Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
April 11, 2014
Members in attendance: William Veal, Jason Howell, Chad Galuska, Kevin Keenan, Neal Tonks, Robert Cameron
Ex-Officio Members in attendance: Beverly Diamond
Location: HHP Dean’s conference room, second floor of 86 Wentworth
Time: 10:00-11:00am

1) Minutes from the March 20 meeting were approved with no corrections.
2) The committee discussed suggestions for improvement of Section H of the New Course form, including:
   • The possibility of incorporating the program curriculum map into the form.
   • Adding additional columns into the table of student learning outcomes (2 more) and removing the additional block under the table.
   • Adding detailed instructions for completing the table within Section H.
   • Providing examples on the curriculum committee website as well as the standard General Education SLOs for users to copy and paste into the table.
   W. Veal will collect the recommendations and convey them to the Curriculum Committee.

3) W. Veal initiated discussion of the committee charge. The official wording of the committee’s entry in the FAM was discussed. Ideas for committee activities that would fall within the proposed wording:
   • Study abroad: we can help a department do the effectiveness of a study abroad program for their department. For example, what is the value added component of study abroad for a program or course?
   • Interdisciplinary programs: we can advise and work with interdisciplinary program coordinators.
   • Undergraduate programs: we can help with the process to review undergraduate program reports.
   • Student complaint policy and process: we can provide assistance to the committee that handles student complaints. (Further clarification from Student Affairs will precede this.)
   • Urban Studies: K. Keenan proposed using the Urban Studies undergraduate program as a test case for the committee’s involvement in program review.

4) The proposed wording of the Committee’s entry in the FAM was read to the committee and N. Tonks motioned to approve the wording. The motion was seconded by K. Keenan and the vote passed with a vote of 6 aye and 0 nay. Proposed Wording:

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 designees 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.
   (3) To review or initiate policies related to institutional effectiveness.
   (4) To communicate results of reviews and collaboration for program improvement.
Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
March 20, 2014
Members in attendance: William Veal, Jason Howell, Chad Galuska, Tyler Mobley, Gayle Goudy
Ex-Officio Members in attendance: Beverly Diamond
Location: HHP Dean’s conference room, second floor of 86 Wentworth
Time: 1:00-2:00pm

1) Minutes from the February 21 meeting were approved with a correction to the listing of Ex-Officio Members.

2) W. Veal added an item to the current meeting’s agenda, pertaining to a request for help from the Curriculum Committee.

3) W. Veal initiated discussion on the committee’s review of the 5th-year report. J. Howell described one aspect of Section 4.1 (student achievement). T. Mobley discussed the helpfulness and appropriateness of the rubric for reviewing the reports. G. Quesada discussed application of the rubric to program assessment reports. B. Diamond discussed the ability of the Provost’s Office to review all of the program assessment reports. W. Veal discussed the proper definition of feedback with the involvement of the committee in reviewing program assessment reports. J. Howell provided clarification on the meanings of the terms definitions, measures, and benchmarks, and W. Veal will add an item to the rubric regarding those.

4) W. Veal initiated discussion on the request for help from the Curriculum Committee, which requested help in designing part H (Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment) of the new course form. There was a suggestion to add a checkbox for “General Education Course” and a suggestion to add instructions on where to find the existing student learning outcomes if it is a Gen Ed course. W. Veal asked the committee members to suggest further changes to part H and send them via email prior to the next meeting.

5) W. Veal initiated further discussion on the objectives of the committee, involvement with Gen Ed and Curriculum committees, and how the committee’s work integrates with the OIEP in terms of program assessment.

6) W. Veal will propose final changes to the committee’s entry in the FAM and will put it on the agenda for the next meeting. Changes to the FAM entry will be implemented in the next academic year.

7) Committee’s entry in the FAM (kept for continuity).
Current Proposed Wording: (copied from minutes of 2/21/14 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 designees 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.
1) Minutes from the January 23 meeting were approved with a correction to the listing of Ex-Officio Members.

