

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
February 16, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Monday, February 16, 2009, at 11:30 am. Members present were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Carey Roberts, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol Trusty, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, and Ms. Annette Stuckey. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	After Mr. Wyatt Watson corrected a phrase in the December minutes, Dr. Robin Lasey moved for the minutes' approval. Dr. Susan Underwood seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
<b>General Education</b>	<p>The Gen Ed sub-committee passed its responsibilities to the newly-formed Gen Ed Committee at a joint meeting on February 13, 2009.</p> <p>The Gen Ed Committee's charge was approved by the Faculty Senate and is now posted online at <a href="http://uesc.atu.edu">http://uesc.atu.edu</a>. The Committee will include elected representatives for each school and the Ozark campus, and appointed representatives for Academic Affairs, the Assessment Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Student Government Association. All officers will be elected and/or rotated out on a regular basis.</p> <p>From this point forward, the Assessment Committee will view Gen Ed as a department. Accordingly, the Gen Ed Committee will maintain an assessment plan in Tracdat and report as a distinct unit to any inquiries by the Assessment Committee.</p>

<b>Non-Academic Assessment</b>	<p><b>Reports</b></p> <p>As of February 13, 2009, twelve main campus offices and most Ozark offices had submitted assessment plans to Dr. Roberts. Mr. Jerry Forbes stated that the reports from Student Services would be sent in the near future. Mr. Watson stated that several delinquent offices should not be pressed for another month, as the delay was more likely due to being busy rather than procrastination.</p> <p><b>Tracdat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Training for non-academic program heads will be held in late March and early April.</li> <li>➤ The recent 4.1 upgrade for Tracdat added curriculum mapping to the program's feature set.</li> <li>➤ The Assessment Committee has invited Mr. Dave Choban back to provide advanced administrator training to Dr. Roberts, Mr. Watson, Ms. Beth Giroir, and Ms. Sarah Redford. Dr. Lasey will also attend to discuss Gen Ed with Mr. Choban. This meeting will be held in early March.</li> </ul>
<b>AAACL Spring Conference</b>	<p>The AAACL 2009 Spring Conference is scheduled for April 9<sup>th</sup> at UALR. Dr. Bob Mundhenk will present the keynote speech in the morning, with plenary sessions to be held in the afternoon. A luncheon will also be included.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts noted that the AAACL executive board examined the negative feedback from its Fall 2008 workshop, which suffered from a poor speaker and false advertising regarding its topic, and has promised that these problems would not be repeated.</p> <p>The Assessment Committee will pay the \$20 registration fee for any attendees from ATU and will provide van transportation to Little Rock.</p>
<b>Funding Distribution: Assessment Forum</b>	<p>An Assessment Forum has been planned for Monday, March 2, 2009, in the Williamson Dining Room. This forum's focus is to be non-academic assessment, with Library director Bill Parton headlining the presenters.</p>

	<p>The invitation for this forum will be extended to non-academic program directors and Assessment Committee members. This will not be for faculty.</p> <p><b>Motion</b>  Dr. Roberts made a motion that a menu be created for up to \$10 a plate, with the total cost of the forum not exceeding \$700.  Mr. Watson seconded.  The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<b>Additional Business</b>	<p><b>Storing Praxis Scores in Banner</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Mr. Watson stated that until someone is given the responsibility of entering scores into Banner, the storage process could proceed no further.</li> <li>➤ What is involved in the score entry for Praxis? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores will arrive throughout the year, with a probable figure of thirty to fifty score reports arriving every two months. Mr. Watson noted that for this number of scores, a Banner download would be too inefficient.</li> <li>• There are multiple sub-scores for each Praxis I and II exam, all of which would have to be entered for each student.</li> <li>• Because of security issues, student workers will not be allowed to perform this data entry.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Several Committee members asked Mr. Forbes if the University Testing Center could feasibly take over Praxis score entry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Forbes stated that it could happen, but he did not understand why Teacher Education Student Services would give up control over something so important to their accreditation. The general consensus was that office staff in Education are so overwhelmed already that they don't have time to do the additional data entry.</li> <li>• Mr. Watson explained that entry of Praxis scores was only the beginning. Once Major Field Exams and other departmental test scores are added into Banner, it would be preferable for score entry to be centered in a single office than to leave it in the control of the various departments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><b>Computer Services</b></p> <p>As test scores and Gen Ed assessment become more integrated with other information on Banner, the assessment-related programming tasks being requested of Computer Services are guaranteed to increase. Unfortunately, the task backlog for that office is already too long, and none of its staff is certified to program Banner enhancements.</p> <p>The Assessment Committee decided to consider recommending that a certified Banner/Oracle Forms programmer be hired.</p> <p><b>Recurring Project Grant Form</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts asked Dr. Daniel Bullock to create a new abbreviated grant form for departmental tests and other recurring assessment projects. This two- to three-page form should ask applicants to explain the test/project, the budget, and results for any previous years funded through the assessment grant program.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	<p>Dr. Lasey made a motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:33 pm.</p>

