

Meeting Minutes for the
Academic Program Assessment Committee Meeting
Tuesday, September 18th, 2012, 12:00-1:00 p.m.
Conference Room, Second Floor, Olin Life Sciences Building

In attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair), Vanessa Edkins, Brian Ehrlich, Veronica Giguere, Mike Gallo, Michael Grace, Pierre Larochelle, Ted Richardson, Tim Rosser, Matt Ruane, Andy Stanfield, Manolis Tomadakis, Richard Turner, Alex Vamosi

The Chair welcomed committee members back after the summer hiatus and introduced Mike Gallo as the newest representative for the College of Aeronautics, replacing Donna Wilt. She then asked past members to introduce themselves.

I. April 20, 2012 meeting minutes approval

The minutes were approved with no corrections by 12 members with one member abstaining.

II. Assessment Report status (overall)

The Chair reported on the Fall 2011 Assessment Cycle Results, which was submitted to Dr. McCay, COO, in June. To summarize, there are 185 degree programs with a total of 1777 assessment Measures/Targets. Fifty-one percent (51%, or 899) were marked as “Not Reported This Cycle” because the assessment course or scholarly activity to which they were affiliated was not offered in fall 2011. Excluding those not reported this cycle, the achievement statuses for the remaining 878 Measures/Targets are as follows: 67% (or 588) “Met” or exceeded the Target threshold, 14% (or 119) “Partially Met”, and 15% (or 129) did “Not Met”. Five percent (or 42) of the Measures were missing findings, but some of this is due to exempt degree programs (because they were new in the fall of 2011) or reporting of findings in the wrong assessment cycle (for example, in the 2012 cycle). The latter were transferred to the correct reporting cycle.

For every Target marked as “Partially Met” or “Not Met”, Action Plans were reported. Responses to Summary/Analysis Questions, which included requests for additional resources, if necessary, were reported by all academic programs. While a majority reported that there were sufficient resources, the most commonly cited resource request was for additional personnel (either full- or part-time) to manage and report the assessment data (i.e., assessment coordinators). Other requests were for curriculum coordinators, additional faculty, additional compensation for faculty, and funding for standardized exams.

There were challenges for some programs, particularly those relying on 9-month faculty to input data and to report during a time when they were not on contract.

The Chair then opened the floor for discussion of the process and received feedback that it was difficult to achieve compliance because of the high turn-over in assessment coordinators in some colleges, lack of training on WEAVE and confusion over which year to report results, and lack of attention to data collection despite advance announcements. As to the latter two issues, the Chair suggested that two types of training sessions be held in October: one for department heads, program chairs, and faculty who need to be familiar with administrative functions of WEAVE and one for Assessment Coordinators and faculty assigned to entering data, findings, and action plans. The Chair also suggested that three email reminders be sent out from her office each year (spring, summer, and fall) to all academic DRCs, stressing that data collected from assessment courses be uploaded to WEAVE. These will serve to remind everyone to actually collect data and should relieve some of the burden when the annual reporting deadline nears. The members were agreeable to these two suggestions.

The Chair asked the members to send updated lists of DRC members to her via email.

III. Discussion of Revised Assessment Timeline

The Chair handed out copies of a revised Assessment Timeline for Academic Programs (appended to the meeting minutes) and asked for discussion on the logistics of the continuous improvement process. It was pointed out that if this process was followed exactly as written, the implementation of Action Plans in January would be based on plans established on year-old data. This seems to defeat the continuous improvement concept emphasized by SACS. An alternative expressed view is that the timeline is used simply to guide the process toward the required report deadline of June 1st. As long as continuous improvements are not substantive (e.g. changing assessment courses, major alterations to learning outcomes, etc.), they should be encouraged whenever the need arises. The Chair stressed the importance of finding a balance between the two expressed views.

Due to time constraints, the Chair closed this discussion and quickly pushed through the remainder of the agenda items.

IV. “Findings” evidence in WEAVE

The Chair reminded the committee about the decision to include representative samples of student assessment work in the 2013 assessment calendar year as part of the material for review by SACS review panels. The committee will need to define what constitutes a representative sample.

V. Miscellaneous

a. General Education DRC

The Chair stated that the General Education competencies have been reviewed and updated to make them easier to assess. They will be appended to the meeting minutes.

b. Certificate programs – why two direct measures?

The Chair gave the floor to Dr. Ted Richardson, who wished to discuss the two-direct measure requirement for certificate programs. The Chair reminded the committee of the certificate program requirement for one student-learning outcome in the area of Discipline Specific Knowledge, measured by two direct measures. Dr. Richardson argued that since the direct measure used to assess his certificate programs is a comprehensive student portfolio, it alone should provide sufficient assessment of Discipline Specific Knowledge. A motion was made, and seconded, to amend the certificate program measure requirement from two direct to one direct/one indirect. The amendment passed unanimously.

c. New program guidelines (revised)

The Chair announced that the New Program Guidelines document has been revised to include a requirement for assessment criteria before final approval of new programs by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UGCC) or Graduate Council. It will be presented to Graduate Council on Thursday, September 20th and to UGCC on Friday, September 28th. The revised document will be appended to the meeting minutes.

