, or literature to the human experience
3. identify ideas and arguments from literature or philosophy and relate them to the global context in which they were created
4. understand basic terms used to identify and describe diverse works of art, music, theatre, film, literature, or philosophy
5. identify and analyze relationships among schools of art, music, theatre, film, literature, or philosophy

Gen Ed Fine Arts Courses:
- MUS 2003 – Intro to Music
- ART 2123 – Experience Art
- TH 2273 – Intro to Theatre
- ENGL 2173 – Intro to Film
- JOUR 2173 – Intro to Film

Gen Ed Humanities Courses
- ENGL 2003 – Intro to World Literature
- ENGL 2013 – Intro to American Literature
- PHIL 2003 – Intro to Philosophy

Indirect Measures:
- History Courses
- Attendance at and involvement in Theatre productions and SGA Movie Nights
- History courses for distinct academic disciplines
  - "Foundations of Physical Education"
  - Introductory education courses
  - "Nature of Science" (for science education majors only)

Communicate Effectively

Written:

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their written communication general education requirement will:

a. Gather thoughts and present them in a cohesive, written manner
   (Criterion Service Category: Organization and Development)
b. Synthesize information into a collective argument
   (Criterion Service Category: Style).
c. Use proper grammar
   (Criterion Service Category: Grammar, Usage and Mechanics)

Speech:

Students at Arkansas Tech who complete their spoken communication general education requirement will:

a. Verbally present thoughts in an organized manner.
b. Speak with confidence on a variety of subjects.
c. Adapt to multiple audiences including a professional audience.

Gen Ed Writing Courses
- ENG Remedial
- ENG 2003, 2013

Gen Ed Speech Courses:
- SPH 1003 – Intro to Speech Communication
- SPH 2003 – Public Speaking
- SPH 2173 – Business and Professional Speaking

Indirect Measures:
- Essays in Philosophy and other Social Sciences
- University Honors
- Career Services
- Exit Interviews and focus groups with students
- Praxis Exams

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
April 3, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Thursday, April 3, 2008 at 1:02 p.m. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Hanna Norton, Dr. Carey Roberts, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Dr. John Watson.
Members absent were Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, Mr. Bruce Sikes, and Mr. Wyatt Watson.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Carol Trusty moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. David Underwood seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Assessment Grants	**<u>English Grant</u>** ➢ This grant request was for continued funding of the Criterion service for the English Dept (originally approved on May 10, 2007). The service provides students with individualized suggestions for improvement, gives faculty an idea of areas that need more focused attention in class, enables the program to be compared to other programs, and provides a method by which General Education progress can be tracked. ➢ This grant followed the old format, but Dr. Roberts was confident that everyone will be using the new format by Fall '08. ➢ Dr. Daniel Bullock recommended that this grant be accepted as it was basically an update on one that had already been approved. He added that he would like to see more information on what the Criterion service is beyond the information already provided. The Committee unanimously approved this grant for an additional $2000 to continue the project for another year. **<u>Clarification of March Grant Discussion</u>** Funding for Regular Departmental Testing Procedures ➢ This was a change from the Committee's agreed-upon

	mandate. ➢ The prior focus on funding innovative projects only will be changed. The committee will set aside $10,000 a year for such grants. ➢ The new focus for the majority of Assessment Committee grants will be on standardized tests given regularly at the departmental level (in order to fill the void created by elimination of the Rising Junior Exam). ➢ This will allow the funding for these materials to be channeled through the Assessment Committee rather than through Academic Affairs, which controls the other part of the assessment funds. Depending on how much this new mandate costs, additional money may be transferred from Academic Affairs'funds side to the Assessment Committee. No Separate Application ➢ There will be no separate application for innovative and regular assessment projects, so everyone will have to justify purchase of tests and apply data after their projects are completed. ➢ Given that every project has a different timeline, it is probably not a problem that the application form does not include an update section.
AAACL State Meeting (April 21-22)	The 1st AAACL state meeting is scheduled for April 22. The Committee is currently receiving registration forms on a daily basis. The speaker, Dr. Janice Denton, will also speak on General Education on April 21 at a 6 pm dinner for Department Heads and Deans. ➢ The Committee members were invited to attend the dinner. They were to contact Dr. Roberts if they wished to attend the meeting or the meeting and luncheon on the 22nd. ➢ The afternoon of the 22nd will have plenary sessions which the committee members were free to attend. Topics include: o Using Technology for Assessment o Non-Academic Assessment o Issues in Arkansas Higher Education o Best Practices in University Assessment ➢ Dr. Montgomery and her Hospitality students were recognized for their efforts in organizing the conference. Problem ➢ The Department Head dinner on the 21st was scheduled for