2) W. Veal discussed the committee’s assigned task of reviewing components of the 5th-year Interim Report using the rubric that was sent out in email. Several committee members indicated that they had reviewed the Sufficiency of Faculty component of the report. B. Diamond indicated that SACS is concerned with institutions setting their own definitions and goals, and suggested that the committee provide feedback on definition of full-time faculty. The committee discussed the current definition of “Full-Time Faculty,” the inclusion of Adjunct Faculty teaching 12-hour loads in that category. Discussions led to proposing a new criterion for the rubric sent out by W. Veal that would allow for the review of measures and definitions that are used in generating reports of this nature. Committee members continued the discussion of the inclusion of adjuncts in the definition of full-time faculty.

3) W. Veal assigned homework for committee members to review components 4.1 (student achievement) and 3.3.1.1 (program assessment) of the 5th-year Interim Report using the updated rubric that will be sent out soon.

4) W. Veal discussed other potential charges and proposed the dissolution of the committee should a worthwhile charge not be found.

5) Committee’s entry in the FAM (kept for continuity).

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 designees 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).
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 designees 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.
Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness  
November 8, 2013  
Members in attendance: William Veal, Kevin Keenan, Neal Tonks, Gioconda Quesada, Jason Howell, Robert Cameron, Gayle Goudy  
Non-Members in attendance: Beverly Diamond, Andrew Sobiesou, Jim Posey, Lynne Ford, Gabriela Peschiera  
Location: HHP Dean’s conference room, second floor of 86 Wentworth  
Time: 9:00-10:00am  

1) Minutes from the October 11 meeting were approved.

2) Several attendees discussed potential roles for the committee. B. Diamond discussed a potential role for the committee in the assessment of international programs, in particular by assisting in the process of developing an assessment program for Study Abroad, as well as in the development and effectiveness of other assessment programs at the college. L. Ford furthered this discussion by describing potential roles for the committee in the evaluation of the General Education assessment process, and also mentioned that the committee could be charged with receiving information from assessment and making suggestions for improvements in the assessment process. J. Posey mentioned that "the assessment of assessment" is a recent topic of discussion on the national assessment email list, and this could potentially be a charge of the committee. B. Diamond suggested that the committee review several reports that are available on the Compliance Assist site, and mentioned reports in Section 3.3.1 and 2.8 (Sufficiency of Faculty report) as potential starting points. She said that she would check to make sure that all committee members had access to the reports on the Compliance Assist site. In light of these new potential charges for the committee, W. Veal tabled the committee’s involvement in assessment of the study abroad program.

3) K. Keenan asked what would the tangible result (if any) of the committee’s actions be. G. Quesada mentioned that the committee could serve as liaisons between the faculty and administration on assessment policies and practices. B. Diamond suggested that the committee should focus on reports related to academic affairs, as it is a faculty committee. Several attendees discussed where in the reporting process should the committee’s charges lie, whether they be on the side of creating assessment and effectiveness reports, or on the side of reviewing such reports as created by the reporting departments. It was also mentioned that the committee has the power to submit recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

4) Following a suggestion of B. Diamond, W. Veal proposed taking a few months for the committee to actually perform some tasks, and subsequently review the committee’s charge and FAM wording and see how they mesh with what the committee actually does. Changes to the FAM wording will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in the Spring.

Current Proposed Wording:

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 designees 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).

5) W. Veal will soon initiate discussion of the committee meeting time next semester, as well as possibly provide committee members with reports from Compliance Assist to review. Meeting adjourned.
Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Minutes from October 11, 2013

Members in attendance (in alphabetical order):

    Robert Cameron, Chad Galuska, Giaconda Quesada, Neal Tonks, William Veal (Chair)

Non-Members in attendance (in alphabetical order):

    Penny Brunner (Associate Vice-President for Institutional Effectiveness), Lynne Ford (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration), Karin Roof (Director of Survey Analysis and Research)

Time: 9:00-10:00

Minutes from the September 13 meeting were amended and approved

W. Veal announced that he had met with Lynn Cherry, Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies, to discuss the identity and role of the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness. She informed W. Veal that the Committee has the freedom to define its identity and role, but suggested that the Committee assess or collect data for programs at the College, such as Study Abroad or General Education.

