Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness  
January 23, 2014  
Members in attendance: William Veal, Kevin Keenan, Gioconda Quesada, Jason Howell, Gayle Goudy, Chad Galuska, Tyler Mobley  
Non-Members in attendance: Beverly Diamond, Jim Posey  
Location: HHP Dean’s conference room, second floor of 86 Wentworth  
Time: 1:00-2:00pm

1) Minutes from the November 8 meeting were approved.

2) W. Veal initiated brainstorming about objectives for the committee, with an emphasis on the verbs in the proposed wording of the committee’s entry in the FAM:

Current Proposed Wording: (copied from minutes of 11/8/13 meeting)

14. Committee on Institutional Effectiveness
   a. Composition: Nine faculty members. In addition, the following are ex-officio non-voting members: the Provost or his/her designee and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness & Planning.

   b. Duties:

      (1) To collaborate with the College administration on compliance with the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.

      (2) To review the College's Institutional Effectiveness processes and make recommendations as necessary (including but not limited to Accreditation Standards, Assessment Cycle, Assessment Guide).

      (3) To review or initiate policies related to institutional effectiveness.

      (4) To communicate (remainder of statement to be determined).

3) G. Quesada passed out an assessment rubric in use by James Madison University and discussed its use as a tool to review assessment reports produced by other departments/offices at the college.

4) W. Veal and B. Diamond discussed accessing the 5th-year Interim Report on Compliance Assist and discussed how the committee could review certain aspects of the report as a committee task. J. Posey proposed that the focus of the committee could be to determine how to best use the results of the various assessment reports for improvement purposes, as opposed to compliance. B. Diamond added that the committee could review the benchmarks that were set in the 5th-year Interim Report and provide feedback on the sufficiency and appropriateness of those benchmarks. The committee then discussed analyzing several aspects of the 5th-year Interim Report and providing feedback and suggestions for improvement in advance of development of the 10-year report.

5) G. Quesada and W. Veal discussed continuity of the committee membership over the next academic year.

6) W. Veal proposed that the committee review several aspects of the 5th-year report over the next few months in an effort to help guide the finalization of the committee’s duties before the end of the spring semester. B. Diamond recommended that the committee choose two from the Sufficiency of Faculty, Student Success, and Program Assessment components of the 5th-year report to read and discuss over the next two months. W. Veal suggested that the committee start with the Sufficiency of Faculty report, and the committee members were assigned to read this report before the next meeting.