	the same time as the Student Leadership Banquet, to which all of the Heads were invited. Dr. Denton's presentation may be moved to the beginning of the dinner to encourage participation in both activities or at least compensate for the conflict.
Deans' Checklist	The Deans' Checklist was created by the Deans' sub-committee and presented to the Assessment Committee in draft form (see below). ➢ Dr. Sheets and Dr. Tyler will follow Model A (evaluating their schools' program assessment plans using accrediting agency standards). ➢ The other Deans will follow Model B (using this checklist to evaluate assessment plans and provide feedback to Department Heads). New Timeline ➢ Department Heads print their Assessment Reports from Tracdat and deliver them to the Deans by July 1st. ➢ Deans complete a checklist for each department in their schools and send these to the Assessment Committee by August 1st. ➢ The October deadline has been eliminated to help ease the September-October cluster of assignments. The Deans will receive this checklist as a printable Word document. ➢ QuestionPro and online forms may be used later, but not during implementation over the summer of 2008. The Committee was asked to look over the checklist carefully, as non-academic assessment will be its next major project.
Summer Graduate Assistantships	Graduate Assistants are to be used to help departments and the Committee collect, quantify, and analyze assessment data, especially regarding General Education. ➢ Two half-time Summer I positions were requested; one half-time Summer I & II position was approved. ➢ Following several interviews, the position was filled as of April 14, 2008.

Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Watson and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 1:51 pm.

Model B
School Assessment Evaluation

Academic Year:
Date of Evaluation:
Identify Program:
Reviewed By:

The primary reason for the existence of the Dean's office is to assist department heads in administering their departments, to assist the faculty in achieving their program goals, and to assist students in attaining their educational objectives. In an effort to enhance student learning the Dean will evaluate each program's assessment efforts and, where appropriate, provide specific suggestions for improvement.

Goal 1: Each program will have appropriate educational objectives.

This goal will be measured as follows. Each educational objective is:

1. A statement of what students are supposed to learn.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

2. Clear and succinct.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

3. Appropriate to the mission of the program.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4. Made available to program constituents.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Suggestions for improvement:

Goal 2: Each educational objective will be measured appropriately.

This goal will be measured as follows:

1. Each educational objective is adequately measured. This may require the use of both direct and indirect measures.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

2. The program assessment plan avoids using the same measurements to assess all of the objectives.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

3. The measures are pertinent to the educational objective.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4. The criteria for success for each measure are reasonable.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

5. The measures assess what students learn rather than simply assessing student satisfaction.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Suggestions for improvement:

Goal 3: For each educational objective, data will be regularly collected to determine to what extent the objective is being met.

This goal will be measured as follows. Each annual program assessment report will show that:

1. Data for each objective are collected regularly.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

2. Data are summarized in a form that can easily be understood.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

3. Data are reasonably interpreted.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4. Actual results are obtained based on data instead of broad anecdotal impressions.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Suggestions for improvement:

Goal 4: Assessment results are being used to improve the program.

This goal will be measured as follows. Program assessment reports will show that:

1. All educational objectives are being measured on a regular cycle.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

2. Assessment results are leading to program improvement.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

3. The annual assessment report is worded in a way that is easily understood by reviewers outside the discipline

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4. Program improvements are being made through curriculum changes such as improvement in existing courses, the addition of new degree options, and/or the addition of new degrees.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Suggestions for improvement:

Goal 5: Assessment results are having long term impact.

1. The program is documenting improved retention rates.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree ☐ NA

2. The program is documenting improved retention rates.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree ☐ NA

3. The program is experiencing improvements in the quality or quantity of program faculty.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree ☐ NA

4. The program is experiencing improvements, including renovations and construction, in program facilities.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree nor disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree ☐ NA

Each school dean may include additional goals and measures.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
May 6, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Tuesday, May 6, 2008 at 1:00 p.m. Members present were Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, Dr. John Watson, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Hanna Norton, and Ms. Tammy Rhodes.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Brenda Montgomery moved for the approval of the minutes with a few changes. Dr. Jan Jenkins seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Assessment Grants	**<u>Library Grant</u>** ➢ This grant request was for funding to send Dr. Bill Parton to the Library Assessment Conference on August 4-6, 2008. ➢ The Committee did not want to begin funding travel requests regularly, and there was concern that approving this grant might result in a deluge of such requests. ➢ The Committee discussed denying the grant as a regular minigrant to avoid the appearance of funding travel but fund it another way. It was decided that the Committee should deal with this grant on its own merit and deal with the deluge if it comes. ➢ It was concluded that this grant was meritorious, as Dr. Parton is a supporter of assessment on campus, represents a major non-academic unit, and could be instrumental in implementing non-academic assessment during the 08-09 year. ➢ Reporting on this grant will be done in the same form as all other grants. **Motion** The Committee will approve this grant request for $1691. Dr. Jan Jenkins made the motion. Dr. Robin Lasey seconded. The motion was passed with one vote against.

