The Minutes of
UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The Assessment Committee met Wednesday, August 28, 2013 at 1:00pm in Rothwell 456. The following were present:

Dr. Monica Varner (Chair)	Dr. Stephen Jones	Dr. Patricia Buford
Mr. Wyatt Watson	Ms. Amy Pennington	Dr. Mary Gunter
Dr. Jan Jenkins	Dr. David Roach	Dr. Susan Underwood
Dr. Robin Lasey	Dr. William Hoefler	Ms. Annette Stuckey
Ms. Audra Porter		

Guest Presenters:
Dr. Ed Bashaw, Dean of the College of Business
Dr. Stephen Jones, Associate Dean of the College of Business

Absent:
Mr. Bruce Sikes	Dr. Rick Ihde
Dr. Annette Holeyfield	Ms. Marilyn Johnson

Call to Order   Dr. Varner called the meeting to order.

College of Business
Assessment Introduction:
Dr. Bashaw provided an introduction of the ETS field exams and a description of the standardized measures used by the College of Business and accreditation process.

College of Business
Grant Proposal   Dr. Jones provided an explanation of the assessment questions regarding the Fall 2013 grant requests to fund the ETS, iSkills, and DIT-2 tests. (See Appendix One).

Dr. Jones provided answers to the following questions asked by the committee during his presentation:

- Is the online class' tests given in a classroom or online?
- Can the online students take the tests individually?
- Do you let the online students take the tests at their own pace?
- Can online students choose when they want to take the tests?
- How do you know the person taking the test is really the person taking the test?
- What is the incentive of the student to do well on these tests?

- Do you (College of Business) have a means of purchasing these tests if the grants were no longer available?
- Does your accrediting body have any requirements for the percentage of your budget to go to assessment?

Evaluation   Dr. Varner submitted the College of Business grant application evaluation rubric (see Appendix B), the application guidelines for assessment project grants, and the financial grant history of the College of Business. The committee discussed if the grant for the DIT-2 and iSkills met the criteria for the new and innovative grant, it was determined it did not since both instruments had been given in previous years. The motion was made by Dr. Underwood to merge the two grants since the three assessment instruments were all recurring assessment projects, and award the College of Business the maximum amount for recurring grant which is $5000.00. Dr. Jenkins seconded the motion. In favor 9; opposed 1.

Other Business   Dr. Varner shared a grant proposal on behalf of the Behavioral Sciences Department regarding attendance to a service learning conference. The Behavioral Sciences department head and faculty member are requesting grant money to attend the conference to learn how to implement course embedded service learning in general education and program core courses. They also plan to assess student learning from the service learning project, by applying general education and program student learning outcomes. The item was tabled for further review of university policy for off-campus service learning opportunities.

Adjournment   The meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

(Appendix A)

College of Business
Dr. Stephen Jones, Associate Dean of College of Business

(1) Are these standardized tests administered in a controlled environment, are the exams proctored by the University Testing Center or College of Business faculty members? How do you assure the integrity of the exam?

> The Educational Testing Service has intended for these exams - the Major Field Test and the iSkills Assessment - to be administered under the direction of a faculty member within the context of a course. Faculty members are given protocols to follow to ensure the integrity of the assessment to the extent possible. The College of Business has administered each of these exams following these protocols in the past, the MFT since 1995 and the iSkills in 2008/2009.

(2) Explain the different sample sizes for the requested tests. ETS sample size is 70, iSkills and DIT-2 is 225 and 250.

> The ETS MFT is given only to seniors in the capstone course as an exit assessment. The average enrollment for this course (and therefore the number of students being assessed) is lower than for other courses and assessments. Unlike the MFT, both the iSkills and the DIT-2 are being administered to lower- and upper-division students.

(3) Do you compare the iSkills results for freshman with junior and senior results?

> There are some comparisons made in the initial report used in the 2010 reaffirmation cycle for AACSB accreditation. However, the original report made by the committee chair at that time did not go into depth on the differences in results between these two groups. I intend to provide a more transparent and complete report of the results with this project.

