

# Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Meeting

9/11/13  
3- 5 PM  
WSC – Warren – Room 211

**Type of Meeting:** Planning  
**Transcriber:** Kristin

**Attendees:** Bob Austin, Melissa Wilson, Mark Hanna, Janet Barton, Patsy Lemaster, Joe Wyatt, Jeff Wallick, Megan Eikner, Cynthia Urbina, and Kristin McDonald-Willey

**Absentees:** Danita McAnally, Lee Colaw, and Tina Babb

## Minutes

<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Overview of New Committee Members</p>	<p><b>ACTION</b> - Introduction of new and current committee members and brief overview provided on committee's purpose. Group diversity is integral to the Non-Instructional (NI) Committee's success. The NI Committee meets primarily on institutional effectiveness issues and attempts to create processes that are meaningful and also fulfill SACSCOC requirements.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Kristin</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Overview of SACSOC Institutional Effectiveness Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.5</b> – The institution engages in ongoing, integrated and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes</li> <li>(2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and</li> <li>(3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.</li> </ol> <p><u>Suggestion:</u> At a minimum (1) describe the planning process used at the institutional level including a list of persons and/or committees which play key roles in the process; (2) describe the process by which institutional goals and objectives are set, reviewed, modified, and (3) identify who is responsible for setting and modifying institutional goals. Provide a timeline by which the above occurs, the plans (such as a strategic plan) that have been developed, assessment results, and improvements resulting from the analysis of assessment results. Describe how the planning and evaluation process informs budgeting decisions.</p> </li> <li>• <b>3.3.1</b> – The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>3.3.1.1 – Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes:</b> <u>Suggestion:</u> Ensure that data displays address all locations both traditional and electronic delivery; ensure that there is evidence of review of both the education program itself and of the student learning outcomes for each educational program; Ensure that goals/objectives and data gathered are meaningful</li> <li>○ <b>3.3.1.2 – Administrative support services:</b> <u>Suggestion:</u> Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple “to do” lists.</li> <li>○ <b>3.3.1.3 – Educational support services</b> <u>Suggestion:</u> Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple “to do” lists.</li> <li>○ <b>3.3.1.5 – Community/Public Service within its educational mission, if appropriate</b> <u>Suggestion:</u> Create meaningful goals/objectives, not simple “to do” lists.</li> <li>○ <b>Note:</b> 3.3.1.4 – Research within its educational mission is Not Applicable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Kristin</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Overview of Task</p>	<p><b>Kristin</b> – Noted that in August the President's Cabinet Mandated that the institution do away with the old PET process and begin a new process where the Program Review process is combined with the PET form. Kristin has already been working with the Student Service's division to make form edits for their division. <b>Bob</b> – Discussed how for Student Services this new process could capture in meaningful information. That the new process would not require lengthy responses, graphs, etc. and could just serve as a simple reflection on data. Also discussed how various sections could be catered to individual areas. <b>Overall</b> – The discussion was general and revolved around the purpose, importance, and functionality of the review process.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Kristin and Bob</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Overview of Form</p>	<p>Bob took the group on a guide through the form.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Bob</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Tina's Suggested Edits</p>	<p>Tina was unable to attend, but sent some edits and/or questions via e-mail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What should an area do if every question is not applicable to their area?</li> <li>• Part V – Question 4 – Include wording such as “audits” for clarity</li> </ul>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Kristin read e-mail comments</p>

<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Committee Comments</p>	<p><b>Concern</b> - A few committee members were still concerned with some of the wording or the length of the document. There were still some concerns about how the information reported on the form would actually be <b>used</b>.</p> <p><b>Response</b> – Continue to work on wording and assurance that President's Cabinet expressed interest in using the data to form strategic planning and make institutional improvements.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Group</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item:</b> Request</p>	<p>Take the form, review the information, and send any comments/concerns to Kristin. At the next meeting, the plan was to take the Student Services form and review the form in a more in-depth way.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator:</b> Kristin</p>
<p><b>Next Meeting:</b> To be scheduled within a few weeks.</p>		