Business (2007-2008)	Accomplishments over 07-08 Year: ➢ Tracdat implementation ➢ Many assessment grants ➢ A3CL State Conference ➢ Dean's role in program assessment proposed ➢ Gen Ed assessment plan devised ➢ Department Head Dinner on Gen Ed Gen Ed Assessment ➢ The Faculty Senate held over discussion about creation of an official Gen Ed Committee to the fall. ➢ The Assessment Committee cannot and is not charged to take over managing the Gen Ed Curriculum. ➢ Several weaknesses with Gen Ed have been identified (see below). ➢ ATU is advanced in Gen Ed assessment when compared to other institutions in the state, including the U of A. Concerns about Gen Ed Management ➢ Whether a committee could effectively manage Gen Ed and encourage faculty to endorse course changes. ➢ A committee should be made up of specialized, semi-permanent members and be under Senate oversight. Department Head Dinner ➢ Food served by the Hospitality Department was praised. ➢ At least one department head has expressed new motivation to begin discussions on Gen Ed.
Agenda (2008-2009)	1. "Finalize" Gen Ed Assessment ➢ Continue work on it until the Faculty Senate takes over 2. Online Program Assessment ➢ Asking questions about training and retention 3. Non-academic assessment ➢ Implement on Russellville and Ozark campuses concurrently.

Summer Graduate Assistantship Assignments	The Committee did not have any additions to assistant assignments list (see below).
Additional Business	**Motion** Mr. Wyatt Watson may post the non-academic sub-committee's document on nonacademic assessment on the Institutional Research website as a draft, pending Committee revision. Dr. John Watson made the motion. Dr. Lasey seconded. The motion was approved unanimously. Acknowledgements: ➢ Drs. Hamm, Tarver, and Underwood were thanked for granting Dr. Roberts an additional course release. ➢ Dr. Roberts was recognized for being honored with the title "Coordinator of University Assessment." ➢ Mr. Jason Brown was recognized for his efforts as the graduate assistant attached to the Assessment Committee.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Dave Roach and was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Weaknesses in ATU General Education Assessment

1. Lack of communication among faculty regarding content and the purpose of the core courses

2. Numerous departments are trying to compensate for perceived weaknesses in core courses

3. Confusion about and lack of implementation of the Faculty Handbook guidelines for course syllabi:

   "Description of how course meets general education objectives (courses included in the general education component should show how the course meets one or more of the objectives contained in General Education Objectives listed in undergraduate catalogue)." (*Faculty Handbook*, 74)

4. No person or group charged with overseeing General Education curriculum

5. The University Assessment Committee can develop the assessment plan for General Education, but cannot manage the curriculum.

Assignments for the Summer Graduate Assistant

1. WELLNESS Edit student Tech Fit statistics from name to T-number.
Drs. Roberts and Holeyfield

2. WELLNESS Transcribe all Health and Wellness documents into electronic format, organized by T-number.
Drs. Roberts and Holeyfield

3. SCIENCE Chart by T-number data from Biology Lab quiz.
Dr. Lasey

4. CRITICAL THINKING Evaluate essays for writing quality and grading accuracy.
Dr. Roach

5. COMMUNICATION Tablulate speech rubric data by T-number
Dr. Roberts

6. COMMUNICATION Collect and analyze Criterion data
Dr. Roberts

7. ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES Look for sections of the SSI that might be useful in assessing ethics
Dr. Roberts

8. CRITICAL THINKING Tabulate by T-number and analyze data from POLS and HIST gen ed courses
Dr. Roberts

9. HUMANITIES Organize information collected from gen ed courses
Dr. Roberts

10. OZARK Scan assessment reports from Ozark campus

11. GEN ED Collect all Gen Ed goals and results into a single, tightly written report on Gen Ed at ATU for the 2007-2008 school year.
Dr. Roberts

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
September 4, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Tuesday, September 4, 2008 at 2:30 pm. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, and Mr. Ron Hutain. Student representatives Mr. Jason Brown and Mr. Robert Chenowith were also present.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Susan Underwood moved for the approval of the minutes. Ms. Carol Trusty seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Recognition of Membership	Dr. Willie Hoefler replaced Dr. John Watson as the representative of the School of System Science. Dr. Trey Philpotts replaced Dr. Hanna Norton as the representative for the Faculty Senate. Mr. Robert Chenowith took the role of student body representative on the Committee for the 08-09 year. This position was vacant during the 07-08 year. Mr. Jason Brown returned as Graduate Assistant to the Committee and took the role of graduate student representative for the 08-09 year. The latter was vacant during the 07-08 year. Mr. Robert Haynes was recognized for his exceptional work as a Graduate Assistant for the Assessment Committee during the summer terms of 2008.