(4) How do assure that only majors are being measured with ETS, iSkills, and DIT-2?

> The MFT and iSkills assessments are administered to students in core courses which are not commonly used by students studying outside a Business field. The courses in which the DIT-2 will be administered may have a fair number of non-majors in them, but the cost of the test is low and the College of Business will be covering that expense.

(5) Explain the rationale for testing juniors and seniors with iSkills?

> The iSkills assessment is administered in the Operations Management course (MGMT 3103) which contains a mixture of junior and senior

business majors. It is the course which best fits the end of the technology sequence in the core.

(6) What curriculum changes have you made utilizing formative assessment strategies with iSkills and DIT-2?

> After the last administration of the iSkills Assessment in 2008/2009, the College of Business began altering the content in the two lower-division technology courses, BUAD 2003 and MGMT 2013. The BUAD 2003 has been enhanced to place more emphasis on software training in Microsoft Excel and Access (spreadsheets and databases). The MGMT 2013 course was replaced by the BDA 2003 course which focuses on problem solving using the skills specifically learned in BUAD 2003. The earlier iSkills administration showed some but not major difference between lower- and upper-division students. We expect to see a greater division in this administration.

> The DIT-2 administration has been haphazard at best. It has revolved with other measures in an attempt to assess ethical reasoning. We have chosen to return to its use as a standardized, accepted instrument. Over time the College has enhanced the discussion of ethics in core courses throughout the curriculum. We hope to see what, if any, effect this enhancement has had with our students.

(7) What standards from the accrediting body must be included in your Student Learning Assessment plan?

> AACSB does not require any assessment measures in particular. The ETS MFT is the most commonly used and well-accepted measure for curriculum development and assessment. The ATU College of Business has consistently used this instrument since the mid-1990s and been rewarded for it by our accrediting body. Its continued use across the capstone sections each semester helps us remain familiar with our students' progress and with our curriculum's success in providing the knowledge and skills needed by our students for their careers.

(APPENDIX B)

OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

GRANT APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC

The Arkansas Tech University Assessment Committee will review proposals and make their decision based on the following criteria: Circle yes, no, not applicable (NA) for each category.

►Does the project focus on documenting, improving, or demonstrating accountability for student learning, academic performance, or program improvement?

Documenting accountability for student learning:　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
ETS, DIT-2, and iSkills

Documenting accountability for academic performance:　　Yes　　No　　NA
Major Business Categories, Ethics in Business, and Technology Competency

Documenting accountability for program improvement:　　Yes　　No　　NA
Quantitative Reasoning curriculum change: Math 2223

Improving accountability for student learning:　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
Formative and Summative assessment, iSkills and DIT-2

Improving accountability for academic performance:　　　Yes　　No　　NA
Freshman and Junior/Senior Assessment, course sequence in technology and ethics components in core.

Improving accountability for program improvement:　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
Curriculum changes (Math 2223) and Instructional changes (BUAD 2003 and BDA 2003), the type of instructional changes are not noted.

Demonstrating accountability for student learning:　　　Yes　　No　　NA
College of Business has developed an Assurance of Learning Schedule, assessment timeline, course schedule for assessment, and curriculum mapping of student learning outcomes and assessment measures.

Demonstrating accountability for academic performance:　　Yes　　No　　NA
See above.

Demonstrating accountability for program improvement:　　Yes　　No　　NA
See above.

►Does the project have the potential to make a significant impact upon, or the techniques to be useful to, other school, departmental, or university assessment programs?

Project will have a significant impact upon other assessment programs:
Colleges　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
Departments　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
University　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
The College of Business could serve as role model for other programs, if assessment planning was shared with other Deans on campus and made available on the assessment website for all faculty.

Techniques will have a significant impact upon other assessment programs:
Colleges　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
Departments　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
University　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes　　No　　NA
See above.

