



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT  
ASSESSMENT AND  
ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT  
COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2010  
1:30 PM, STUDENT UNION**

Present: Comer, Damron, Davis, Edwards, Gates, Haseley, Najd, Ownbey, Paustenbaugh, Penn, Rohrs, Swinney, Thompson, Van Delinder and Wilber

Absent: Hawkins, McDaniel, and Miller

1. Introductions of Assessment Council Members were made to Mark Nicholas, new Assessment Assistant Director.
2. Minutes from the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting were reviewed. No corrections were requested.
3. Penn reminded Assessment Council to keep journaling about any issues and/or questions that apply to assessment. Penn also reminded members that all journaling questions can be emailed to them if they prefer.
4. AAIC Mission Statement draft was reviewed and discussed for any changes that needed to be implemented for next meeting. Two structural changes were mentioned for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions being that the Chair and Vice-Chair should switch roles, the changes would be as follows:

The Chair of AAIC serves a two-year term, shall be elected from the regular membership of AAIC and must have served at least one year on AAIC prior being elected the is position. The Chair shall vote only to break a tie.

- Preside over meetings of AAIC;
- Coordinate activities of the ad hoc committees.

The Vice-Chair of AAIC would be the Director of University Assessment and Testing and would be the non-voting member of AAIC.

- Convene regular meetings of AAIC and organize materials for the meeting agendas;
- Appoint ad hoc committees for the purpose of completion of special projects or for the development of recommendations to be considered by the full council;
- Serve as a liaison to other faculty groups.

These changes to the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council Mission Statement will be voted on next AAIC meeting February 2011.

5. Penn discussed the new revisions for reviewing Annual Assessment Reports and the best way to get feedback to the colleges about their reports to make recommended revisions to the reports before the programs annual review. This strategy for reviewing Assessment Reports would help identify and determine whether issues that have been

found were in fact rectified and that goals of the program have been reached. This process would be completed by College Coordinators, UAT, and Program Assessment Specialist hybrid program. It was mentioned that the evaluation process be revised to clear up confusion about academic or calendar year dates of review. Dr. Penn stated he would add calendar year to the time table. It was also mentioned that if a college representative wrote the Assessment Report, another person, from that college, familiar with assessment practices could review report.

The review process would be a 5 year cycle of review for the program:

- ❖ Year 1-Full Review by UAT/College Representatives
- ❖ Year 2-Follow-up on review by CC/ PAS
- ❖ Year 3-Follow up on review by CC/ PAS
- ❖ Year 4-Full Review by AAIC Teams
- ❖ Year 5-Follow-up on review CC/PAS

Penn also gave a handout of the upcoming review of programs for 2012 and how the programs will be reviewed; AAIC members will split into groups of 2, each group will review 2 programs and give feedback on each program.

6. Penn presented updated list of programs who received funding in FY 10. The highlighted names on list were programs who did not submit a report for the FY10 year, making them ineligible for future funding. The funds will be removed. No objections.

7. An update was given by Rick Rohrs on the 3 year piloted Program Assessment Specialist for Arts and Sciences and Human Environmental Services. Dr. Rohrs stated he is available to speak with departments to offer help with assessment for their particular area. The program seems to be going well.

8. Penn also reminded everyone about the SAAC or Student Advisory Assessment Council and mentioned to everyone to recommend 2 students (1 graduate, 1 undergraduate) from their college to be on the committee that would meet once in the fall and spring. SAAC would give feedback on assessment results that are collected and any other questions (research) that arise. If you have any ideas or questions for SAAC, please feel free to let Dr. Penn know so we may use them.

9. Update on ETS Proficiency Profile exam

A list was handed out with scheduled and completed exams that are on file with the testing center. The counts stand at the following as of 3:00 pm Friday, November 5th, 2010.

- Agriculture 11 students
- Arts and Sciences 48 students
- Education 4 students
- Engineering 18 students
- Human Environmental Sciences 12 students
- Business 13 students
- University Academic Services 7 students

Penn encouraged the colleges to continue making phone calls to students as we are on our way toward having the required 200 students but still far short. Discussed having college advisors call students to set up appointments to take ETS Proficiency Profile.

10. Penn discussed a brief overview of the GSSS report. A few of the highlights are as follows, and as always the complete report is on the UAT website:

- 63% response rate
- 91% of students are using library resources
- 88% of students are satisfied with advisors
- A low percentage of students were happy with assistantships.
- A low percentage of students were happy with diversity

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.