Honors Program Sophomore Service Projects	Dr. Jan Jenkins asked committee members to consider the University Honors Campus Volunteer program to help out with events and projects. As a service component is very important for an Honors program, Sophomore Honors students will now be required to volunteer for a minimum of ten hours in the Fall semester and another ten hours in the Spring term. ➢ They may perform all manner of tasks including data entry, helping to set up for events, stuffing envelopes, and filing. ➢ Proposed tasks may be emailed to volunteers@atu.edu. Interested students will reply to accept the task or request additional information.
General Education	Membership of the Gen Ed sub-committee for 07-08 included Drs. Holeyfield, Jenkins, Lasey, Montgomery, Norton, and Roberts. Tasks: ➢ 07-08: Design the Gen Ed assessment plan and implement course-embedded measures. ➢ 08-09: Repair weaknesses in the plan and identify sound non-course-embedded measures. Sub-committee will also increase faculty involvement in Gen Ed assessment and publicize the information collected during the 07-08 year. Update: Gen Ed Committee ➢ Original plan for the sub-committee was to design the assessment plan and then pass on responsibility for Gen Ed to another body. ➢ As no such body existed, the Faculty Senate was asked to create one. A Senate sub-committee was created to design the new body and determine its charge. ➢ In the meantime, Dr. Watson (Dean of Academic Affairs) proposed that an ad hoc committee be formed to oversee Gen Ed until the Faculty Senate has completed its work. ➢ As the Assessment Committee does not have the authority to propose changes to the curriculum, this new committee should have that power. ➢ For now, the Assessment Committee will continue to collect

	data on the Gen Ed curriculum and send it on to the Gen Ed Committee for analysis. A description of the ad hoc Gen Ed Committee may be seen at http://uesc.atu.edu.
Assessment Grants	**Proposal: Assessment Forum** Dr. Glenn Bishop and Mr. Ray Moll of the Parks, Recreation, and Hospitality Administration Department requested $500 to fund the luncheon portion of a campus-wide Assessment Forum on September 8, 2008. The Committee unanimously approved the grant for $500.
Goals for 08-09	**Goal: Finalize General Education Assessment** (see above) **Goal: Implement Non-Academic Assessment** ➢ This was addressed during the 07-08 year, but a major push will be made by the Committee during the 08-09 year. **Goal: Examine Online Education** ➢ John Gale did introductory work on online courses years ago. ➢ "Vacancy Factor" Mr. Wyatt Watson observed that web courses filled up much faster than class-based courses for Fall 08. Definite answers for why this occurred need to be discovered. ➢ CSP Capstone Course Dr. Underwood stated that two groups of CSP students will be spending Fall 08 examining online education to determine the variables that have an impact upon student success in online courses (one from the students' perspective, the other from that of the faculty). Dr. Underwood promised updates during upcoming meetings.
Sub-Committee Appointments	**Sub-Committee:** General Education **Goal:** Repair weaknesses in the Gen Ed assessment plan, identify sound non-course-embedded measures, increase faculty involvement

	in Gen Ed assessment, and publicize the information collected during the 07-08 year. **Chair:** Dr. Lasey **Members:** Holeyfield, Jenkins, Montgomery, Norton, Philpotts, Roach **Sub-Committee:** Non-Academic Assessment **Goal:** Determine exactly what will be assessed in the Non-Academic departments and how the data will be reported in Tracdat. **Chair:** Dr. Trusty **Members:** Bullock, Forbes, Rhodes, Sikes, Watson **Sub-Committee:** Online Education **Goal:** Collect and analyze information related to online education; make recommendations to improve online programs **Chair:** Dr. Underwood **Members:** Clary, Hoefler, Stuckey [and Montgomery] **Notes:** ➢ Dr. Montgomery requested to serve on both the Online Education sub-committee and the Gen Ed sub-committee. ➢ Mr. Chenowith was temporarily assigned to Online Education, but will be allowed to move to other sub-committees. ➢ Unassigned Members: Mr. Ron Hutain, because of his location at the Ozark campus.
AAACL	AAACL Fall Workshop ➢ October 9, 2008, at Harding University ➢ HLC Representative to speak on Non-Academic Assessment ➢ $20 per person to attend (the Committee will pay for attendees from ATU)
Other Business	Grant Reports will be posted online at some point in the 08-09 year, probably on a dedicated ATU Assessment website. The Curriculum Committee scrapped the new Curriculum Change forms that the Assessment Committee viewed during Spring 08. As such, the discussed changes were not implemented at the time of this meeting. Curriculum Change forms are now being posted online at

