

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI  
**University Assessment Committee Meeting**  
**October 24, 2006**  
12:15 pm  
Honor's Classroom

**Members Present:**

Lue Bell, Mitchell Berman, Patricia Biesiot, Denise Brown, Wynde Fitts, Jerry Griffith, Desmond Fletcher, Stanley Hauer, Jim Henderson, David Hunt, Kathryn Lowery, Kathy Masters, Bill Powell (and proxy for Steve Moser), Beth Richardson

**I. Call to Order**

Patricia Biesiot called the meeting to order at 12:20 p.m. The UAC reviewer training sessions held the first two weeks of October are not considered official UAC meetings.

**II. Issues with Assessment Plans and/or Reviewing and Reporting Rubrics**

**Academic Programs**

A question regarding an “unacceptable” target in the PowerPoint handout from the UAC training sessions was raised. It was determined to be an error in the handout. The members had a discussion about acceptable targets. Reviewers should ensure the programs are very specific in their targets. For example, if a program sets a target that a percentage of graduates will get a job after they graduate, the wording should specify “a job within their field.”

A member suggested the measures should be consistent across the university. For example, should programs have one measure called “Exit Survey” with multiple targets addressing multiple outcomes or multiple measures called “Exit Survey” - one for each outcome? It was suggested the programs with multiple measures with the same name be more specific in the measure’s title field to eliminate confusion.

A discussion was held regarding program missions. In the conversion to WEAVE, the program’s purpose from the old four-column template was inserted into the Mission field of WEAVE. The UAC members were reminded of this. Some programs have updated their “purpose” into a “mission.” Programs could include both their department’s mission and program’s purpose in the Mission field of WEAVE.

A member noted the plans will improve over time. Some departments have just recently formed formal assessment committees.

A member suggested a vertical tool is needed to help administrators collect data. This tool would begin with the faculty. If such a system was in place, the chairs and faculty would be able to spend more time analyzing data instead of collecting data.

A member wanted to know if consequences were in place for the programs that did not “take” the suggestions of the reviewers. In the past, most of the programs that did not “pass” the UAC review were very receptive to help. Institutional Effectiveness, specifically the Coordinator of Assessment, now has more time to focus on the individual assessment plans and to aid in and follow the revision process.

### **III. Revisions to UAC Policies and Procedures**

The members received a handout of the 10-24-06 draft revisions of the UAC Policies and Procedures. The revisions were proposed for discussion.

#### **Section 3.2. Responsibilities**

The members received a SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 and on-site review selected comments/recommendation handout. This handout was distributed to give the members an opportunity to review the standard and comments from the on-site team regarding evidence of improvement based on analysis of results. The phrase “which must demonstrate continuous improvement” was proposed as an addition to the first UAC responsibility, “guide the assessment process.” A member stated the term “guide” implies the committee is an advisory committee.

#### **Section 4.1. Faculty Representatives**

It was proposed faculty representation change from “if a college has more than **50** academic programs to assess, additional members may be appointed by the respective dean at the ratio of one additional member for every **25** additional academic programs or fraction thereof” to “if a college has **30** or more academic programs to assess, additional members may be appointed by the respective dean at the ratio of one additional member for every **15** additional academic programs or fraction thereof.” This would lessen the number of assessment plans each UAC member would have to review. It would also ensure all members would be able to review plans from outside their college.

#### **Section 4.2. Administrative Representatives**

It was proposed administrative representation change from “the Executive Cabinet appoints **three** Committee members from Administrative units” to “the Executive Cabinet appoints **six** Committee members from Administrative units.” This would lessen the number of assessment plans each UAC member would have to review.

#### **Section 4.3. Ex Officio Members**

It was proposed the Coordinator of Assessment be added as an ex officio member of the committee. The issue of whether an ex officio member was able to vote was discussed at length. The committee will consult Robert’s Rules of Order to resolve the issue.

The proposals will be voted on at the next UAC meeting.

### **IV. Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

### **V. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.