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
March 17, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Tuesday, March 17, 2009, at 2:30 pm. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, 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, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Dr. Dave Roach, and Mr. Bruce Sikes. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 2:33 pm.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	<p>After Dr. Susan Underwood corrected a few errors in the February minutes, she moved for the minutes' approval.</p> <p>Dr. Annette Holeyfield seconded.</p> <p>The motion was passed unanimously.</p>
<b>Non-Academic Assessment</b>	<p>The Committee briefly discussed which offices have still not turned in assessment plans.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts expressed several concerns that arose from examining the submitted non-academic plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Many offices are already performing assessment, but the resulting data remains unrecorded. Example: If an objective is to ensure that every purchase order is funded a few days in advance of the required date, and the person verifying that this is done only reports when there is a problem, the resulting data will be useless and probably won't be collected at all.</li><li>➤ Who will be responsible for Tracdat? Will it be several people in each office, or will it just be the office supervisors?</li></ul>

	<p>Dr. Roberts said that he would finish checking the plans and then meet with the non-academic sub-committee to discuss any other concerns before meeting with the office heads to discuss these issues.</p>
<p><b>General Education</b></p>	<p>Dr. Annette Stuckey reported that the ad hoc General Education Committee was currently looking for short projects that could be completed before its membership changes in May 2009.</p> <p>They recently undertook a project to contact the Heads of those Departments that administer Gen Ed courses in order to find out whether and how these courses are designed to meet the Gen Ed goals.</p>
<p><b>Assessment Grant</b></p>	<p><b>Proposal: Business MFAT</b>  Dr. Tom Tyler of the Business Department requested \$1,890 to purchase and administer 70 ETS Business MFAT tests.</p> <p>Although this proposal was submitted in a non-standard format, it was accepted as the application for recurring projects has not been finalized yet.</p> <p>Mr. Wyatt Watson asked whether the Committee could advertise for the 2009-2010 school year that MFAT proposals would automatically be funded if the applicable department entered the results into Banner. Dr. Roberts responded that this might cause a flood of MFAT proposals that could limit the Committee's ability to fund other projects.</p> <p><b>Motion</b>  Dr. Holeyfield made a motion to fund this proposal for the full \$1,890. Dr. Brenda Montgomery seconded.  The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p><b>AAACL Spring Conference</b></p>	<p>The AAACL 2009 Spring Conference is scheduled for April 9<sup>th</sup> at UALR. Dr. Bob Mundhenk will discuss assessment's relationship with retention and how to balance the conflicting requirements of state regulators and accrediting bodies.</p>

	<p>The Assessment Committee will pay the \$20 registration fee for any attendees from ATU and will provide van transportation to Little Rock.</p>
<p><b>Proposal for a New Sub-Committee</b></p>	<p>Dr. Roberts proposed that a new sub-committee be created to investigate alternative ways to assess programs. As the yearly faculty evaluations include some course-level assessment, he charged it to focus especially on how these may be used by the Committee and Department Heads. The members should feel free to conclude that faculty evaluations are not useful to program assessment and to recommend subsequently that the sub-committee be disbanded.</p> <p>Drs. Hoefler, Holeyfield, Montgomery, and Underwood volunteered to serve with Dr. Roberts on this sub-committee.</p>
<p><b>Additional Business</b></p>	<p><b>Assessment Forum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dr. Roberts praised Mr. Watson's menu choices and Dr. Montgomery's Hospitality faculty and students for the fantastic Assessment Forum held on March 2, 2009.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tracdat</b></p> <p>Mr. Watson mentioned that a major issue currently facing Tracdat at ATU is the lack of single sign-on integration with OneTech (allowing both to share the same password and related security features). He stated that whatever the solution proved to be (e.g. training, hardware, software), it was certain to cost something.</p> <p>He asked whether the Committee considered a single sign-on to be a worthwhile expense. The Committee reacted positively to the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ As the Assessment Committee bought the program, it seems legitimate that the Committee should pay for it to be integrated with the University's existing computer system.</li> <li>➤ It might be easier for faculty to use if they did not have to worry about remembering a separate password or visiting a special web address.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Roberts reworded the question to ask the Committee whether its would support the pursuit of solutions to this problem by Mr. Watson and himself. The Committee members present (9, after some had to leave early) gave its unanimous approval.</p>