	http://uesc.atu.edu.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Robin Lasey and was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
October 20, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Monday, October 20, 2008 at 2:30 pm. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Dr. Carey Roberts, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Mr. Ron Hutain, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, and Mr. Bruce Sikes. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Robin Lasey moved for the approval of the minutes. Ms. Annette Stuckey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. NOTE: After the meeting, a clarification was raised about Dr. Montgomery's sub-committee posting. The minutes were changed to reflect her membership on both the Online Course and Gen Ed sub-committees.
Digitization of Assessment Data	Mr. Wyatt Watson met with Dr. Glenn Sheets and others from the School of Education to discuss digitizing their assessment information on ATU servers and Banner, creating the ability to report on and search the data with Argos's data tools. Praxis scores are to be placed in Banner by the end of the Fall '08 semester. Argos integration should be completed by Summer '09. ➢ One concern with this plan was that it will involve a significant amount of data entry (160 scores or more per semester). It is hoped that the initial expense of entry will be offset by saving hours of data collection when writing NCATE and SPA accreditation reports. Additionally, this process will collect these important scores in a central, secure place, which may prove better in the long run than the present system.

	The School of Education was also looking into digitizing the senior surveys and intern evaluations. Mr. Watson proposed that the numerical scores could be stored into Banner and integrated with Argos, but that doing so with the written response portions would prove more difficult. In the next month, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Trey Philpotts, and Dr. Roberts plan to meet with Mr. Watson to discuss formatting results from General Education assessments for entry into Banner.
Sub-Committee Updates	**General Education** ➢ Dr. Lasey was recognized as having been elected Chair of the General Education Ad Hoc Committee. ➢ The Gen Ed sub-committee met once and assigned its members to examine standardized tests for applicability to Gen Ed assessment. ➢ The Assessment Committee expressed its desire that the Gen Ed Ad Hoc Committee take over Gen Ed assessment, but it would prefer that the Gen Ed sub-committee's efforts be built upon rather than replaced. Dr. Roberts stated that the Gen Ed sub-committee had done an excellent job, given that no departments outside of Health/ Physical Education and English systematically assess their Gen Ed courses. This situation required sub-committee members to expend countless hours overseeing the creation of assessment measures and building departmental and faculty support. **Online Education** ➢ The CSP assessment class submitted to the sub-committee its proposals for analyzing online student success, the implementation of which will be overseen by Dr. Susan Underwood. The two groups are to begin collecting data before the end of October. ➢ The groups should produce summative reports by the end of the Fall '08 semester. **Non-Academic Assessment** ➢ Dr. Carol Trusty stated that this sub-committee had determined

	that every non-academic department with an assessment plan should produce a mission statement and link it to the University's mission statement. Their assessment plans will be linked to this established mission. ➢ The AAACL conference at Harding University had promised to focus on non-academic assessment, but attendees reported that the actual conference barely addressed the topic.
Grant Distribution Guidelines	**History** **2000** – HLC requested that ATU create positions to address weaknesses in assessment and Institutional Research. Mr. Watson and Dr. David Underwood were hired. – The student Assessment Fee was raised to $10. This was supposed to offset the cost of the CAAP exam for general education and provide funding for departmental assessments (e.g. standardized tests; pilot projects, etc.). **2003** – The Assessment Committee began offering Assessment Project Grants, capped at $2500. **2004** – The follow-up report from the HLC focused visit on assessment was submitted. It commented that there was no method in place for the distribution of these grants, severely limiting their effectiveness at promoting positive departmental assessment. **2006** – The Assessment Project Grant cap was raised to $5000. **2007** – The CAAP exam ceased to be offered at ATU, resulting in a significant increase in funds available for the promotion of assessment and related projects. A portion of these funds went to Academic Affairs and another portion went to the Assessment Committee. **2008** – It was decided that any annual or periodic departmental assessment tests would be funded by the Assessment Committee (as "recurring projects") instead of Academic Affairs. The Committee set aside $10,000 to continue offering grants for "pilot projects," while the rest of its funds were allocated for recurring projects.

Grant Distribution

- Dr. Roberts stated that since each student pays a total of $170 or more in fees every semester, it is important that the Committee spend the student's $10 Assessment Fee wisely.
- The system for distributing grants for pilot projects was considered sound, but as Academic Affairs had been accepting memoranda as funding requests, there should be a new process for requesting grants for recurring tests and projects.
- Dr. Roberts and Dr. Bullock will meet over the Fall '08 semester to discuss the new forms and to write guidelines to delineate the two types of grants.
    - The new form should have a section requesting an explanation of the "sample size" to prevent departments from assessing a single professor's classes or selecting only its best students.

Grant Distribution

The Committee expressed concern that assessment funds might be channeled to a few departments, when the intention was that they should benefit all departments.

- Although funding for "recurring tests" cannot be capped, funding for "pilot projects" could be.
- Every year, Dr. Roberts has sent an email notifying department heads about the assessment grants. The problem clearly isn't a lack of publicity.