►Does the project proposal demonstrate the connection between program objectives and the means by which the objectives are measured

The project is new and innovative: Yes   No   NA

Presently, it's unclear if the iSkills and DIT-2 application is new and innovative, but the College of Business has provided the necessary information required for a new and innovative project (see below). The selected assessment measures are validated instruments which are commonly utilized by Business Academic Programs and are supported by AACSB. It's clear the recurring project is ETS which has been approved and administered (as noted by Banner) from Fall 2005 to Spring 2013 in both semesters. The iSkills and the DIT-2 are being considered by the College of Business as a new and innovative project. The definition for Repeated Request in the Application for Assessment Project Grants is "Has this department or program received funds from a previous assessment grant? If so, please describe, in detail how the results from previous projects have been used to enhance student learning. The College of Business has described the previous results in the Post Assessment Report and the manner in which they have enhanced student learning. (See Post Assessment Report page 3 for full discussion.) DIT-2 was administered in Fall 2008 and Fall 2011, and iSkills was administered in Spring 2008 and Fall 2009 (see record of funding for the College of Business).

Assessment outcomes and measures connect: Yes   No   NA

ETS is assessing SLO 3 and SLO 5 (Ability to think critically and reason effectively about business problems and Foundation knowledge for conducting business in a diverse, global environment.)
iSkills is assessing SLO 1 (Ability to use technology to support business decisions.)
DIT-2 is assessing SLO 4 (Ethical awareness and ethical decision-making framework in a business context.

Expected goals and objectives can be achieved: Yes   No   NA

The three instruments are reliable and produce valid results (ETS and University of Alabama).

Proposal describes measures and analysis: Yes   No   NA

The Post Assessment Report describes measures and data analysis for the three assessment measures.

Proposal describes student learning effectiveness: Yes   No   NA

The Post Assessment Report describes student performance and reports students are achieving the performance standard set by the College of Business.

►Does the project proposal include an appropriate and reasonable budget?

Budget is appropriate: Yes   No   NA

The budget follows the grant guidelines.

Budget is reasonable: Yes   No   NA

The College of Business is requesting funding for projects for ETS, iSkills, and DIT-2. The College of Business is matching funding from the department for the amount of $300.00 (which covers the cost for DIT-2).
The total request for grant 201370 Recurring Assessment Grant Application is $2090.00.
The total request for grant 201370 COB Project Grant Assessment Application is $4500.00.
Total grant funding request is: $$6590.00

The Minutes of

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

OF

ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The University Assessment Committee met Tuesday, October 24, 2013 at 2:00pm in Rothwell 456. The following were present:

Dr. Monica Varner (Chair)	Dr. Stephen Jones	Dr. Patricia Buford
Mr. Wyatt Watson	Ms. Amy Pennington	Mr. Bruce Sikes
Dr. Jan Jenkins	Dr. Susan Underwood	Dr. Annette Holeyfield
Dr. Ivan Still	Dr. William Hoefler	Ms. Antonette Stuckey
Dr. Mary Gunter	Ms. Audra Porter	

Guests Present:

Dr. David Underwood, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs

Absent:

Dr. Lucas Maxwell	Dr. David Roach
Ms. Marilyn Johnson	Dr. Robin Lasey

Call to Order   Dr. Varner called the meeting to order and introduced our guest, Dr. David Underwood.

Approval of

Minutes: September 17, 2013 minutes approved by the UAC.

Introduction: Dr. David Underwood presented Open Pathways, our current accreditation process mandated by two components: the Assurance Review and Quality

Initiative Project ("Gateways to Completion"), and gave a timeline for our reaffirmation of accreditation. A packet from the Higher Learning Commission outlining the criteria for accreditation was provided. Questions arose as to whether each sub-category of the core component of criterion must be completed entirely or partially to fully address the criterion, so further examination will be done to insure accuracy. Dr. Underwood highlighted why we do assessment: to improve the quality of education for our students that they receive at our institution.

Old Business: No old business brought forth.

New Business: Materials handed out: Dr. Varner provided several documents for the committee to review. She discussed:

"Engaging University Units: Building a Culture of Assessment"

Page 1: ATU's assessment units.

Page 2: Principles to lead ATU through assessment

Page 3: Dr. Varner's philosophy and assessment model, Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE). UFE enhances the use of evaluations (assessment). UFE helps users clarify their purpose, objectives, intended results, implications for use, and change model.