<b>Adjournment</b>	Mr. Watson made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.
--------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
April 16, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Tuesday, April 16, 2009, at 1:07 pm. Members present were Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Susan Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Eldon Clary, Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Trey Philpotts, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Annette Stuckey, and Ms. Carol Trusty. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	Dr. Susan Underwood moved to approve the March minutes. Mr. Wyatt Watson seconded. The motion was passed unanimously with six votes.
<b>Budget</b>	<p>Dr. Roberts stated that he expected there to be no far-reaching changes to the Assessment fund, as the restrained distribution practices of Academic Affairs and the Assessment Committee have left it in fairly stable condition.</p> <p>He added that if the Professional Development Fund is curtailed, the Committee should expect an increase in grant proposals. In expectation of this, he recommended that the Committee continue its policy of rejecting grant proposals for travel and conferences.</p> <p>Mr. Watson asked whether the Committee has discretionary control of the Assessment fund or only recommends spending for Academic Affairs' authorization. Dr. Roberts stated that the Committee directly controls a part of the Assessment fund, while Academic Affairs retains control over the rest. If necessary, the Committee can request additional money for assessment grants.</p>

<b>Faculty Handbook</b>	<p>The Alternative Assessment Sub-committee (created in March 2009) met to look over the Peer Review section of the Faculty Handbook for program assessment opportunities. The sub-committee noted that this section has no language connecting student learning with the peer review process.</p> <p>The sub-committee will work over the Summer to finalize a minor revision to the Peer Review section of the Handbook, addressing this wording. The Committee may then make a recommendation in Fall 2009 regarding this revision.</p>
<b>Recommendation: University Policy for Publicizing Assessment Information</b>	<p>The present Committee members agreed in their discussion that every assessed unit should publish its objectives online.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dr. Roberts stated that assessment data should not be published online in such a way that it will be available for other universities to access. Such information may be placed on an intranet at a later time.</li> <li>➤ Mr. Watson warned that the objectives must be easily accessed and clearly labeled, since buried information is no better than no information at all.</li> <li>➤ The original plan from Michael Stoker was to create a template with the LCMS (Luminous Content Management System) that would allow Department or Office Heads to enter and publish their objectives in a unified format quickly. The Committee concluded that too many exceptions in format exist to implement this plan.</li> <li>➤ Another recommended option was to add a button to every department's sidebar. This option was rejected as it would not work with the structure of some existing Department websites and might create a duplicate listing of their majors, one for prospective students and another to satisfy the University.</li> <li>➤ Dr. Underwood mentioned that unifying the format of the ATU departmental websites and publishing objectives were two separate issues and suggested that if the Committee endorsed both, the former would be an impediment to achieving the latter.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Motion</b></p> <p>Dr. Underwood made a motion for the Committee to recommend that “Every assessed program must have all learning objectives publicly available on its website.”</p> <p>Dr. Robin Lasey seconded.</p> <p>The motion was tabled for vote by a quorum at the May meeting.</p> <p><b>Motion</b></p> <p>Mr. Watson made a motion for the Committee to recommend that “Every non-academic unit or office must have its mission statement publicly available on its website.”</p> <p>Dr. Jan Jenkins seconded.</p> <p>The motion was tabled for vote by a quorum at the May meeting.</p>
<b>Update: Non-Academic Assessment</b>	<p>Dr. Roberts reported that Tracdat workshops for the non-academic departments would be held on Tuesday April 21, Thursday April 23, and Friday April 24.</p>
<b>Additional Business</b>	<p><b>General Education</b></p> <p>The Committee discussed issues in General Education at ATU and in the State of Arkansas. Significant problems regarding the collection of the current course-embedded measures in Banner were identified.</p> <p><b>The Future of the Assessment Committee</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts asked the membership to provide their thoughts on the purpose of the Assessment Committee and what avenues should be pursued in the future.</p> <p>The members present made several comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Committee could work with the Self-Study Committee to address the assessment-related problems the latter found while writing its reports.</li> <li>➤ The Committee could work with the Strategic Planning Committee when it gets underway.</li> <li>➤ The Committee should agree at the May meeting upon a regular meeting time for 2009 – 2010, so more members will be able to avoid scheduling classes that conflict with the meetings.</li> </ul>

**Adjournment**

Mr. Watson made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting was adjourned at 2 pm.

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
May 5, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Tuesday, May 5, 2009, at 10:00 am. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Dr. Dave Roach, 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. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Trey Philpotts, and Mr. Bruce Sikes. Dr. Michael Tarver was present as a guest of the Committee. Student representative Mr. Jason Brown was also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	<p>Ms. Carol Trusty moved to approve the April minutes. Ms. Annette Stuckey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Dr. Dave Roach asked that a grammatical quirk be corrected in the April minutes. The Committee agreed and the change was made.</p>
<b>Old Business</b>	<p><b>Pending Motions</b> Dr. Roberts read the tabled motions from the April meeting to the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ “Every assessed program must have all learning objectives publicly available on its website.”</li><li>➤ “Every non-academic unit or office must have its mission statement publicly available on its website.”</li></ul> <p>Both were unanimously approved.</p> <p><b>Non-Academic Assessment</b> Dr. Roberts reported that he has overseen several successful workshops for university staff to introduce them to Tracdat and help them enter their plans. More workshops will be held in June.</p> <p><b>General Education Committee</b> Dr. Robin Lasey described the accomplishments and summer plans</p>

