University-Wide Assessment Committee  
Student Development  
January 27, 2015  
9:00 a.m., Arcadia 120 Conference Room

Members present: John Beard, Jennie Cassidy, Whitney Comer, Allison Faix, Vivian Ford, Michael Jacobs, Tara Josey, Chris Mee, Aggie O'Brien-Gayes, Geoff Parsons, Caesar Ross, Michael Ruse, Pat Singleton-Young, Charles Whiffen, Tom Woodle

Members absent: Jean Ann Brakefield, Stephen Harrison, Travis Overton

Welcome

Jennie Cassidy, Chair, convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the Arcadia 120 Conference Room and welcomed all present.

Discussion Items

2015-16 Assessment Plans – Due to the upcoming SACSCOC accreditation visit, the 2013-14 assessment reports were submitted and evaluated early. This process has now been completed. The existing 2014-15 assessment plans have already been rolled forward into the 2015-16 template. This may cause confusion as individuals may think their plan is already complete. Plans, or elements of plans, may remain the same over several years; however, changes to plans may also take place. Preliminary 2015-16 Assessment Plans are due March 15, 2015.

Feel the Teal Assessment – At the last meeting Eileen Soisson joined the committee to discuss Feel the Teal assessment. Based on the discussion, several general goals were identified for this committee:

1) Compilation of a list of assessment items
2) Inclusion of identified assessment items in yearly plans
3) Continued discussion relative to why students leave the University

Included with the meeting materials is information submitted by Eileen in follow up to the last committee meeting. Information includes the Feel the Teal mission, vision, and key elements of service and culture perceptions to be assessed. Also included is a summary of each training module and the learning objectives for each. Eileen is currently assessing the actual training modules. The committee goal is to assess how we (the University) are doing after participating in the Feel the Teal training.

Discussion turned to the identified key elements of service and culture supplied by Eileen. These include:

- Do we provide service that offers reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and professional tangibles?
- Does CCU have a culture that is civil and respectful of others?
- Have service situations been resolved and handled in a professional manner?
- Does CCU have a positive service culture apparent to its external customers? Yes No
- Does CCU have a positive service culture apparent to its internal customers? Yes No
It was suggested that the components of the first element (e.g. reliability, responsiveness, etc.) be further defined. These components may mean different things to different people. Terms are subjective and difficult to measure. In addition, it is not being suggested that all of these key elements be initially assessed.

It was suggested that components be clearly identified and assessment items be created that may be relevant across areas. Assessment items can then be incorporated into departmental assessment plans. It was also discussed that students are not the only stakeholders being targeted by the Feel the Teal initiative.

A suggestion was made that the second through fifth elements on the above list be added to Eileen's Feel the Teal assessments. As not all CCU employees and students attend the training, surveying this group would not be representative of the campus as a whole.

**Retention** – At the last committee meeting the possible relationship between retention and the culture at Coastal was discussed as an item for future discussion. It was decided to take a closer look at why people are leaving. Exit interviews are given to freshmen who self-identify that they are going to transfer to another university. Aggie O'Brien-Gayes shared that the top three reasons (financial, too far from home, unavailable course of study) have remained consistent over time. Financial issues may worsen over time as federal guidelines for elective versus required courses have become stricter. Michael Ruse shared that our Financial Aid Department is working on this issue. John Beard shared that modifications to Program Evaluation may be made to help alleviate the problems being caused by the new guidelines. Originally Program Evaluation was built to assist with advising, not to track federal requirements relative to financial aid.

**Next Meeting** – As assessment reports for 2015-16 are due in March, it was recommended that the next meeting focus on rubrics and tools for developing assessment plans.

With nothing further to discuss the meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.