Page 4: An example of an assessment and peer review process, Horizontal Evaluation (HE). HE is flexible and can be applied to a range of settings to facilitate the sharing of experiences and knowledge while building trust and a sense of community.

"ATU Evidence of Assessment"

An overview on the completion rates of academic, general education, and non-academic assessment evidence uploaded in TracDat.

"UAC Strategic Plan"

Discussion included scheduling unit assessment, aligning the language of the UAC strategic plan to fit with our goals for usage, the duplicity of uploading data to both regional accrediting bodies as well as in TracDat, and how TracDat will benefit us in preparation for an HLC visit. Motion made to change the language in goal two of 2013-2014 strategic plan.

Motion to Approve Strategic Plan with amended changes by Dr. Gunter and seconded by Dr. Susan Underwood. Dr. Varner agreed to complete requested changes and send Assessment Strategic Plan to UAC by email. If no further changes were required, the UAC strategic plan will be approved and shared with university stakeholders. The motion was unanimously approved if all conditions were met.

Adjournment   The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Follow-up: On October 25, 2013 Dr. Underwood contacted Dr. Varner concerning sub-categories of the core components. Dr. David Underwood researched the requirements for completing subcategories of the core criteria. His response has been included in the minutes. Dr. Underwood also provided an HLC document explaining the process.

Dr. Varner,

After the meeting with the Assessment Committee yesterday afternoon, I called the Higher Learning Commission regarding the sub-components of the Criteria and whether or not it was necessary to provide evidence regarding those. The answer from the Commission indicated that in order to meet any Criterion, the institution must meet all core components and sub-components of the Criterion (if the sub-component is applicable to the institution). In the document that I passed out entitled "The Criteria for Accreditation" I would refer everyone to Page 1, in the lower right corner, under "The Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components". Without quoting the entire section, please note that it says "The **Core Components** identify areas of particular focus within the Criterion. Some of these Core Components are further elaborated or explicated in sub-components. The sub-components are not comprehensive: they elaborate certain aspects of the Core Component that the Commission seeks to ensure are not overlooked, but they do not fully constitute the Component. Some of the Core Components do not have sub-components because such elaboration has not appeared necessary. An institution provides evidence with regard to those sub-components of the Core Components that apply to the institution…"

Based on this, I believe we need to move forward with the assumption that it will be necessary for us to provide evidence that we have met the requirements specified in each of the sub-components unless we can make a good argument that they do not apply to this type of institution.

David

Also see HLC Online Assurance Review and the Pathways Model (page two)

The new criteria now contain three levels: The original Criteria and Core Values, plus the Core Values now contain Subcomponents which must be specifically addressed. Meeting all of the Subcomponents can be equated to meeting the Core Values which can be equated to meeting the Criteria. If any subcomponent or core value is not met, that Criterion is not met and sanction follows. All components will be rated by reviewers as 1) met or exceeded, 2) met with some concerns, or 3) not met (which means sanction).

The new Criteria contain an additional, or new, emphasis on the following:

- More explication of mission
- Public obligation and purpose
- Primacy of educational responsibilities over other areas/interests
- Responsible and ethical conduct and full disclosure
- Clarity in governing structures, priority and authority
- Appropriateness of degree programs-differentiated by learning goals
- Assured, consistent quality wherever and however programs or courses are delivered
- Effective advising, preparation and placement of students
- Appropriateness of co-curricular programs
- Ability to demonstrate claims made for the educational environment and student experience
- Assessment of student learning
- Program review (must include, in addition to assessment, information regarding retention/persistence and should include information regarding placement of program graduates)
- Student retention, persistence and completion
- Appropriateness of transcription of credit and program and course rigor (some examples mentioned here were dual course credit, transfer equivalency, non-traditional format of course length, presentation format, i.e., face-to-face, online, etc.
- Institutional effectiveness, systematic performance documentation and improvement

The Minutes of

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

OF

ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The University Assessment Committee met Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 4:00pm in Rothwell 456. The following were present:

