University-Wide Assessment Committee
Administrative Units
November 1, 2011
2:00 p.m., Dawsey Conference Room

Members present: John Beard, Lori Church, Abdallah Haddad, Matt Hogue, Dan Lawless, Holly Legg, Chris Mee, Thom Mezzapelle, Anne Monk, Meg Hurt (for Greg Thornburg), Sandy Williams

Members absent: Jennifer Hughes, Tim McCormick, Kim Sherfesee

Opening Remarks
Anne Monk, Chair, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in the Dawsey Conference Room and welcomed all present.

Review of Assessment Report Rubrics
The Committee members were divided into groups to review all 2010-2011 assessment reports using an assessment rubric. All results will be sent to the administrative departments.

Academic Testing Center
The assessment report for Academic Testing Center improved some but still needed some work. The objectives needed some work. More training is necessary to help the editor have a better understanding of how to write an objective. This will help when it is time to write the analysis of results and the use of results for continuous improvement.

Admissions
The Office of Admissions did well on writing the results sections. However, timelines were needed within the objectives.

Conference Services
Conference Services used more than one verb when writing objectives. The objectives need to be better streamlined.

Public Safety
The mission statement for the Office of Public Safety should be the same as the mission statement on the website.

Facilities
The Department of Facilities used more than one verb when writing objectives. This has been resolved in the 2011-2012 assessment plan.

Financial Aid
The verbs within the objectives in the Office of Financial Aid assessment report are hard to measure. Timelines also need to be included within the objectives.

Financial Services
The assessment report for the Office of Financial Services was well written. The objectives were very clear and easily measured.

**Grants and Sponsored Research**
The Office of Grants and Sponsored Research have a difficult time to report on how the office enhanced student support services. The objectives need to be clarified.

**Human Resources and Equal Opportunities**
The Office of Human Resources and Equal Opportunities had well written objectives. Timelines were well integrated. There were no real issues reported with the use of results.

**Information Technology Services**
The assessment report for Information Technology Services is way too long. It should be condensed.

**Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis**
The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Analysis assessment report was very well written. No suggestions were made by the committee.

**Office for Philanthropy**
The mission statement for the Office for Philanthropy needed to be rewritten. It seems to be more of a sales pitch than a mission statement. Fundraising should be mentioned within it.

**Orientation**
The Orientation assessment report needed timelines included in the objectives. Verbs were used that were measurable.

**Procurement and Business Services**
The Procurement and Business Services report was well written.

**University Communication**
University Communication needed to look at the mission statement. There is a connection to the University mission statement but it could be stronger. Timelines will also need to be added to the objectives.

**University Relations**
The report for University Relations was recently updated and will need to be re-evaluated. The updated review will be sent to the department.

**Wheelwright Auditorium**
Wheelwright Auditorium needed to add timelines to the objectives in the assessment report.

The reports were the Office of the Registrar and the University Counsel were not completed by the time the assessment rubrics were completed. Anne Monk, Chris Mee and Holly Legg will go back and review these two reports and forward the review to the departments.

All 2011-2012 assessment plans will be re-opened until November 11, 2011 to be able to make any changes based on the rubric assessments. The rubrics need to be assessed to determine if
changes need to be made. Through this review, it was determined that the part of the rubric that asks how the report indicates how the department enhances support of student programs and/or services is very hard to assess for administrative units. This part might need to be removed or rewritten.

The SACS onsite visit is scheduled for March 6-8, 2012.

A reminder to all committee members was given by Anne Monk, if any would like to participate in the focus groups being administered by the Student Development Oversight Committee please let Jennie Cassidy know. The focus groups will be held on November 2 and 3 at 7:00 p.m. Some of the questions that the facilitators will be asking of the students relate to the administrative units.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the University-Wide Assessment Committee – Administrative Units will be on Tuesday, December 6, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Dawsey Conference Room. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.