Meeting Minutes for the
Academic Program Assessment Committee Meeting
April 8, 2015, 12:00-1:00 p.m.
7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, Crawford Building

Attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair), Vanessa Edkins, Brian Ehrlich, Veronica Giguere, Pierre Larochelle, Bill Rankin, Ted Richardson, Matt Ruane, Manolis Tomadakis, Richard Turner, Andy Stanfield, Alex Vamosi, Donna Wilt

Absence: Michael Grace

Guests: John Allen, CJ Colley, Jennifer Morin


I. January 29, 2015, meeting minutes approval
   The minutes were approved after adding Veronica Giguere's name to Absence list.

II. SACSCOC update
   The Chair reported that the SACSCOC on-site visit went very well. The committee had four recommendations: one that was mandatory regarding noncompliance with FR 4.7 and three others pertaining to the QEP. Although Florida Tech was strongly encouraged to address the QEP recommendations, the committee found it compliant with CR 2.12 and CS 3.3.2 and accepted the plan.

III. Academic Program Assessment – 10 year timeline (removed from agenda; this topic was discussed as part of agenda item IV)

IV. Updates to APAC Policies and Procedures manual
   a. APAC membership: Term limits
   b. Procedures and Timelines

   Revisions to the APAC Policies and Procedures manual were discussed and, in some instances, approved. The draft version, with changes emphasized, is appended to the minutes.

   After lengthy discussion, it was decided that membership terms are not necessary, thus, the committee approved eliminating items II.A.iii., II.B.iii., and II.C.iii in the draft version. All additions to Section III, which clarified reporting responsibilities in WEAVE, were approved by the committee.

   After further discussion about procedures and timelines in Section IV, the committee decided to continue with the annual PLO assessment and improvement cycle and a cumulative 5-year academic program review which aligns with the regional accreditation reporting timeline. This is reflected in the draft version of the manual.

The Chair stated that the edited version of the manual would be distributed by email for final comment and eventual approval by the committee.

**VI. Action Items**
**Review the edited version of APAC Policies and Procedures manual and approved final version.**

VII. Next meeting: Fall, 2015

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Monica H. Baloga, Chair*
*April 13, 2015*

<div align="center">

**Academic Program Assessment Committee**

**Policies and Procedures**

<span style="color:red">**(DRAFT)**</span>

</div>

## I. Mission, Vision and Goal Statements

- **Mission**

The Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC) 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 Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) the status of the academic assessment process within the institution.

- **Vision Statement**

The APAC's vision is to foster and sustain a productive academic-oriented culture of assessment at Florida Institute of Technology by emphasizing the positive outcomes of the assessment process on the betterment of academic programs and student development.

- **Goal Statements**

  1. To define, review, and implement policies and procedures that help maintain an academic assessment process at Florida Tech.
  2. To assist academic units with assessment of student learning and development by reviewing the quality of, and providing feedback on, their assessment plans.
  3. To advocate the hiring of qualified personnel in the areas of assessment and institutional effectiveness.
  4. To recommend appropriate actions to the Offices of the VPAA and the Chief Operating Officer (COO) that are critical for sustaining the assessment process and promoting the culture of assessment at Florida Tech.

**II. Roles, Membership, Responsibilities, and Term Limits**

**A. Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC)**
   **i. Membership**
   The Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC) is composed of representatives from academic colleges, online learning, and academic support services. Each college will be represented by two members. The chair of the APAC will be from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) and will serve as a non-voting member. Academic deans, the VPAA, and the COO are *ex officio* members. All representatives are appointed by the COO.

   **ii. Responsibilities**
   The duties of APAC members are
   - to serve as chair or co-chair of a Divisional Review Committee; organizes the DRC reviews of assessment results and assessment plans;
   - to apprise the college dean or appropriate vice president of issues and updates related to the continuous quality improvement process;
   - to provide assistance and guidance to the unit and department heads on the academic assessment policies and procedures;
   - to provide timely communication of all APAC mandates, instructions, and deadlines to Assessment Coordinators and others as appropriate;
   - to maintain a current list of DRC members in the colleges and divisions and updates this with APAC chair each fall or whenever changes are made;
   - to serve as the liaison for any unit or program in his or her college or division that requires assistance in the development of plans, analysis of collected data, documentation of assessment results, and navigation of the web-based assessment management system;
   - to work with the Assistant Vice President of Assessment and the IE Assessment Analyst to coordinate training for Assessment Coordinators and other appropriate groups.