Dr. Monica Varner (Chair)	Ms. Audra Porter	Dr. Patricia Buford
Dr. Stephen Jones	Ms. Amy Pennington	Mr. Bruce Sikes
Dr. Susan Underwood	Dr. Annette Holeyfield	Dr. Lucas Maxwell
Dr. Ivan Still	Dr. William Hoefler	Ms. Antonette Stuckey
Dr. Mary Gunter	Dr. David Roach	Ms. Marilyn Johnson

Absent:

Dr. Jan Jenkins	Dr. Robin Lasey	Mr. Wyatt Watson

Call to Order   Dr. Varner called the meeting to order.

Approval of

Minutes: October 24, 2013 minutes approved by the UAC.

Old Business: ATU 2011-2021 Continuous Improvement Plan, ATU's assessment process (color PPX), was presented to the Dean's and Graduate Councils. Our continuous improvement plan stems from our strategic plan merged with the Higher Learning Commission's recommendations. ATU Graduate Council is in the process of creating their own strategic assessment process and updating their mission. We will add the Graduate Council's new plan to the new ATU assessment website in progress.

New Business: **"ATU 2011-2012 Continuous Improvement Plan"**

A model of continuous improvement for institutional effectiveness that incorporates all of our university units: academics, student services, university offices, and Ozark campus. Our model, developed by James O. and Karen W. Nichols, has been widely and successfully used in institutional research, assessment, and effectiveness at universities throughout the nation.

Action Items: **"Degree/Program Continuous Improvement Student Learning Report"**

This form is an alternative rubric for program assessment that can be filled out in Microsoft Word and uploaded as evidence for program assessment in TracDat. Some program evaluators are familiar with TracDat and may continue to use that format. This form provides an adaptable and user-friendly format that some may find easier to navigate. Editing is being done to align the semantics of the form with those of TracDat and ATU campus culture before dissemination to university stakeholders. Once this form is approved, it will be available on the ATU assessment website for individual download and completion.

"Assessment Peer Review Degree/Program Continuous Improvement Report"

This form is a rubric designed for peer reviewers performing the assessment of a specific program's assessment process. It differs from the above-mentioned form, the "Degree/Program Continuous Improvement Student Learning Report" by providing evidence from assessment professionals that individual programs are effectively assessing their own student learning. This form will insure the quality of ATU program, unit, and office assessment; a step that will ultimately increase the value in attending our university. It is when we can numerically identify where a program has opportunities, that we can guide programs in implementing positive changes. Results will be shared with university stakeholders.

"ATU Continuous Improvement Report Schedule & General Education Data Academic Cycle 2013-2014"

Schedule of when Academic Programs, General Education CPGEs, Student Services, E-Tech, Honors Program, University Offices, Academic

Support Services, and Ozark Campus are to upload their assessment evidence to TracDat. Multiple dates are provided to give evaluators flexibility in their schedules.

"ATU Continuous Improvement Assessment Peer Review Schedule for Academic Programs and the General Education Program Academic Cycle 2013-2014"

A step in continuous improvement, this form is a schedule of dates for peer reviewers to provide their unit assessments to the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE). Multiple dates are provided to give evaluators flexibility in their schedules.

"Continuous Improvement Assessment Peer Review Schedule Academic Cycle 2012-2013"

This form shows a sample of degrees which are scheduled to submit an Academic Program Review or Accreditation Report to the Office of Academic Affairs in 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017. All academic programs will be peer reviewed to insure excellence 1-3 years prior to their Academic Program Review. Programs that are nationally accredited or state licensed/ certified may request an assessment peer review from the OAIE. Programs that require peer review for 2012-2013 will be assigned a peer review team and reviewed in February through April 2014.

"Tentative Assessment Workshops"

Dr. Varner will be hosting several assessment workshops, also known as ATU's Assessment Academy. This is an introductory list of dates, presenters, and locations.

"Arkansas Tech University General Education Program Criteria for CPGE Assessment"

"Arkansas Tech University Academic Program Criteria for CPGE Assessment"

Adjournment   The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.