Grant Accounting

Dr. Jan Jenkins requested that the Committee receive a report at the next meeting that accounted for the money it has issued in assessment grants, listed by year and including yearly totals. Dr. Roberts stated that such a document would be included in the November 17 meeting packet.

Grant Requests	**Proposal 1: Nursing TEAS** The Nursing Department requested $4501.34 for administering the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS). Dr. Jenkins moved to approve funding of this proposal. Dr. Lasey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. **Proposal 2: Business Ethics Project** The Business Department requested $2271 to complete an earlier study by administering essay prompts on ethics to students at all class levels in their courses, and to provide transportation to a conference to present the study's findings. The Committee had some concerns: ➢ The Committee questioned who was to receive the $560 allocated for "personnel." Over the phone, Dr. Loretta Cochran replied that these funds were to hire CSP graduate students and student workers to rate the responses. These students would be trained, and their rating would be compared to that of faculty members to ensure validity. ➢ Several members were concerned that Assessment Grant funds should not be used to fund conference presentations. The Committee concluded that funding conference travel for research presentations is not in its purview, and such requests should be made to other bodies on campus. Although a motion to table this proposal was passed unanimously, concerns were later raised that this would ruin the proposal's timeline. Dr. Jenkins moved to approve funding of this proposal for $1004 (the total requested, minus the $1267 for travel expenses to a conference). Dr. Jerry Forbes seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. **Proposal 3: Business iSkills Test** The Business Department requested $5000 to administer iSkills tests in several Business courses. Similar proposals totaling $2500 were accepted in the 07-08 year, but the resulting sample size was not large enough for the study.

	The Committee's concerns centered on the necessity of a larger sample size. ➢ The School of Business's accrediting body (AACSB) requires that its faculty perform research and publish the results. This isn't possible with an incomplete study. ➢ The earlier tests were administered as part of courses that included students who were not Business majors. Thus even though their tests were paid for by the Committee, their results were not used in the study. Although several members questioned if this was a justifiable use of assessment funds, the Committee concluded that since the student grades for the course were weighted by iSkills test results, such inclusion could not be avoided. Dr. Lasey moved to approve funding of this proposal. Dr. Trusty seconded. The motion was passed unanimously. **Proposal 4: Business MFT** The Business Department requested $1296 to administer its Major Field Tests. This proposal was in the memorandum format that Academic Affairs had previously accepted. The Committee decided that it would accept this format for the time being, since a form for the Assessment Committee has yet to be created and publicized. Dr. Jenkins moved to approve funding of this proposal. Dr. Stuckey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Underwood and was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
November 17, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Monday, November 17, 2008 at 1:00 pm. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary and Dr. Jan Jenkins. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	Dr. Annette Holeyfield moved for the approval of the minutes. Dr. Willie Hoefler seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Sub-Committee Updates	**General Education** Gen Ed Sub-Committee ➢ The sub-committee has been discussing alternate measures of the Gen Ed goals (e.g. tests, surveys). ➢ Its next meeting was scheduled for December 1st. Mr. Wyatt Watson was asked to attend to discuss reporting Gen Ed results in Banner. Ad Hoc Gen Ed Committee ➢ The faculty senate tabled their discussion of the official Gen Ed committee over disagreements about that committee's power to propose and implement changes to the curriculum. ➢ The Assessment Committee members were certain that it should be the Gen Ed Committee's responsibility to analyze the Gen Ed goals to make sure they are still valid and propose changes to them. This was not a point of contention in the Faculty Senate.

	Ozark Campus ➢ The conversation on assessment at Ozark is ongoing. The Ozark faculty and staff were attempting to make the broad ATU Gen Ed goals practical to facilitate the creation of assessment measures. **Non-Academic Assessment** ➢ The sub-committee's November 13 minutes are attached (see below). ➢ The overall plan for non-academic assessment is to match the academic support offices' objectives to individual office mission statements, created from the University Mission Statements. This will satisfy HLC's growing emphasis on university mission. **Motion** On the Non-Academic sub-committee's recommendation, Dr. Roberts made a motion to approve the plan laid out in the sub-committee's minutes and to approve the final draft Non-academic FAQ to be posted online. The motion was unanimously accepted **Online Education** ➢ Online surveys were sent out to students and faculty. The student survey produced 381 responses and pages of comments. The groups are now following up on these results. ➢ The summative reports will be due in November, and a student from each group will report to the Committee at the December 17 meeting.
Gen Ed Survey	Several of the Gen Ed goals are difficult to assess because the courses involved are not systematically assessed by the departments directly responsible for them (with a few exceptions). Since there is no common measure across all sections of a course, an indirect measure must be devised to compensate for this weakness. Dr. Roberts proposed that Academic Affairs (preferably the Vice President, in order to give it authority) should send out feelers to find out from those teaching Gen Ed courses how they address the Gen Ed goals in their classes. ➢ Dr. Dave Roach stated that if this search discovered that some departments are already using quality measures for assessing