	<p>for the Gen Ed Ad Hoc Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A Gen Ed link has been added to the Current Students page on the ATU website and one is planned for the Faculty page. This link directs viewers to the catalogue's description of the Gen Ed goals and curriculum.</li> <li>➤ The 2010-2011 catalogue will have the Gen Ed goals listed directly under the University Mission Statement, with a signpost to the rest of the Gen Ed information.</li> <li>➤ The Committee's summer projects include entering the Gen Ed assessment information into Tracdat and preparing a Gen Ed website to be uploaded onto the ATU server.</li> </ul>
<p><b>HLC Accreditation</b> <b>Dr. Tarver</b></p>	<p>Dr. Micheal Tarver attended to discuss the progress of the HLC Self-Study and problems uncovered in the process.</p> <p><b>General Education</b></p> <p>Dr. Tarver responded to Dr. Lasey's mention of a Gen Ed website by describing an ongoing effort by the administration and Registrar's Office to create a webpage presenting the Gen Ed curricular requirements for all programs at both ATU campuses. This will meet a requirement by HLC that Gen Ed requirements be readily identifiable and publicly available.</p> <p>Dr. Lasey recommended that Dr. Tarver cooperate with the Gen Ed Committee in the creation of this webpage. Dr. Tarver stated that this website will be administered by the Registrar's office, as it must remain up-to-date for accreditation. It also covers the Gen Ed curriculum, which Dr. Tarver considered outside the Gen Ed Committee's task, which is overseeing assessment of the Gen Ed Goals. Dr. Lasey replied that there should be some collaboration to prevent overlap between their websites.</p> <p><b>Problem: Russellville – Ozark Integration</b></p> <p>Dr. Tarver explained that the greatest challenge of the self-study is obtaining information on the University when the integration of its two campuses is ongoing. There remains a question of where the institutions' interests meet and where they should be separate.</p> <p>The Ozark campus was expected to be an issue in the Self-Study, as it has a number of qualities that distinguish it from the main campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ozark had no publicly-available information on what courses</li> </ul>

are considered part of the General Education curriculum, even in its catalogue. This is another reason why the Registrar's Gen Ed Curriculum webpage is necessary.

- All committee positions are appointed. No apparatus for faculty elections exists at the Ozark campus.
- There is no Faculty Handbook for Ozark personnel.
- No tenure plan exists at the Ozark campus.
- No formal Professional Development Fund at the Ozark campus.

The Self-Study's organization contributed to this problem. An effort was made to ensure involvement of Ozark personnel in each Self-Study sub-committee; however, once the sub-committees met, they divided their criteria among their members. This meant that the sub-committee reports had huge gaps, with most of these sub-criteria receiving no attention at all from Ozark personnel, since they were not working on all criteria. This forced Dr. Tarver, the Self-Study Committee, and the Ozark administration to comb the sub-committee reports multiple times to identify and remedy these gaps.

#### **Problem: Faculty-Weighted Report**

Another difficulty in completing the self-study has been that it is faculty-led. This caused the sub-committee reports to be weighted heavily on faculty experiences and activities. Gaps remain regarding the activities of staff and students. Dr. Tarver expressed his hope that the editors, next year's open meetings, and the 2009-10 Student Government Association will provide the necessary feedback to redress this bias.

#### **Timeline**

Referring to his handout (attached to the bottom of this document), Dr. Tarver said that 2009 is the primary year for HLC preparation. The original plan was to have all the sub-committee reports submitted in January, but as the last sub-committee report was not submitted until April, the plan has been adjusted. Editing the draft report will take place during the summer, and the result will be presented for comment at open meetings for faculty and staff early in fall 2009.

#### **Assessment Committee Contribution**

Dr. Tarver asked the Assessment Committee to read over the Self-Study draft report and provide feedback from a university-wide

	<p>perspective. He said that he would complete the first round of editing in May and will email a copy of the draft report to the Committee members after June 15. The resulting lists of recommendations and comments coming from the Assessment Committee and the Faculty Senate should foster some valuable discussions at the open meetings.</p> <p>This feedback will be crucial to satisfying the HLC site team, which will expect the university to have identified problems and made plans to correct them. Perfection is not an expectation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Example: The University exists to promote student learning, yet the Faculty Handbook section on Peer Review provides little guidance on identifying excellence in teaching. Instead, it serves as a portfolio-building manual to faculty seeking promotion. This conflict should be addressed in the final report.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Business</b>	<p><b>The Future of the Assessment Committee</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts explained that the Committee would be involved in evaluating the assessment plans from Tracdat following the June 30 completion deadline for all. Because of low attendance at Committee meetings this last semester and a dwindling number of new, substantive topics to discuss, he proposed that future meetings take place periodically, rather than monthly.</p> <p><b>Budget</b></p> <p>The Committee will continue to administer Assessment Grants in the 09-10 year; however, it had come to Dr. Roberts attention that some faculty are advising students to not be concerned with their performance on the tests used for departmental assessment, as these usually have no bearing on student grades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ He stated that students must be made to understand that doing their best allows the composite results to reflect more accurately their degree programs' quality.</li> <li>➤ He suggested that the Committee membership encourage their faculty colleagues to promote student effort instead of telling students that the results will not affect them.</li> <li>➤ Dr. Jenkins replied with a warning that simply encouraging students to do their best and then trusting them to do so may be a better course, as stressing results could induce test anxiety and skew the outcomes.</li> </ul>