   **iii. Term of Membership**
   APAC members will be appointed to a three-year term with re-appoints possible. If a member cannot complete the three-year term, the dean will nominate a replacement to the Chair who will seek approval by the COO.

**B. Assessment Coordinator (AC)**
   **i. Membership**
   Assessment Coordinators (ACs) for an academic unit or degree program will be appointed by the dean of the college where the unit or program resides. In addition, the number of ACs per academic unit or degree program will be decided by the college deans. At the recommendation of the members of the Academic Program Assessment Committee, at least one Assessment Coordinator should be a 12-month faculty member or a staff member, such as a department head or an academic chair, who is very familiar with the academic unit or degree program to which he or she is assigned.

ii.   **Responsibilities**
The duties of an AC are
- to enter assessment plans in the web-based assessment management program.
- to collect and coordinate assessment data from faculty and/or staff responsible for implementing assessment measures.
- to enter all assessment data, action plans, and answers to analysis questions in the web-based assessment management program, WEAVE, for review by departmental/academic unit faculty, including program chairs and department heads. ACs should work with the Assistant VP of Assessment to ensure all is entered into WEAVE.
- to lead an annual departmental/academic unit discussion about all program-level student learning assessment data and results, comparing the results to those of the previous year.  The discussion should result in the development of Action Plans that lead to improvements to student learning.
- to lead a departmental/academic unit three-year review of the program assessment outcomes and measures, comparing them to those of the previous three years, and to make appropriate changes as necessary.
- to attend an annual meeting with the Assistant VP of Assessment to review new policies, procedures, and reporting criteria and to refresh training on WEAVE.

iii.   ~~**Term of Role**~~
~~The term limit for ACs will be determined by the academic unit head and approved by the dean of the college where the academic unit or program resides~~.

**C. Divisional Review Committee (DRC)**
i.   **Membership**
Within the academic sector of the university, a Divisional Review Committee (DRC) is composed of all Assessment Coordinators (ACs) from the departments, degree programs, or academic units that make up a particular division.  The co-chairs of the DRCs are two of their corresponding APAC representatives.  A division can be an entire academic college, group of colleges, and/or academic units within the institution of Florida Tech.  There are five academic Divisional Review Committees.  These are as follows:

CoB/ESD Divisional Review Committee (includes online programs)
CoE/CoA Divisional Review Committee (includes online/off-site programs)
CoPLA Divisional Review Committee (includes online programs)
CoS Divisional Review Committee (includes off-site programs)
GenEd Divisional Review Committee (includes University Experience)

## ii. Responsibilities

The DRC is responsible for the following:

- to establish internal submission deadlines for initial and final submissions of assessment results, reports and plans.
- to review and evaluate, every three years, the quality of assessment plans for each department, degree program, and academic unit with its division.  The review criteria are outlined in the Assessment Review Rubric and can be found on the APAC website (www.fit.edu/apac).  The procedural flowchart for Changes to Assessment Items that define the roles for DRC co-chairs and members can be found in this document and, separately, on the APAC website (www.fit.edu/apac).
- to assist faculty and staff in adhering to specific review criteria.
- to review all new degree programs before sending to APAC.  The procedural flowchart for New Programs that define the roles for DRC co-chairs and members can be found in this document and, separately, on the APAC website (www.fit.edu/apac).

## iii. Term of Membership

The term of membership on a DRC will be determined by the academic unit head and approved by the dean of the college where the academic unit or program resides.

### III. Policies

   A. **APAC Voting Policy**

   Two-thirds of the APAC members, not counting the chair and *ex officio* members, represent a quorum. A majority vote of a present quorum of members constitutes approval or passing of an item.

   B. **Assessment Policies**

   1. **Policy on PLOs and Number and Types of Measures**

   The <u>minimum</u> number of Program-level Student Learning Outcome (PLOs) statements per academic degree program and the number and type of measures for each is outlined below. These were decided by a majority vote by the members of the Academic Program Assessment Committee in the summer of 2010.

   "Academic programs" for Florida Institute of Technology will be defined as any degree-granting program. These include PhD/PsyD/EdS/EdD/MS/MSA/MBA/MAT/MEd/ BS/BA/AS/AA programs. Although degree-programs may have several options, they will be treated as one entity (with special requirements that will be detailed below) in the assessment process.