	their Gen Ed courses, these measures should be left in place rather than replacing them with Committee-derived measures. ➢ Dr. Holeyfield pointed out that the old Faculty Handbook forced every course to justify how it met the Gen Ed goals. This has since been clarified to require justification for Gen Ed courses only, which means that the information being requested should already be in the course syllabi. ➢ Dr. Brenda Montgomery stated that such justification is required in her department, although it is linked to their accreditation standards rather than the Gen Ed standards. ➢ Dr. Lasey stated that her syllabi have never been critiqued, and some faculty would take such criticism poorly. Dr. Roberts responded that while accredited schools are used to having their syllabus content matched to standards, schools in the humanities and the sciences are less comfortable with the enforcement of the syllabus requirements in the Faculty Handbook. ➢ Dr. Roberts concluded the discussion by stating that Gen Ed is important to the university as a whole and for the accreditation of programs all over campus. The departments and faculty operating Gen Ed courses should be reminded of this responsibility.
Program Assessment Reports	The Deans and Dr. Roberts have been looking over the assessment reports in Tracdat. ➢ Meetings with Dr. Roberts are scheduled when problems are identified in a department's plan. ➢ Follow-up with those without plans was ongoing, as was discussion with the School of Education over its relationship to Tracdat. ➢ Common problem: Most of the programs with poor assessment plans have chronically low numbers of students enrolled (fewer than four in the program). New Task for the Assessment Committee ➢ In the past, the Committee members have received a few assessment reports each to evaluate. As the Deans will now take over this role, the Committee should have a new assignment. ➢ Dr. Roberts proposed that the members become expert

	contacts on assessment for Department Heads on campus. Names will not be publicized with contact information, but Dr. Roberts would serve as the arbiter for referring Department Heads to them for help on specific issues (e.g. one person would be the expert on checking the validity of measures, while another could help with the creation of surveys). ➢ The members were asked to think about what their specialties should be so that a list can be compiled for the December meeting.
Adjournment	A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Lasey and was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Non-academic Assessment Committee Meeting
November 13, 2008 – 2:30 p.m.
Bryan Hall Conference Room

Members Present:

Carol Trusty, Chair, Administration & Finance
Wyatt Watson, Institutional Research
Tammy Rhodes, Academic Affairs
Carey Roberts, Coordinator of University Assessment

Non-members Present:

Patricia Cunningham, Administration & Finance

Members Absent:

Dan Bullock, Academic Representative
Jerry Forbes, Student Services
Bruce Sikes, Ozark Campus

Members discussed the use of the University's organizational chart (found in the Faculty Handbook) to determine what areas will prepare an assessment plan. All areas shown on the organizational chart should be covered by an assessment plan; however, some of the areas may be combined into one plan.

The following members will be responsible for assessment plans as follows:

- Wyatt Watson, President's Office and Development
- Tammy Rhodes, Academic Affairs
- Carol Trusty, Administration and Finance
- Jerry Forbes, Student Services
- Bruce Sikes, Ozark Campus

Each area preparing an assessment plan will prepare a mission statement for their respective area, as well as stated goals. This information will be due February 2, 2009, and will be forwarded to the non-academic assessment committee.

In February and March, 2009, meetings will be scheduled with the departments on how the goals will be measured.

In April, 2009, training on TracDat will be held with the non-academic areas.

The committee recommends that the FAQs be changed from "draft copy" and posted on the assessment website.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
December 17, 2008
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Wednesday, December 17, 2008, at 1:00 pm. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Dr. Carey Roberts, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, and Mr. Bruce Sikes. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present. Student presenters Ms. Kelly Bostick, Mr. Luke Heffley, Ms. Marsha Oels, and Ms. Brandie Soar were present as guests.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	After noting that a member's gender was erroneously ascribed in the November minutes, Dr. Susan Underwood moved for the corrected minutes' approval. Dr. Carey Roberts seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
Sub-Committee Updates	**General Education – Dr. Robin Lasey** The Gen Ed sub-committee focused its efforts in December on phasing itself out, moving authority to the ad hoc Gen Ed Committee, whose charge finally went through the Faculty Senate and will be official beginning in the Fall 2009 semester. These efforts will culminate in a joint meeting between the two bodies in February 2009, at which a report on the Gen Ed assessment plan will be submitted to the Gen Ed Committee. Mr. Wyatt Watson attended the last meeting of the sub-committee to discuss how Gen Ed results may be collected, formatted, and entered into Banner. This discussion resulted in the identification of several problems related to electronic-based assessment at ATU:

- Only two people are intimately familiar with the Tracdat software package, and one of them is graduating in the Spring 2009 semester. If something were to happen to these administrators, it could set assessment on campus back more than a year.
- Someone should be given the responsibility for entering Praxis scores and other test scores into Banner so these can be used for Gen Ed assessment. The University Testing and Disability Service Office was suggested as a possible location for this task.

