

Minutes for the  
University Assessment Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, June 16th, 2010, 10:00-11:00 a.m.  
Conference Room, Second floor, Olin Physical Sciences Building

In attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair), Brian Ehrlich (by conference call), Veronica Giguere, Pierre Larochelle, Hamid Rassoul, Tim Rosser, Matt Ruane, Manolis Tomadakis, Richard Turner, and Alex Vamosi

Absent: Ken Crooks, Ted Richardson, and Rodd Newcombe (teaching conflict)

I. June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting minutes approval

Minutes were approved with exception of the amended UAC mission statement. This statement was modified to include a definition of who comprised the UAC committee. After some discussion on whether this was necessary, the committee members agreed to the following changes:

“The University Assessment Committee (UAC) is composed of representatives from academic colleges, online learning, and academic support services who oversee and assist academic units within the institution of Florida Institute of Technology with assessment pertaining to student learning and development. It serves to define and implement policies and procedures to maintain a robust academic assessment process, to review the quality of assessment plans submitted by units within academic colleges, and to report annually to the Provost’s office the status of the academic assessment process within the institution.”

II. Miscellaneous

- a. Voting: For an item to pass, a majority approval of voting UAC members are needed.
- b. Glossary (see Appendix A): During the June 9<sup>th</sup> Assessment Workshop session, several Assessment Coordinators and UAC members asked for a glossary of assessment terms and that they be aligned with those used by ABET, AABI, APA, and AACSB. The Chair asked those UAC members who handled programmatic accreditation to submit a glossary of terms from their particular areas so she could complete this project.
- c. Scoring rubric: Another item brought up during the June 9<sup>th</sup> Assessment Workshop session was about appending an assessment scoring box to graduate defense forms for departmental use when assessing graduate programs. The Chair spoke with Rosemary Layne, Director of Graduate Programs, about adding a scoring box to graduate defense forms. She agreed that one could be added. Because the forms are then submitted to the Registrar’s Office, it was recommended that they be scanned into an accessible database for use by departments and/or colleges. No action has been taken at this time.

- d. AA/AS programs: The committee approved a minimum of three PLO statements for any AA or AS program, one in each area of Discipline Specific Knowledge, Communication, and Critical Thinking. As with any other PLO statement, they each will require one direct measure.
- e. Consultant Report (see attached document in email): Dr. Alexander-Snow submitted a report, “Recommended Action Steps for Program Assessment”, based on her experiences and any feedback provided during the Assessment Workshop. The report was distributed to each UAC member and to Senior Vice Provost Bonhomme and Provost McCay.

### III. College and Departmental Mission Statements

Liz Fox copied the current mission statements from the University Catalog. The Chair will meet with Senior Vice Provost Bonhomme and Provost McCay to discuss the Deans’ involvement with assessment, possibly beginning with updating current mission statements.

### IV. Discussion (cont’d) - Policies and Procedures

The Chair called for discussion on the type of academic assessment process the UAC thought was appropriate for Florida Tech while still meeting SACS requirements. She reminded the members that Dr. Alexander-Snow presented “best practices” for an assessment process. While SACS does not *require* a particular format or process, they do require that an institution shows “continuous improvement” in program-level learning. The Chair then indicated that certain criteria were necessary for SACS reporting purposes, those being mission statements, PLOs, measure statements, results/data, and information on how those results were used to improve the program (referred to as “closing the loop”).

The committee discussed requiring **mission statements** at the university level, the college levels, and the academic unit levels. The term “unit” is defined as a department or an academic program within a school or college. Although the committee does not require that every degree program offered at Florida Tech has a mission statement, it may be necessary for some. For example, the Department of Humanities and Communication will need to have separate statements to address the Humanities program and the Communication program since they are very different.

**Vision statements** were determined to be optional.

**Course mapping** is strongly recommended as part of “best practices”. The process of course mapping can be determined by each academic college.

**Curriculum mapping** and **Assessment mapping** are required components for internal and external purposes (ex. for reporting to accrediting institutions). The Chair requested uniform reporting of this material for reviewing purposes and asked the programmatic accrediting

representatives on the committee for any templates that they use. Tim Rosser indicated that AABI has template that he will submit for committee review.

Because of time, the Chair ended the discussion, and the next meeting time was determined for Wednesday, July 7<sup>th</sup>, from 10:00-11:30 a.m.

**Action Items for ABET, AACSB, AABI, and APA UAC members: Submit assessment definitions from these accrediting institutions to the UAC Chair.**

## Appendix A: Assessment Workshop Terms and Definitions

**Course level student learning outcomes (SLOs):** Statements that indicate the skills and knowledge a student should have upon completing a required course in a degree program.

**Program level student learning outcomes (PLOs):** Statements that indicate the skills and knowledge a student should have upon graduating from the degree program.

**Course mapping:** matching the SLOs of a required course to the PLOs of the degree program.

**Curriculum (or program) mapping:** matching the PLOs to the required courses in a degree program. Ideally this should represent a developing assessment model where courses are identified that introduce (I) the PLO criteria, that reinforce (R) it, and that emphasize (E) it (usually a senior-level or capstone course).

**Measure statements:** Statements that indicate the type of measure or tool used for assessing PLOs. There are two types of measures.

**Direct measures:** measures used to analyze student behaviors or products in which they demonstrate how well they have mastered PLOs. The **products** can be exams (both published and locally-developed), embedded assignments, course activities, portfolios, etc.

**Indirect measures:** measures used to analyze reported perceptions about student mastery of PLOs. Examples can include surveys, interviews, and focus groups.

**Assessment Mapping:** matching your measure statement for a PLO to a specific course in a degree program. This tells you where and when you will be assessing particular PLO criteria.