   1) For all <u>bachelor's degree programs</u>, a minimum of six Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes (PLOs) will be used for assessment purposes with two in each area of Discipline Specific Knowledge, Communication, and Critical Thinking. The exceptions to this plan are for degree programs with multiple options, specifically in the area of Discipline Specific Knowledge. These programs will have one PLO statement that reflects general knowledge of the degree program and one PLO statement for each option in that program that reflects the specific emphasis in that degree program. Lastly, as decided at this time, the number of measures used for assessing each PLO will be two, and at least one will be a direct measure.

   2) For all <u>associate's degree programs</u>, a minimum of three PLOs will be used for assessment purposes, one in each area of Discipline Specific Knowledge, Communication, and Critical Thinking. The number of measures for assessing each PLO will be two, and at least one will be a direct measure.

   3) For all <u>graduate programs</u>, a minimum of three PLOs will be used for assessment purposes, one in each area of Discipline Specific Knowledge, Communication, and Critical Thinking. The number of measures for assessing each PLO will be one, and it will be a direct measure.

   4) For all <u>credit-bearing certificate programs</u>, a minimum of one PLO will be used for assessment purposes, in the area of Discipline Specific Knowledge. The number of measures for assessing the PLO will be two, and at least one will be direct.

   2. **Policy on Assessment Items (Mission, Vision statements, Course Mapping, Curriculum Mapping, Measurement Statements that include Achievement Targets)**

   **Mission statements** at the university level, the college levels, and the academic unit levels are required and should align with each other (i.e. unit to college, college to university). 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.

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

**Goals** were determined to be optional.

**Course mapping,** which requires **course level student learning outcomes (SLOs),** is strongly recommended as part of "best practices". The process of course mapping can be determined by each academic college.

**Curriculum/Assessment mapping,** which requires **program level student learning outcomes (PLOs),** is required for internal and external purposes (ex. for reporting to accrediting institutions). PLOs must be reported in WEAVE, the university's commercial, web-based assessment software, in the Outcomes/Objectives section of the Assessment Summary page.

**Measurement statements that include Achievement Targets** are required for each PLO and must be reported in WEAVE in the Measures & Findings section of the Assessment Summary page.

**Rubrics** used to determine level of achievement are required and must be uploaded into WEAVE.

**IV. Assessment and Evaluation Procedures and Timelines**

    **A. Collection and Recording of Assessment Data**

PLOs for each academic program will be measured each time their corresponding assessment course is offered. All data and results (i.e. Findings and Target statuses) for each Measure must be recorded in WEAVE annually. However, to ensure data integrity, it is strongly recommended that data be recorded as soon as they are collected.

    **B. Development of Action Plans**

Action Plans must be created for all Targets that are found to be "Partially Met" or "Not Met". Action Plans need to be implemented by the beginning of the next assessment year in order to be part of the next annual cycle. Entry Statuses (i.e. In-Progress, Ongoing, Terminated, or Finished) for all Action Plans from the previous cycle need to be updated annually in accordance with the PLO assessment schedule.

    **C. Analysis Questions**

Analysis Questions found on the Achievement Summary/Analysis page in WEAVE require responses ~~during each year of appointed PLO assessment~~annually.

    **D. Annual Assessment Reporting**

Program level ~~APAC voted to evaluate~~ assessment data are collected annually over~~during~~ a calendar (vs. academic) year period. Action Plan reporting and Analysis Questions responses for the prior calendar year must be completed in WEAVE by June 1 of the current calendar year. ~~Annual assessment data will be collected for three consecutive years, after which a full review of the academic program is required.~~

    **E. ~~Five-year Assessment Cycle -~~ Academic Program Review (APR) ~~and Improvements Made as a Result of Assessment~~**

Every five years, a full academic program review, which includes a cumulative evaluation of PLO assessment undertaken since the last review, is required for all academic degree programs and their respective units. Additional components of the APR will be determined by SACSCOC- and university-level requirements. ~~During this year of academic program review and reporting, no PLO assessment will be required.~~

~~In the year following the APR, improvements to academic units and degree programs will be made based on the five-year evaluation process. New PLOs, measures and targets will be developed in anticipation of the next five-year assessment cycle. During this year, no PLO assessment will be required.~~

~~5-Year Assessment Cycle timeline:~~
    ~~Year 1: implement major improvements to academic units and degree programs; develop new PLOs, measures, and targets~~
    ~~Year 2: annual PLO assessment~~

Year 3: annual PLO assessment
Year 4: annual PLO assessment
Year 5: full academic program review