Non-Academic Assessment – Ms. Carol Trusty

The sub-committee had not met since the last Assessment Committee meeting, but Ms. Trusty reiterated the established deadline of February 2, 2009, for non-academic departments to complete their Mission Statements and office goals and submit them to the sub-committee.

Online Education – Dr. Underwood

Dr. Susan Underwood invited student representatives from the CSP student groups who have been studying online courses over the last semester to present their findings (Documents were posted on the Assessment Committee website under 2008-2009 Results & Data).

Student Perspectives – Mr. Luke Heffley and Ms. Kelly Bostick

- An online survey and statistics from Institutional Research were presented to the Committee. The presenters' conclusions indicated that the student body was generally satisfied with ATU's online courses, felt cheated if their professors were noticeably uninvolved or consistently unavailable, and wanted more information on course requirements and activities before registration.
- The Committee agreed that later studies of online education should account for those students who drop online courses. Mr. Watson said there are three categories for this:
  - Drop Delete (drop before class starts)
  - Drop (drop during the 100% refund period)
  - Withdraw (drop after that 100% refund period)

	The Committee decided that the “Drop Deletes” were not attributable to student performance, though the other two should be considered. Faculty Perspectives – Ms. Marsha Oels and Ms. Brandy Soar ➢ An online survey of faculty who recently taught online courses was presented to the Committee. From a completion rate of 24%, several trends appeared: - Good time management and high levels of motivation are considered necessary for success in online courses. - Faculty involvement is an important motivator for student engagement. - Most faculty were “satisfied” with the Blackboard course management program. Raising Performance in Online Courses – General Discussion ➢ Ms. Soar stated that the current system for online education at ATU may have hit the bounds of how many courses can be offered. Mass expansion of the offerings would not be beneficial to the students, as the problem is not the number of courses, but that some registering students do not have the ability or means to complete such courses successfully. ➢ Ms. Oels proposed a limitation on Freshmen registration in online courses. Ms. Annette Stuckey and Dr. Trey Philpotts both concurred that Freshmen tend to have the most problems in their online courses. ➢ Mr. Watson warned that such a limitation would be difficult to implement, as four programs are online-only. These are the following: - AS and BS in Early Childhood Education - BS in Emergency Administration Management - MS in College Student Personnel Such a limitation would either require these programs’ students to attend seated classes at ATU for their freshmen year or significant reprogramming of Banner, neither of which is feasible. Additionally, this might conflict with an Arkansas law that requires that most Bachelor’s degrees be possible to complete in eight semesters.

	➢ With official limitation being difficult to implement, some proposed that the issue be dealt with through faculty advising. Mr. Heffley stated that on-campus students should be required to explain why they need online courses, as they are currently snatching the slots that off-campus students need. Dr. Roberts proposed that the Advising Center may be the best place to start, as they advise a huge number of the Freshmen who are signing up for online courses. TECH 1001 Assessment – Dr. Underwood ➢ In the Fall 2008 semester, there were 24 sections of TECH 1001 offered, with a standard curriculum that was more or less followed by the professors. Every incoming Freshman was required to take either TECH 1001, CSP 1013, or a discipline-specific intro/orientation course, although they did not necessarily have to pass these as a graduation requirement. ➢ On January 18, 2009, a meeting of those who taught TECH 1001 will be held to discuss problems and correct deficiencies. ➢ The challenge will be the lack of departmental responsibility for the course. It was concluded that as the Office of Academic Affairs draws money from the institutional support fee for the course, it should take the lead in any assessment activities. ➢ As a scholarly exercise, Dr. Underwood will perform a regression assessment of TECH 1001 students during the Spring 2009 semester, tracking how students do in their second semester compared to their projected performance without the introductory course. ➢ Dr. Lasey stated that the Assessment Committee's role in this issue should be to ensure that someone assesses TECH 1001 and that the results are publicized. ➢ The Committee concluded that that publication of results was crucial, for such action would prove the course's efficacy and thereby prevent faculty from viewing it as a self-perpetuating program of dubious quality.
Other Business	Dr. Daniel Bullock will continue his development of a grant request form for recurring tests.

	The Ozark campus will continue to create and revise Tracdat assessment plans. Dr. Roberts recently sent a letter to program directors around campus reminding them that Tracdat is not “assessment” but rather a tool for organizing information. He asked them to consider that if something happened to one of them, would his or her replacement be able to find the program’s assessment data and understand how it fits into an assessment plan. Dr. Robert’s assured them that Tracdat is part of the solution to this problem.
Adjournment	In recognition of grading yet to be done, the entire Committee rose with a motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent was granted and the meeting was adjourned at 2 pm.