VI. Action Item:

- 1. Submit a list of current DRC members and the disciplines/areas they represent to the Chair via email as soon as possible.**

VII. Next meeting: week of October 22nd, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

Monica H. Baloga, Chair

September 25, 2012

Florida Tech Assessment Timeline (Academic Programs)

I. January through December:

Gather data from the Measures for the Outcomes of the current calendar year. Assessment Coordinators remind faculty/staff that assessment data must be collected in the assessment courses offered during each semester, including summer. In order to keep data current and secure, it should be uploaded into WEAVE as soon as it is collected, and it should be labeled and organized by date of collection. For any specific Measure, data must be entered in the Targets and Findings section. It is important to ensure that it is uploaded in the correct yearly cycle.

II. January:

Input revised Outcomes, Measures, and Targets and implement Action Plan.

Input new (reviewed and approved) Outcomes, Measures and Targets in WEAVE for the new calendar year in the correct yearly cycle. Implement proposed Action Plans from previous calendar year.

III. February and March:

Analyze the data gathered in previous calendar year.

Department Heads or Program Chairs, along with Assessment Coordinators, analyze the assessment data from the previous calendar year with department/program faculty. For example, data collected during the entire 2012 calendar year will be analyzed beginning in January 2013.

IV. March through May:

Develop Action Plan based on analysis of data.

Department Heads or Program Chairs, along with Assessment Coordinators, develop Action Plans for all Targets marked “Partially Met” or “Not Met”. Action Plans must include continuous improvements for student learning, but they can also include improvements to the assessment of a particular student learning outcome. Action Plans for each must be uploaded in WEAVE under the appropriate Target in the correct yearly cycle.

V. Assessment Report:

Submit Assessment Report to COO.

The deadline for completing Items II. and III. is June 1st of each calendar year. An Assessment Report will be generated by the Office of Institutional Compliance for submission to the Chief Operating Officer for review by June 15th.

VI. August through October:

Action Plan planning and revision of Outcomes, Measures, and Targets for next calendar year. Academic departments/units will plan for changes to assessment courses and curricula based on proposed Action Plans developed in March-May period.

General Education Core Competencies

Revised from the Florida Tech *2005 Reaffirmation Report*

Version 3, 14 May 2012

General education core competencies at the Florida Institute of Technology.

Upon completion of an undergraduate degree from the Florida Institute of Technology, a student will be able to:

- 1) Demonstrate college level writing and reading skills.
- 2) Describe an understanding of the intellectual and historical changes that have taken place in the development of human civilization.
- 3) Apply college-level algebra skills to the solution of mathematical processes.
- 4) Apply statistical skills (including methods of collection, analysis, and interpretation of data) or be able to apply introductory calculus skill to the solution of real world problems.
- 5) Demonstrate knowledge of the principles of the natural sciences and identify the scientific method of inquiry when applied to the investigation of the natural world.
- 6) Demonstrate an understanding of the social and behavioral sciences, including interrelationships with other disciplines.
- 7) Utilize appropriate computer technologies to communicate effectively within both university and global communities.

New Program Process, Guidelines and Template

This document outlines the process and guidelines for the Florida Tech departments and colleges who wish to introduce new programs (minors and degree & for-credit certificate programs). When colleges are proposing new programs, information is needed by the Office of the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and Executive Vice President, the Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC), and either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council, as appropriate. This document provides the necessary information to make a decision to approve, disapprove, or ask for modification of the proposal. The information also provides a basis for evaluating an approved program over the next 5–7 years.

I. Proposal

A completed proposal with appropriate departmental and college approval is to be submitted to the COO for review. A completed proposal includes:

- 1) A completed New Program Case Statement
- 2) A detailed business plan
- 3) “Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum” form

New Program Case Statement: Use the attached template. It is expected the proposal for a new degree program will address most if not all of the items in the template, while a proposal to create a minor will only require responses to some of the items. If a new minor requires no new resources and no new faculty or courses, then most of the sections in the template will not apply.

Detailed Business Plan: As part of the program proposal, a five-year financial model or five-year business plan should be submitted for the proposed program. Provide the following information:

- Expected Student Enrollment (full-time and part-time)
- Tuition (use current tuition) revenues
- Additional Faculty required
 - Departmental expense (provide salary estimate)
 - Service course faculty (provide salary estimate)
- Additional Support Staff
- GSAs, Adjuncts
- Summer faculty teaching
- Fringe benefits
- Operating expenditures
- Travel
- Equipment
- Library acquisitions
- Program recruiting

“Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum” form: The form can be found on the Florida Tech website at www.fit.edu/registrar/forms.html under the Faculty and Advisor tab. This form can be used for certificate programs as well. Get necessary signatures before submitting to the COO.

