

Meeting Minutes for the
Administrative and Academic Support Assessment Committee Meeting
Monday, April 30, 2012, 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 (via teleconference), Greg Graham, Wendy Helmstetter, Eric Kledzik, John Milbourne, Rodd Newcombe, Beverly Sanders, Leslie Savoie (non-voting), John Windsor, Claire Wurmfeld

Absent: Tom Marcinkowski, Bob Rowe

I. Approval of April 2, 2012 meeting minutes

All voting members present approved the minutes with no corrections.

II. Endorsement of Student Affairs' Targets

The Chair reminded the committee members that only two administrative/academic support units had assessment Targets that have not been endorsed. These are for Student Affairs and Marketing and Communication. The Chair stated that Marketing and Communication was still working on theirs, and committee members should be prepared to endorse via email communication when they have been completed. The Chair asked for the committee's endorsement of the Targets listed for Student Affairs. All voting members present endorsed those Targets.

III. Achievement Summary/Analysis questions: discussions and approval

The Chair reviewed the questions for this section that were printed in the meeting agenda. These questions have already been reviewed by the Academic Program Assessment Committee during their meeting on April 20, 2012. After some discussion, the questions were edited as follows:

a. Assessment Process:

- 1) Were all assessment items (courses, outcomes, measures, and targets, if applicable) appropriate and reasonable? If the answer is "no" to any of these, provide a brief explanation.
- 2) Did you have enough resources to implement the assessment process? If not, provide a brief explanation.

b. Overall Program Analysis:

What did the findings for the learning and/or intended outcomes reveal about the strengths and limitations of the academic degree program or the administrative/academic support unit overall? Provide a brief (2-3 paragraphs) narrative response.

The questions were approved by all voting members present.*

(*After submitting the edited questions to the APAC for their final approval, it was requested that question b. read "What did the findings for the learning *outcomes* (*i.e.*

PLOs) and/or intended outcomes reveal about the strengths and limitations of the academic degree program or the administrative/academic support unit overall? Provide a brief (2-3 paragraphs) narrative response.” Because this was not a substantive change, the Chair made the change without seeking final approval from the AASAC.)

IV. Action Items

Continue to encourage the administrative/academic support DRCs to report in WEAVE during this cycle for practice. Dr. Windsor stressed that it is important that all units (including the academic programs) log the amount of time and effort put into the entire assessment process (collecting and analyzing data, reporting, meetings, etc.) in order to have a good accounting of resources needed for this task.

V. Next Meeting: TBD, Fall 2012

Respectfully submitted,
Monica H Baloga, Chair