	<p><b>Membership Changes</b></p> <p>Dr. Trey Philpotts will not be on the Committee next year, as his single year term for the Faculty Senate has ended. To the knowledge of the membership present, the new appointment remained pending at the time of this meeting.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the 08-09 year, Mr. Jason Brown will end his term as Graduate Assistant and Graduate Student Representative to the Assessment Committee. The Committee applauded in recognition of his two years of dedicated service.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	<p>Dr. Roach made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 am.</p>

**2010-2011 Re-Accreditation of Arkansas Tech University**  
**by the Higher Learning Commission**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Scheduled ATU Event</b>	<b>Expected HLC/NCA Event</b>
<b>2007</b>		
Summer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-Study Coordinator appointed</li> <li>• Executive Committee appointed</li> </ul>	
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee Members attend HLC Workshop</li> <li>• Commission to be notified of preferred dates for visit</li> <li>• Steering Committee organizational meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sends three-year reminder letter to organization reminding it of scheduled evaluation</li> </ul>
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee develops a Self-Study Plan and submits it to HLC Liaison</li> </ul>	
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-Committees begins to gather data and develop drafts to submit to the Steering Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff Liaison reviews plan and provides feedback</li> </ul>
December		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCA sends Annual Meeting information and registration packets to institutions</li> </ul>
<b>2008</b>		
April 11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee members attend HLC/NCA Annual Meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff Liaisons make presentations on self-study and other topics, meet with organizations at the Annual Meeting</li> </ul>
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim reports completed by Sub-Committees</li> </ul>	
June - December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Committee analyzes rough drafts of Self-Study Report</li> </ul>	
December		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff Liaison sends two-year reminder letter to organization reminding it of scheduled evaluation</li> <li>• NCA sends Annual Meeting information and registration packets to institutions</li> </ul>

<b>2009</b>		
Early Spring	• Sub-Committees revise first draft to submit to the Self-Study Coordinator	
Spring	• Self-Study Coordinator meets with Ozark Senior Administration to review report draft to ensure ATU-O inclusion	
April 17-21	• HLC/NCA Annual Meeting	• Staff Liaisons make presentations on self-study and other topics, meet with organizations at the Annual Meeting
May - August	• Steering Committee analyzes rough drafts of Self-Study Report	
August	• Self-Study Coordinator circulates and receives reactions to first draft of report	
September 1	• Open Meeting on Russellville Campus to discuss first draft of report (3:00-5:00pm - East Dining Room)	
September 3	• Open Meeting on Ozark Campus to discuss first draft of report (9:00 – 11:00 a.m.)	
September	• Self-Study Report revised	
October	• Steering Committee circulates and receives reactions to second draft of report	• HLC confirms date of visit and other organizational information
November 16	• Open Meeting on Ozark Campus to discuss second draft of report (9:00 – 11:00 a.m.)	
November 19	• Open Meeting on Russellville Campus to discuss second draft of report (3:00-5:00pm - East Dining Room)	
December	• Self-Study Report revised	
<b>2010</b>		
January	• Steering Committee circulates and receives reactions to third draft of report	
February 24	• Open Meeting on Russellville Campus to discuss third draft of report (3:00-5:00pm - East Dining Room)	
February 26	• Open Meeting on Ozark Campus to discuss third draft of report (2:00 – 4:00 p.m.)	
March – April	• Self-Study Report Editors finalize writing of Self-Study Report	• Staff Liaison sends one-year reminder letter to organization reminding it of scheduled evaluation
April	• Self-Study Coordinator attends HLC/NCA Annual Meeting	• Staff Liaisons make presentations on self-study and other topics, meet with organizations at the Annual Meeting
May	• Self-Study Report to be submitted to University President	
June	• Comments on proposed team members sent to HLC • Self-Study Report to be submitted to ATU Board of Trustees	• HLC sends a list of proposed team members and an Evaluation Summary Sheet to Arkansas Tech University

