minutes

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

*Date | time* 10/19/2016 1:00 PM | *Meeting called by* Christine Austin

Committee members

Phillip Harp, Academic Advising | Lindsey Ingmire, IMSSO | Courtney Kline, Admissions | Aubrey Holt, Campus Life | Rhonda Fleming, Registrar (absent) | Cheryl Moody, Administration & Finance | Lindelle Frazier, Student Services | Ken Wester, OIS | Tiffany Henry, Sponsored Programs | Christine Austin, OAIE (chair) | Jordan Denton, OAIE (absent)

| Agenda |
| --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER**: Meeting officially began at 1:03pm. Last month’s minutes accepted unanimously.**NEW BUSINESS:** Dr. Austin opened the meeting by informing the committee that Jordan would be taking the lead for the meeting for this month. Jordan handed out a packet of information to the committee members containing the following information. 1. Mapping
	1. Broken down into both the department domain, as well as the office domain.
2. Outcomes – Student Services & Gen Ed
	1. Pages 3-6 of the handout.
	2. Page 3 (front & back) explains what the Student Services outcome domains are.
	3. Page 4 – 5 explains what the learning outcomes for general education and what you would be looking for.
	4. Page 6 offers a screen shot of what the assessment plan might potentially look like.
3. Yearly Assessment Review
	1. Needs to be submitted at the beginning of the year to show what is going to be attempted to be addressed by that department/office during the course of the year.
	2. Measure criteria for successes and the assessment method
	3. The yearly review is based on the academic year, not the fiscal year.
4. Assessment Report Review
	1. Each check list is specific to the program for which it is designed for, weather academic or administrative, and is depended upon weather the outcome is learning or non-learning based
5. One-Page Assessment Summary
	1. Is done at the end of the academic year.
6. Assessment Plan Templet
	1. Is done whenever a new program or service is added.
	2. Academics and Administration has to do this so we make sure the assessment is being done from the creation of the service.
	3. Right now the office is looking to transfer the form from a paper copy to a digital one.

 A question was asked about the “Office Domains & Dimensions” (p2) of the hand out. Is the goal of each office to hit each category of the sheet? Jordan answered by letting the committee know that hitting all domains and dimensions was absolutely not required, but emphasized that each office should strive to hit as many as possible. While one office is not necessarily expected to cover all of them, if a domain or dimension is not being addressed by the overall department that would be something to look at. Jordan mentioned that both pages of the mapping in the packet were not set in stone, and that the Assessment office was looking at adding to them in the future.  A question was asked, “will each office have to match their mapping to those of the committee?” Jordan answered, “not as long as the domains are being met to some degree”. After answering the question, Jordan informed the committee that for the next meeting the university mission, once finally approved, would have to be addressed. Jordan explained how once approved, all of the general education, student services, and administrative office outcomes would have to connect back to the university mission statement.  Moving on from the university mission statement, Jordan and Dr. Austin mentioned to the committee that all of the self-assessment reviews will be done before Higher Learning Commission (HLC) arrives on campus. Dr. Austin stated that a review should be done every five years, including one for the year in which the report is being submitted. Dr. Austin emphasized that when it comes to assessment plans, validity and reliability do not have to be as rigorous as in research because it is less of a concern for the assessment process.  Jordan went over the new Blackboard Shell with the committee. Jordan mentioned that the shell would contain information on both non-academics and administration. Committee members are going to be given access to the shell at the close of the meeting. Over the course of the next few days, content would be added to the shell. A question was asked, “How many non-academic departments are there?” Jordan answered by saying that she did not have an exact number, but knew that combined there are about 337 academic and non-academic programs. Jordan mentioned that an email was sent out to offices looking for volunteers to see who would go first for review. Dr. Austin mentioned that as of now, TracDat was the software the university uses, but pointed out that she was looking into potentially replacing it with a better alternative. As of the meeting, no decisions or avenues have been taken upon. Dr. Austin mentioned that some of the bigger flaws with TracDat is that it does not allow for year to year trend analysis, and that each office has to be looked at individually instead of an aggregate view. Jordan mentioned that her end of the year project is to complete an assessment manual. Jordan is looking at creating something online that is more inclusive by adding links in order to break down things. By next semester, committee members will be taking a look at different sections as a means of providing feedback. Jordan concluded by mentioning the possibility of having an Assessment Day and naming it “Curious Jerry Day”. Ideas such as, “what does Jerry want to know?” as a means of introducing assessment to the campus wide community. The potential event would be held toward the end of the academic year, potentially in April as a fun day. The purpose of Curious Jerry Day would be to make the assessment process easier, while showcasing what is being done across campus. Anyone who would want an assessment grant would be expected to present during the event.   |
| **OTHER BUSINESS:** None |
| **Future Agenda Items & Meeting Dates:** Wednesday, November 16th at 1pm in Brown 355 |
| **Announcements: None**  |
| **ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting officially ended at 1:50pm |