

Meeting Minutes for the
Administrative and Academic Support Assessment Committee Meeting
Monday, August 29, 2011, 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Link Multimedia Classroom (Room 204)

In attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair, non-voting), Rodney Bowers, Brian Ehrlich, Tristan Fiedler, Willie Freeman, Greg Graham, Wendy Helmstetter, Tom Marcinkowski, John Milbourne, Rodd Newcombe, Bob Rowe, Beverly Sanders, Leslie Savoie (non-voting), John Windsor, Claire Wurmfeld

Absent: Rob Ghiotto

The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming back Dr. John Windsor from his summer hiatus and then had the other members introduce themselves to the two newest members of the committee, Claire Wurmfeld (Financial Planning) and Willie Freeman (IT).

I. Approval of July 18, 2011 meeting minutes

All voting members approved the minutes as is.

II. Missing Product/Services lists

The Chair mentioned four units that still had not turned in Product/Services lists to upload onto WEAVEonline. They are Financial Aid, Financial Planning, Security, and the Office of Institutional Compliance. These four units are requested to submit these as soon as possible.

III. Discussion and Endorsement of Mission Statements

The Chair announced a suggestion by Dr. Tom Marcinkowski (sent via email prior to the meeting) that, for easy identification, each mission statement should contain the name of the unit for which it was written. There was general agreement among the other committee members but questions arose about whether official or abbreviated unit names should be used. The use of an abbreviated name (e.g. the Office of Research) may be easier and may avoid unnecessary confusion that the use of official names (e.g. the Office of the Vice President for Research) may bring about. The Chair requested that the DRCs poll their members about which names they would like to use, and once the list is generated, she will take it to the Chief Operating Officer for approval.

Another item that came up regarding mission statements is the use of the university name, and its derivatives, in the statement. It was agreed, for consistency, that “Florida Institute of Technology”, “Florida Tech”, or “FIT” should not be included and instead the generic term “university” be used to indicate the institution. The Chair asked the committee whether this and the policy about the unit name should be included in the rubric used to evaluate the mission statements. The committee members agreed, and the

Chair table the endorsement of the statements until unit names are approved and the changes are made. The revised rubric is appended to these minutes.

Finally, the Chair instructed that the recently submitted mission statements for Financial Aid and the Office of Institutional Compliance (OIC) be reviewed by their respective DRCs before the next meeting. It was decided that the OIC would be categorized as part of the Academic and Administrative Support DRC.

IV. Discussion and Approval of Rubric for Objectives/Intended Outcomes

The Chair asked for discussion of the rubric to be used to evaluate objectives/intended outcomes. The revised rubric is appended to these minutes. Voting was tabled until the committee could review and comment on the revisions. The Chair requested that the voting be done by email.

V. Next Meeting: Monday, September 26, 10-11 a.m.

Unless there is a delay in approving the objective/intended outcomes rubric, the Chair announced the next meeting to be on Monday, September 26, from 10-11 a.m. The Link Multimedia Classroom has been tentatively reserved.

*Respectfully submitted,
Monica H Baloga, Chair*

Action Items:

- 1) Submit Products/Services List from Financial Aid, Financial Planning, Security, and Office of Institutional Compliance.**
- 2) Submit list of abbreviated unit names for approval by COO.**
- 3) Review and comment on the revised rubric for objectives/intended outcomes.**

AASAC Assessment Plan Evaluation Rubric (Draft)

Unit Name _____ Year _____

Mission Statement* A concise statement outlining the purpose of the administrative or academic support units, who it serves, in what ways, and with what result.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General statement of the intent of the administrative or academic support unit. Doesn't identify stakeholders. Too general to distinguish the administrative or academic support unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of the administrative or academic support unit's purpose. Identifies stakeholders. Identify[#] and distinguish from other administrative or academic support units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and concise. Statement of the administrative or academic support unit's purpose. Indicates primary functions or activities of the administrative or academic support unit. Identifies stakeholders. Aligned with respective professional organization and program-specific bodies, if applicable. Specific to the administrative or academic support unit (identifies[#] the unit and what it does that separates it from others).
Notes:		

*Use the term "university" in place of "Florida Institute of Technology", "Florida Tech", or "FIT".

[#]Use approved office/department/unit name.

Objectives/Intended Outcomes Specific statements that describe the desired quality of key functions and services within the administrative or academic support unit.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than three outcomes listed. Incomplete – does not address the major functions or services associated with the unit. One or more does not describe an outcome. Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum of three outcomes listed. Addresses major functions and services associated with the unit. Some use action verbs (according to Bloom's Taxonomy). Observable and measurable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets "Acceptable" criteria. Most statements use action verbs (according to Bloom's Taxonomy) For units with a strong learning component, at least one outcome focuses on student learning.
Notes:		