July – August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATU distributes information to its constituencies regarding request for third party comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLC formally invites team members to participate</li> </ul>
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional Snapshot completed</li> </ul>	
August – November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-Study Report to be finalized, duplicated, and distributed</li> </ul>	
October		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLC notifies ATU and team members that team is complete</li> </ul>
November		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Chair contacts ATU to make arrangements for evaluation visit</li> <li>• HLC sends materials for the visit to team and to ATU</li> </ul>
December		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCA sends Annual Meeting information and registration packets to institutions</li> </ul>
<b>2011</b>		
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATU sends one complete set of evaluation materials to each member of the Evaluation Team and to the Commission Liaison</li> <li>• ATU shares Self-Study Report with institutional constituencies</li> </ul>	
February 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource Room Finalized</li> </ul>	
March 14-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evaluation Visit</b></li> <li>• <b>Begin transition from self-study to action plans/implementation</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Evaluation Visit</b></li> </ul>
April		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Visit Chair completes draft of Team Report and sends it to HLC staff and team members for review</li> </ul>
April – May		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLC staff liaison discusses draft with Team Chair</li> <li>• Team members submit corrections to Team Chair</li> </ul>
June		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Chair sends draft Team Report to Arkansas Tech University for correction of errors of fact</li> </ul>
July (2 weeks after receiving draft Team Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATU responds to draft Team Report with corrections of errors of fact</li> </ul>	
August		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Chair completes final Team Report and submits it to the Higher Learning Commission</li> <li>• HLC duplicates Team Report and sends copies to ATU and the team members</li> </ul>
August (2 weeks after receiving final Team Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATU sends response to Team Report to Higher Learning Commission and team and chooses a Readers Panel or Review Committee</li> </ul>	

**Self-Study Steering Committee:** Micheal Tarver (Coordinator), Glenn Sheets (Chair - Criterion One), Pamela Carr (Chair - Criterion Two), Eldon Clary (Chair - Criterion Three), Susan Underwood (Chair - Criterion Four), Donna Vocate (Chair - Criterion Five), Bruce Sikes, Sandra Cheffer, Carey Roberts, Carol Trusty, Wyatt Watson, David Underwood, Timothy Smith, and Hanna Norton.

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
September 15, 2009  
Ross Pendergraft Library Room 325

The Assessment Committee met in the Ross Pendergraft Library Room 325 on Tuesday, September 15, 2009; at 2:00 pm. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Mary Gunter, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Jeff Robertson, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Ms. Karen Riddell, Dr. David Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Student representatives Ms. Danielle Jolie and Ms. Savanna Knight were also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	Dr. David Roach moved to approve the May minutes. Dr. Susan Underwood seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
<b>Old Business</b>	<p>Dr. Roberts updated the Committee on the assessment reports from the summer and briefly discussed some of the strengths and weaknesses that were discovered.</p> <p><b>August Assessment Forum</b> Dr. Glenn Bishop and Mr. Ray Moll put on a forum luncheon at the Williamson Dining Hall. At the forum, Dr. Daniel Bullock and Dr. Ed Leachman shared their assessment contributions. Dr. Bullock gave a brief tutorial of how to use clickers in a classroom. Dr. Roberts commented that the forum was a success overall. Ms. Carol Trusty agreed. Dr. Jeff Robertson added that clickers are very helpful, and their cost is minimal.</p> <p>Dr. Roberts reminded everyone that Tech is entering into the final phase of our assessment effort, “focusing now on faculty and students” and focusing on the deans’ non-academic leadership teams on both campuses. He added that we need to plan to engage more faculty members in assessment.</p>

	<p><b>Summer 2009 Assessment Reports</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts reported that most of the Academic Departments completed their assessment plans in a timely manner. The Departments that were behind are now up to par. Results are being collected, information is being analyzed, and weaknesses have been discovered in several departments. Discussion followed regarding those Colleges and departments where assessment needs more attention.</p> <p>Almost every non-academic office has assessment plans. Student Services is well off and ahead, while Finance is good in some areas and not-so-good in others.</p> <p>Two areas where assessment is making the greatest difference is in the Development Office and in Student Recruitment.</p>
<p><b>New Business</b></p>	<p><b>University Assessment Policy</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts explained that as an institution we do not have a University Assessment Policy and proposed that it might be a good idea to have one. There is a Frequently Asked Questions page on the Assessment Committee website that is open to the public.</p> <p><b>Student Learning and Peer Review</b></p> <p>Dr. Roberts proposed the committee explore ways into which assessment data can be included into the peer review process. Discussion ensued concerning the difference between assessing academic programs and student learning verses faculty evaluations. Several members insisted that assessment must be kept separate from faculty evaluations.</p> <p>Dr. Underwood stressed that assessment can play a role in strengthening faculty portfolios for tenure and promotion.</p> <p><b>“Arkansas Tech Day” and Assessment Activities</b></p> <p>Several Universities and Colleges have a day or week that students engage in assessment activities and see the University as a whole.</p> <p>Discuss focused on the pros and cons of a day or week during the</p>

