

Arkansas Tech University
Assessment Committee Minutes
October 12, 2009
Ross Pendergraft Library Room 325

The Assessment Committee met in the Ross Pendergraft Library Room 325 on Monday, October 12, 2009; at 3:00 pm. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Jeff Robertson, Mr. Bruce Sikes, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Mary Gunter, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Ms. Karen Riddell, Dr. Dave Roach, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. David Underwood, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Student representatives Ms. Danielle Jolie and Ms. Savanna Knight were also present.

Call To Order	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
Approval of the Minutes	<p>Dr. Annette Holeyfield moved to approve the September minutes. Ms. Savanna Knight seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts and Mr. Sikes asked that the acronym for the Paramedic program at Ozark be checked for accuracy.</p>
Old Business	<p>Dr. Roberts mentioned that if changing the name “peer review” is something the committee is interesting in doing, then a subcommittee should be devised before January.</p> <p>Faculty Portfolio Enhancement</p> <p>There must be a sharp line between faculty and academic assessment. In the September meeting Dr. Susan Underwood brought up using departmental assessment information to enhance faculty promotion and tenure portfolios.</p> <p>Discussion continued on how best to use the program assessment of student learning and what steps should be taken to avoid confusing student learning assessment with faculty evaluations.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts reminded everyone that there is supposed to be a narrative in annual faculty reviews highlighting any changes made in teaching, service, and scholarship. Discussion ensued regarding how some faculty incorporate their assessment of student learning in their courses into their</p>

annual faculty review.

Several committee members provided examples of how faculty use program and course assessment in their departments. Focus was placed on the advantages to both faculty and students gained through “course” evaluations [as opposed to “faculty” evaluations].

Ms. Savanna Knight commented that when she filled out course evaluations, the questions would enable her to recall what she had learned, and that would help her to decide whether the course was effective.

Dr. Roberts asked faculty members how they engaged assessment of their programs and how information gleaned from departmental efforts was distributed to faculty.

Dr. Robertson and Dr. Jenkins said their departments meet semi-annually to discuss assessment, exit interviews, and peer reviews. Dr. Montgomery added that her department normally has an off campus retreat together to focus and discuss assessment.

Mr. Bruce Sikes said the peer review portion of the portfolio is relatively new to the Ozark campus.

University-Wide Assessment Policy

Dr. Roberts repeated Dr. Gunter’s comment from the previous meeting that great care should always be given when creating a university-wide policy. He added that while assessment efforts appear to be on the right path, there are some things that every department and office should be doing. Dr. Montgomery suggested having criteria for each department so they knew what was exactly expected of them.

Dr. Roberts added that in the process of creating a self-study report for the Higher Learning Commission, attention has been given to the university’s “mission” documents. Having a succinct assessment policy as part of those mission documents could help clarify some lingering confusion and stress the importance of assessment of student learning for our students, faculty, and staff. He noted that it does not have to be called ‘University Wide Assessment Policy’.

Mr. Sikes asked if it would be heading in the way of a Faculty Senate Governance. Dr. Roberts said that technically it does not have to go through the University, but Dr. Robertson could act as a liaison and let the University know what we are doing.

Dr. Lasey made the suggestion of having a subcommittee to create a

	<p>"How to Assess" document. Members of the subcommittee should include some department heads and those people who are making good assessment efforts. Dr. Holeyfield and Dr. Susan Underwood were suggested candidates for the subcommittee.</p> <p>Mr. Watson seconded the motion for the subcommittee. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Annual Assessment Activities</p> <p>Discussion followed with regard to a day or week's activities to focus student attention on assessment. The committee is currently pleased with participation and did not show an interest in having an annual assessment activity.</p>
New Business	<p>Department Head Training</p> <p>Dr. Roberts repeated what he considered the major phases of assessment efforts at Arkansas Tech. At this stage, the key focus should be getting program assessment results to the people best equipped to analyze that data and implement positive changes to correct any weaknesses.</p> <p>Faculty being involved is a definite issue of this process. Dr. Lasey suggested making a survey for department heads allowing them to communicate through their departments what is needed for assessment. Mr. Wyatt Watson recommended checking with Dr. David Underwood, as he might already have a template for this.</p> <p>Dr. Lasey asked about the status of an assessment newsletter in order to share ideas and results with other department heads. At this time, no newsletter has been published.</p> <p>Dr. Robertson said that the department heads are supposed to meet together yet have failed to do so. He asked Dr. Roberts to assist him in putting together an agenda or a topic to entice a meeting with department heads.</p> <p>Dr. Bullock asked whether any grant requests have been received. Dr. Roberts stated grant requests would be addressed at the next meeting.</p>
Additional Business	No additional business was addressed.
Adjournment	Dr. Robin Lasey made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