G. Quesada noted that Andrew Sobiesuo, Associate Provost for International Education, had expressed previously interest in receiving help in assessing study abroad programs. W. Veal suggested that the Committee consider a possible collaboration with Study Abroad. He also presented the possibility that the Committee assess one or more of the College’s mission statements.

W. Veal asked that for the Committee’s next meeting, members analyze the Committee’s mission statement and send to him our suggestions /modifications. He stated that after a discussion and vote, the Committee’s amended mission statement would advance to the Faculty Senate for approval.

W. Veal suggested that for the Committee’s next meeting, he would invite Andrew Sobiesou and Gabriela Peschiera, Assistant Director of the Center for International Education, to discuss further a possible collaboration with study abroad programs.

N. Tonks asked whether the Committee might inadvertently create more confusion and expressed his wish is for the work of the Committee to be of value. W. Veal stated that he did not want the Committee to duplicate any work that is being done in assessment at the College and he suggested that perhaps the role of the Committee is to aid only those programs and departments that ask for assistance. To this end, L. Ford noted that The College Reads Program may be interested in help in assessing outcomes as that Program’s committee is largely consumed with selecting texts, not assessment of the Program.

P. Brunner and K. Roof facilitated a workshop on assessment. They provided instruction on how to define a mission statement and noted some questions that those involved in assessment need to ask
themselves, namely: (1) How clear are the steps that a student needs to take in order to successfully complete a program?; and (2) How would success be demonstrated? They noted the importance of setting goals that are ambitious, but attainable, and the importance of having a rubric and providing that rubric to stakeholders.

Following the workshop, W. Veal asked the Committee how we might apply what we learned to the assessment of study abroad programs, to which the Committee agreed on the following steps:

1. Develop a mission statement
2. Design learning outcomes
3. Design a rubric
4. Evaluate stakeholders by that rubric

W. Veal reiterated that he would invite Andrew Sobiesou and Gabriela Peschiera to attend the Committee’s next meeting so that we might begin work on possible learning outcomes for study abroad programs. He also expressed his ideal that the Committee’s membership remain intact for the 2014-2015 academic year and that he would inquire as to whether this is possible.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Cameron
Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
September 13, 2013
Members in attendance: William Veal, Kevin Keenan, Neal Tonks, Gioconda Quesada, Chad Galuska, and Jason Howell
Non-Members in attendance: Karin Roof (OIEP), Penny Brunner (OIEP), David Owens (Graduate Studies)
Location: HHP Dean's conference room, second floor of 86 Wentworth
Time: 9:00-10:00am

1) Minutes from the May 8 meeting were approved.

2) The committee was visited by Penny Brunner (Associate VP for Institutional Effectiveness) and Karin Roof (Director of Academic Assessment and Planning). Dr. Brunner explained some of the procedures and requirements for SACSCOC accreditation and assessment, and also reviewed the SACSCOC Substantive Change Policy. Dr. Roof distributed the results of the Class of 2013 Senior Exit Survey. Both Drs. Brunner and Roof discussed how their office interacts with the Dean’s Assessment Committee and possible ways for the Committee on the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness could interact with their office.

3) W. Veal discussed the suggested modifications to the entry in the Faculty-Administration Manual that names the committee, describes the composition of the committee, and specifies the duties of the committee.

4) The committee discussed how to define its purpose and several possible activities/objectives for the committee this year. Pending a discussion with some members of the Faculty Senate, the committee decided to postpone any decisions on these topics.