	<p>academic year where students, faculty, and staff would focus their assessment efforts.</p> <p><b>Assessment and Accreditation Visits</b>  Different Departments are preparing for Accreditation visits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ NLNAC (Nursing)—Spring 2009, Reaccredited</li> <li>➤ COAEMSP (Ozark Paramedic Program)—September 2009</li> <li>➤ ABET (Both Engineering Programs)—October 2009</li> <li>➤ AACSB (College of Business)—February 2010</li> <li>➤ CAPTE (Physical Therapy)—January 2010</li> <li>➤ HLC (University)—March 2011</li> <li>➤ NCATE (College of Education)—Spring 2013</li> </ul> <p>Remember that different departments may need help from the Assessment Committee while going through the Accreditation process. This is an opportunity to educate and help others with assessment.</p> <p><b>General Education Assessment</b>  Dr. Robin Lasey was not present to give an update on the General Education Assessment. Dr. Roberts acknowledged that data collected for this assessment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Critical Thinking</li> <li>➤ Qualitative</li> <li>➤ Scientific Reasoning</li> </ul> <p><b>Assessment Grants, 2009—2010</b>  Dr. Roberts asked if everyone would look over the handout, <i>Application Guidelines for Recurring Assessment Project Grants and Budget</i>, for any problems or suggestions.</p>
<b>Additional Business</b>	<p><b>Membership Changes</b>  Dr. Robertson replaced Dr. Trey Philpotts after his year of term on the Faculty Senate ended. Dr. Mary Gunter replaced Dr. Clary. Ms. Danielle Jolie replaced Mr. Jason Brown as the Graduate Student Representative. While Savanna Knight is the Undergraduate Student Representative.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	<p>Dr. Susan Underwood made the motion to adjourn. Dr. Brenda Montgomery seconded the motion. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.</p>

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.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	<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>
<b>Old Business</b>	<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><b>Faculty Portfolio Enhancement</b></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><b>Annual Assessment Activities</b></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>
<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Department Head Training</b></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>
<b>Additional Business</b>	No additional business was addressed.
<b>Adjournment</b>	Dr. Robin Lasey made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
November 16, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Monday, November 16, 2009, at 3:18 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. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Jeff Robertson, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Ms. Carol Trusty, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Members absent were Dr. Mary Gunter, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Ms. Karen Riddell, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Dr. David Underwood, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Student representatives Ms. Danielle Jolie and Ms. Savanna Knight were also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:18 pm.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	Ms. Savanna Knight moved to approve the November minutes. Dr. Robin Lasey seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.
<b>New Business</b>	<p>Dr. Roberts asked for a motion to cover grant applications and proposals first instead of addressing the agenda topics in the given order.</p> <p>Dr. David Roach moved to disregard the format of the agenda. Dr. Brenda Montgomery seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Grant Applications</b></p> <p>Dr. Daniel Bullock presented the grant applications and proposals to the committee.</p> <p><b>Student Perceptions of College Environmental Factors</b></p> <p>The Department of Retention Services requested \$3,717.00 to fund the purchase and analysis of Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) surveys.</p> <p>Although the committee has funded this proposal before, there was a motion to postpone funding approval until the committee has received a report from Retention Services on results of previously awarded</p>

	<p>grants. Dr. Roberts motioned to table until the December meeting. Dr. Jan Jenkins seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Physics Major Program Assessment</b>  Dr. James Musser and Hamed Shojaei from the Department of Physical Science requested \$818.00 for the purchase of the physics major field test for seniors; 30 tests at \$27.00 each.</p> <p>Dr. Bullock, Dr. Lasey, and Dr. Robertson pointed out that these field tests change every year and that there are not thirty physics majors. The purchase of thirty tests would not be necessary. Dr. Roberts motioned to modify approval to fund the total number actually needed for the Spring Semester for 2010. Dr. Lasey moved the motion. Savanna Knight seconded, and the motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Enhance Student Learning in Inorganic Chemistry</b>  The last grant proposal was submitted by Charles Mebi, who was requesting funding for supplies and exams to introduce new experiments for inorganic chemistry. Also requested funding for travel in order to present results. Performing these experiments would help assess students' problem-solving, analysis, communication, research ethics, and meta-cognition skills.</p> <p>This proposal is not reoccurring. The committee amended the proposal by funding the request for supplies and denying the request for funding travel expenses, making the total \$2011.00. Dr. Brenda Montgomery moved this motion for amendment. Dr. Susan Underwood seconded. The motion to fund only supplies was passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Assessment Requirements for Curricular Change</b>  What should be placed in the curricular change forms regarding assessment? The inclusion of an example for the section on the form was discussed, at the suggestion of Dr. Holeyfield.</p>
<p><b>Old Business</b></p>	<p><b>Department Head Training, January 2009</b>  Department heads want specific guidance for what is expected for program assessment. Conducting a Department Head Workshop in January before spring semester starts would be helpful for department heads. The workshop should give examples of assessment techniques and have questionnaires for department heads to fill out</p>

	<p>and discuss. Also emphasize the importance of having student learning objectives, faculty involvement, communicating and making use of results.</p> <p>The committee decided to finalize details for the workshop at the December committee meeting.</p>
<b>Additional Business</b>	No additional business was discussed.
<b>Adjournment</b>	Dr. Susan Underwood made the motion to adjourn. Unanimous consent to the motion was granted, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 pm.

