

**Meeting Minutes for the
Academic Program Assessment Committee Meeting**
September 1, 2015, 12:00-1:00 p.m.
2nd floor Conference Room, Olin Physical Sciences Building

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

Absence: Michael Grace

Guests: John Allen, CJ Colley

I. Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone back from our last meeting in April and from the summer break.

II. SACSCOC update and questions

Because Florida Tech is in its reaffirmation year, the Chair updated the committee about the institution's response to four recommendations from the SACSCOC On-Site Committee. The Response Report was due on August 10, 2015. One recommendation for FR 4.7, found non-compliant, required only that Florida Tech provide updated site and address information to the U.S. Department of Education. Official approval of the updated sites by USDOE is still pending. The other three recommendations were based on Florida Tech's QEP, which was found to be compliant for both standards. The responses to those recommendations included how students would be involved in the development and implementation of QEP programs, how many students were expected to be impacted by them, and how to better assess desired competencies and learning outcomes associated with them.

III. Revised Mission Statement – review and vote

The Chair handed out the revised mission statement supplied by the Dean's Council and asked for its review. Committee members expressed concern that the revised statement did not truly reflect the mission of Florida Tech and questioned the omission of certain disciplines. The vote was tabled and the Chair asked committee members to please discuss their concerns with their respective deans. Feedback would be requested within a week via email.

IV. Annual Assessment Reports by College

In addition to the typical annual general assessment report, Dr. Stanfield, Assistant VP for Assessment, also did an in-depth analysis of specific academic programs. Undergraduate and graduate degree programs from each academic unit using the same outcomes and targets for 3 to 4 years were analyzed for trends (i.e. growth in student learning). He also reviewed all reported

improvements in order to provide further recommendations for improving the assessment process and student learning overall. The Chair yielded the floor to Dr. Stanfield so that he could discuss some concerning practices he discovered while preparing the report.

- a. Definition of Partially Met - In his review, Dr. Stanfield noted that academic units used different criteria for reporting targets as “Partially Met”. He proposed that the committee consider either create a definition or establish criteria for this category. After discussion, it was decided that an explanation would be required for all targets marked this way.
- b. Rubric Calibration – Another area of wide variance was with performance rubrics. In some case, rubrics used a three-point system while others may use four or five. Furthermore, the criteria for the highest-ranking category were concrete, but the other categories were open to interpretation. Lastly, some rubrics were not performance or learning oriented. Dr. Stanfield stated that he would like to meet with academic units separately in order to discuss the development of better rubrics.
- c. Indirect Measures – Dr. Stanfield noted that academic units may want to consider indirect measures such as student satisfaction and perception surveys to support direct learning measures. It may be beneficial to assess not only how well students are achieving learning outcomes, but also how they perceive how well they are learning.

V. Action Items:

1. Discuss concerns about revised mission statement with deans and report back via email.

VI. Next meeting: October 6, 2015 from 12-1 p.m.; location TBD

*Respectfully submitted,
Monica H. Baloga, Chair
September 9, 2015*