II. Chief Operating Officer Approval Process

The COO will review the proposed program for both its consistency with the Florida Tech mission and its financial viability. If the COO agrees that the program is consistent with the mission of Florida Tech and financially viable, the New Program Case Statement will be submitted to the APAC for review and approval of program-level assessment-based materials. The completed proposal will then be submitted to the appropriate university curriculum committee for review.

Before submission to the appropriate curriculum committee, other documents will need to be completed before course/curriculum approval is granted. These are

- 1) “Adding a New Course to the Curriculum” form; one for every new course to be developed and approved
- 2) Detailed syllabi for all new courses
- 3) Course descriptions for all new courses

“Adding a New Course to the Curriculum” form: Fill out a form for every new course to be developed and approved. Get necessary signatures before submitting to the appropriate curriculum committee. The form can be found on the Florida Tech website at www.fit.edu/registrar/forms.html under the Faculty and Advisor tab.

Detailed syllabi: Contact the appropriate curriculum committee chair for syllabi requirements.

Course descriptions: Course descriptions for new courses must be pre-edited by the Director of Catalog before being submitted to the appropriate curriculum committee.

Once the curriculum committee makes a recommendation with appropriate comments, the proposal will again be reviewed by the COO for a final decision.

III. Other Administrative Processes

Once the COO gives final approval, additional administrative processes need to be completed. Please follow the processes outlined below, as necessary:

Working with Institutional Compliance

- If the new program (whether a full degree program or certificate) is a substantive change (i.e. a significant departure from previously approved programs), the Office of Institutional Compliance must be contacted in order to report it to our regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).
- If the program is an existing program (whether a full degree program or certificate) being offered at a different or new off-campus location, the Office of Institutional Compliance must be contacted in order to report it to our regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Working with the Registrar

- If the program is a new major or minor, the “Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum” form needs to be completed.
- If the program is to be offered at sites other than the Melbourne campus, a new program code identifying that campus needs to be assigned to the program.
- If the program is an existing program offered at a new campus, submit to the COO, who will review and either approve or disapprove the program at the new campus.
- Identify and submit the proposed tuition structure.
- Identify and submit the academic calendar for the program.
- Identify and submit all *University Catalog* changes.

Working with the Assessment Specialist

- Submit program name to the Assessment Specialist, who will create an entity for it in WEAVEonline, the web-based assessment management software.

Working with undergraduate and/or graduate admissions

- Add program to student application.
- Inquire about advertising and publications for the program.

Working with the bursar’s office

- Confirm billing times, if different from standard.
- Confirm payment process, if different from standard.

New Program Case Statement Template

I. Program Relevance

- How is this program consistent with the mission of Florida Tech?

- How is this program consistent with the mission of the department/college?

II. Program Demand

- Market:
 - What is the local market for this program?

 - What is the national market?

 - What is the international market?

- New Students:
 - How many new full-time/part-time students are expected to enroll in the first year?

 - How many new domestic and international students are expected to enroll in the first year?

 - What is the enrollment outlook five years from now?

- What other universities offer this program? How large (enrollment) are those programs?

- Are there current trends or forecasts for interest in this program? If so, what are they and what are your sources of information.

- Will this program be offered to a “non-traditional” audience (part-time students, evening/weekend classes, distance learning, other)? Please indicate all that apply.
- What are the employment opportunities after graduation?
- If this is an undergraduate program, what are the graduate program opportunities?
- Is internship part of the program? If so, will it be required? Will the internship be paid or unpaid?

III. Academic Requirements/Considerations

- What are the entrance requirements (GPA, SAT, math/science, etc.)?
- Is the proposed program a substantive change according to SACS?
- Is the proposed program in line with departmental/college accreditation?
- What impact will the program have on existing programs? For example, will it replace an existing program or complement/compete with another program? Which programs will be affected?
- How will the new program be financially assessed?

- Programmatic Accreditation:
 - Is programmatic accreditation required or proposed for the program? If so, what are the minimum requirements for accreditation? What is the timetable for achieving accreditation status?

V. Financial Resources/Uses

- Can the program support itself financially (provide detailed estimates)?

- Will there be any assistantships or fellowships available?

- What new courses (department and/or service) if any, will be required?

- What new faculty (departmental and/or service), if any, will be required?

- Will new support staff be required?

- Will new GSAs or adjuncts be required?

- What new equipment, labs, or other facilities are required?

- What new library resources will be required?

Signature Page for initial approval of proposed program:

Department Head/Program Chair

Date

Dean or Associate Dean

Date

Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer

Date

Flowchart for Approval Procedure of Assessment Items: New Undergraduate Majors and Graduate Programs

