Meeting Minutes for the
Administrative and Academic Support Assessment Committee Meeting
Monday, September 26, 2011, 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Link Multimedia Classroom (Room 204)

In attendance: Monica Baloga (Chair, non-voting), Rodney Bowers, Brian Ehrlich (via teleconference), Tristan Fiedler, Tom Marcinkowski (late), John Milbourne, Rodd Newcombe, Beverly Sanders, Leslie Savoie (non-voting), John Windsor, Claire Wurmfeld; Eric Kledzik (guest)

Absent: Rob Ghiotto, Greg Graham, Wendy Helmstetter, Bob Rowe

I. Approval of August, 2011 meeting minutes

All voting members approved the minutes with no corrections.

II. Endorsement of Mission Statements

The Chair informed the committee that the requested changes were made to all unit mission statements. Many unit names were amended to reflect the approved letterhead names, which were in line with most of the abbreviated names submitted by DRCs. All voting members endorsed the mission statements.

III. Progress Report: Review of Objectives/Intended Outcomes

a. Academic and Administrative Support DRC reported that most units have been reviewed.
b. Student Support DRC reported that most drafts are complete and the review process will begin.
c. Financial DRC reported that they will begin work on drafting outcomes and then start the review process.
d. Resources DRC reported that Facilities Operations and Campus Security have been reviewed, but that Environmental & Regulatory Compliance is pending.
e. QEP DRC reported (via the Chair) that the review process is underway.

Because of the various levels of progress, the Chair indicated that the deadline for review of Objectives/Intended Outcomes will be extended to the next AASAC meeting on October 24th.

IV. Discussion of Measures and Achievement Targets

The Chair requested that DRCs begin deciding on assessment measurement tools and appropriate desired achievement targets. She also reminded everyone that two measures are needed for each outcome and at least one of those must be a direct measure. The rubric for evaluating measures and targets will be reviewed and voted on at the next

meeting. Dr. Windsor pointed out that it would be difficult to define an intended outcome without having some idea already about how to measure it. Many of the committee members agreed to this stating that many already had measurement tools proposed with the intended outcomes. It was decided that although the committee may approve outcome statements, there will be allowances for change once measures and targets are defined. Again it was stressed that all assessment items need to be finalized and approved before January, 2012.

V. Action Items:
 1) Finalize Objectives/Intended Outcomes review by October 24th.
 2) Discuss Measures and Achievement Targets with DRCs. If units have not already done so, begin work on creating those.

VI. Next Meeting: Monday, October 24, 2011, 10-11 a.m.
 The Link Multimedia Classroom (room 204) has been reserved.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica H Baloga, Chair

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.		
☐ **Developing**	☐ **Acceptable**	☐ **Exemplary**
• 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.	• Statement of the administrative or academic support unit's purpose. • Identifies stakeholders. • Identify[#] and distinguish from other administrative or academic support units.	• 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.		
☐ **Developing**	☐ **Acceptable**	☐ **Exemplary**
• 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.	• 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.	• 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:		