DRAFT

The meeting convened at 1:00 p.m. in Howell Hall Room 107.

Members Present: James Hefflin, Jennifer Holland, Mary Penick, Terry Paridon, Philip Schroeder, Gregory Treadwell, Kirsten Underwood; Tom Sutherlin (non-voting ex officio)

Recording Secretary: Sharon Johnson,

I. Discuss Scheduling, Procedures, and Modifications for 2009-2010 Presentations:

Committee members discussed the problem of coming to the PQIR presentations without seeing the documents or the previous year’s evaluation. Jim Hefflin suggested the documentation be due a minimum of one week prior to the presentation. Mary Penick commented that it would be difficult to keep multiple due dates straight. Tom Sutherlin suggested we could have a single due date for all documentation and multiple dates for presentations. Discussion developed between committee members about the pros and cons of each approach. Benson Warren called for the question: Mary Penick moved to go to a single date; Greg Treadwell seconded the motion. The motion passed. After further discussion, it was decided to ask for the presentations to start in mid-November with the documentation due on all programs a week before that date. Tom Sutherlin checked the calendar and asked for the presentations to start on November 16 and therefore the documents would be due on November 10, 2009.

Greg Treadwell began discussion on the locations of the presentations. Discussion developed around the difficulty last year of not knowing enough in advance where everyone was supposed to be. It was the group’s consensus that presentations should be held in Howell Hall 107 again. Tom Sutherlin suggested CETES if it was available for meeting rooms. Benson commented either site would be acceptable and better than moving targets. Tom Sutherlin was tasked to make appropriate reservations and send a calendar of time and location to Benson prior to the next meeting. Tom also indicated he needed to work with the General Education committee on when they wanted to do PQIRs and see if that could be accommodated the same way.

Tom was asked to set up 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. presentations Monday through Thursday and all day Friday on the dates within the planned schedule.

II. PQIR Template and Administrative Review Form:

Benson Warren distributed the PQIR template and review form for discussion. The committee members discussed the contents and made suggestions for changes. Jim Hefflin asked if we were going to continue evaluating every element for every program. Tom Sutherlin recommended that committee members should modify their evaluations for new programs in their first and second year. Not enough data would be available to adequately discuss trends until the program had three years of data.

Discussion developed around the PowerPoint template and what information was critical to process. Greg Treadwell expressed his concern that the focus on the highest priority program outcomes each year might create an atmosphere that the other outcomes were not important. Terry Paridon indicated that too much work was being put on the faculty and this was infringing on their ability to teach effectively. Jim Hefflin thought the process was challenging the academic freedom of the faculty to decide what was important in their disciplines. Tom Sutherlin pointed out that no one in the administration or the committee was telling the faculty what their content priorities are or what learning outcomes should have the highest priority. He went on to point out that we are accountable to all of our constituencies and assessment is one way of documenting how effective we are at improving learning and services to the students. Terry Paridon disagreed and voiced concern that the process was too invasive and disruptive.

Terry Paridon left the meeting at this time.

Tom Sutherlin offered for discussion a process to make the documentation easier to capture electronically and maintain for the archives and review by the IAC.

1. PQIR folder be set up by ITS on a Cameron Server
2. Chairs upload the presentation files and documents into program specific folders
3. Deans review and approve the stored documentation.
4. IAC members access presentation and documentation prior to the meeting from the server

After discussion, Benson asked Tom to visit with Dr. McArthur and determine if this process could be used and report back at the next meeting.

Benson also asked Tom to prepare an annual calendar with all the PQIR and assessment activities so the committee could see the whole process and plan how to manage the work flow. He knows that the new members will not be aware of all the activities the IAC works on and too often it is thought by the faculty members that their program reviews are all there is to assessment.

Greg Treadwell asked to go back to his question about the learning outcomes. He recommended the committee ask the departments to list all of their learning outcomes every year. Benson voiced concern that it becomes confusing during the presentations because some faculty member spend too much time discussing that long list and not adequately reviewing the direct measures of student learning and what has been done to improve those learning outcomes. Mary Penick indicated she could see both points and asked how we might address both issues. Jim Hefflin suggested we need to know how the programs did on improving the outcomes they chose last year. Philip Schroeder brought up the point that one year might not be enough time to
clearly measure if a change had improved student learning. After further discussion, it was decided that the new PowerPoint template should start with report on the outcome of last year’s proposed actions. Greg Treadwell recommended requiring a list of all program outcomes as part of the documentation. Committee members agreed with asking for this documentation.

III. Assessment Workshops

Benson recommended the committee prioritize this year additional assessment training to include:

- Assessment examination validity and reliability;
- Portfolio review rubrics;
- Rater reliability training;
- Use of the IDEA course evaluation surveys to improve student learning.

These will be prioritized at a later meeting. The examination validity and reliability was considered important.

IV. Faculty Handbook Recommendation for Committee structure and changes in membership and title correction of VP for Student services to Dean of Student Services and Director of Assessment and Planning to Director of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Benson reported he was going to make recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs to correct titles and adjust the membership of the committee. Jennifer Holland suggested the committee consider adding some staff member from the areas cover by the assessment of student satisfaction. Benson indicated he would visit with Dr. McArthur about the committee membership as well as the corrections.

Chair Warren called for any other business and hearing none, adjourned the meeting.