Arkansas Tech University  
Assessment Committee Minutes  
December 14, 2009  
Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber

The Assessment Committee met in the Mary Anne Salmon SGA Senate Chamber on Monday, December 14, 2009, at 10:32 am. Members present were Dr. Jerry Forbes, Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Dr. Jan Jenkins, Dr. Robin Lasey, Dr. Dave Roach, Dr. Carey Roberts, Dr. Jeff Robertson, Ms. Tammy Rhodes, Mr. Bruce Sikes, Ms. Carol Trusty, and Mr. Wyatt Watson. Members absent were Dr. Daniel Bullock, Dr. Mary Gunter, Mr. Ron Hutain, Dr. Willie Hoefler, Ms. Savanna Knight, Dr. Brenda Montgomery, Ms. Karen Riddell, Ms. Annette Stuckey, Dr. David Underwood, and Dr. Susan Underwood. Student representative Ms. Danielle Jolie was also present.

<b>Call To Order</b>	Dr. Carey Roberts called the meeting to order at 10:32 am.
<b>Approval of the Minutes</b>	Dr. Robin Lasey motioned to suspend reading the minutes. Dr. David Roach seconded, the motion was passed unanimously. Dr. Lasey also motioned to approve the December minutes and Dr. Roach. The motion unanimously passed.
<b>Old Business</b>	<p><b>Student Services Grant</b></p> <p>Dr. Jerry Forbes presented a summary of actions to the committee that has taken place due to results demonstrated by the student satisfaction inventory surveys. After Dr. Forbes presented the material the floor was open for any questions.</p> <p>The data is published in both electronic and hard copy forms and funnels back through to each vice president. Discussion of the benefits of entering SSI data into Argos.</p> <p>Discussion of whether any mechanism exists that would enable data to be connected back to implementations and strategic planning. Dr. Forbes explained that the Student Satisfaction Inventory creates information regarding the importance of various issues to students, as well as their satisfaction with the way Tech addresses those issues. Mr. Sikes also asked whether other departments are using these findings. Mr. Forbes said he is unsure of how other departments use this information.</p>

Ten questions on the SSI are reserved for the Assessment Committee. The deadline to submit these questions through Dr. Forbes's office is in late January. The General Education Committee will meet in January and discuss whether they would like to submit one or two questions for the survey. Assessment can be useful in resource allocation; the Student Satisfaction Inventory could be the best example of resource allocation on campus.

Fund the Student Service Grant request of \$3,717.00 for the SSI, with agreement to reserve the ten questions on the survey for use by Assessment Committee.

Dr. Lasey moved to fund this request. Dr. Jenkins seconded, and the motion was passed unanimously.

### **Curricular Changes and Assessment**

Assessment of student learning regularly culminates in two points. One is when a faculty member decides to change teaching method because of some outcome demonstrated by the evaluation process, but this is not easily documented. When changes are made to courses and curriculum, however, the goal of the process is to document how the changes are the result of the assessment process. The course change form is one of the few places where this sort of change can be documented.

Discussion of a new assessment and curriculum change process form. Dr. Lasey requested that the General Education proposals section be modified to state "...from your department or general education assessment efforts..."

Discussion of appropriate language for course proposal/curriculum change forms: these should not be so narrow as to eliminate creativity but should not be so vague as to allow change without justification.

Discussion followed over hasty submissions of in order to meet the October 1 deadline for course proposals and changes. The requirement for justification on these forms must be given more attention.

The incorporation of an assessment rationale would be helpful; the more faculty see the word "assessment" the more knowledgeable they will be. This will also help to create the requisite "climate of assessment" encouraged by accreditation bodies.

There was unanimous consent to Dr. Lasey's amendment to the General Education portion of the form. Dr. Roach moved that the

	<p>suggestion be forwarded to the Curriculum. Dr. Lasey seconded, and the motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Department Head Training</b> The department head workshop, which was to be held before classes resume in January, has been postponed. The committee will discuss details of a workshop at the January meeting.</p>
<b>New Business</b>	<p><b>Assessment Website Update</b> The new website is up and running. Dr. Roberts asked the committee to look over the website and make any notes of suggestions.</p> <p><b>Spring Semester Assessment Workshop</b> It would be helpful to have a workshop for faculty that discusses use of assessment methods and outcomes in the preparation of faculty portfolios.</p> <p><b>Spring Meeting Times</b> Discussion of possible meetings schedule for Spring 2010 semester. Tuesday afternoons appear to be the best option.</p>
<b>Additional Business</b>	<p>Dr. Roberts mentioned that next semester we want to focus on strategic planning and faculty and assessment.</p>
<b>Adjournment</b>	<p>Dr. Lasey moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 11:28 am.</p>