

8-11-2008

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting : 2008 : 08 : 11

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/
institutional_research_minutes_agendas](https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/institutional_research_minutes_agendas)

Scholar Commons Citation

Institutional Effectiveness Committee, "Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting : 2008 : 08 : 11" (2008). *Institutional Research: Meeting Minutes and Agendas*. 2.
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/institutional_research_minutes_agendas/2

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Institutional Research at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institutional Research: Meeting Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

USFSP • Institutional Effectiveness Committee • AGENDA: 8.11.08

On Q-drive: Offerings by Semester Report—also attached to e-mail

Agenda Topics

1. Offerings by Semester Report—Action Item
2. IR Report
3. MAAP Handout
4. A&S Report—Mark Pezzo
5. Next Meeting

Items added at meeting

6. Discussion of learning objectives for English
7. Discussion of lengthening weekly meeting times to 1-1/2 hours

USFSP • Institutional Effectiveness Committee • MINUTES

Order of Business:

Attendees: Cyndie Collins, Kevin Coughlin, Morgan Gresham, Margaret Hewitt, Diane McKinstry, Mark Pezzo, Zafer Unal, and J. E. Gonzalez

1. Offerings by Semester Report—Action Item

Discussion:

The Offerings by Semester Report was presented. It was noted that there are 16 courses in the GE that are at the 3000- and 4000-levels; that there were courses that served multiple GE areas; and that there were courses that were taught infrequently. Preliminary discussion suggested that:

1. one reason that 3000- and 4000-level courses are found in the GE may be due to the “common numbering system” as well as to the way that course numbers are assigned to proposed GE courses by Tampa;
2. it was questioned whether the student learning outcomes that have been developed can truly be applied across GE categories; and
3. that although the long list of GE courses that are listed in our catalog need continued listing in order accommodate transfer credits, perhaps courses could be identified for mothballing based on low enrollments or infrequent offerings.

Conclusion:

The IEC agreed to ask the GE Committee to prepare a report by Sept 30th that addressed these three discussion items; and that the communication to the GE Committee would also include the suggestion that the GE Committee consider holding the current GE curriculum constant for some time certain period beyond fall 2009—in order to maximize our campus assessment efforts in this area. It was also suggested that perhaps Dr. Noonan can address the GE Committee directly with the notion of holding the GE Curriculum constant.

Action Items:

Communicate with the GE Committee and request a report by Sept 30th.

Responsible Person(s):

Cyndie Collins

Due Dates: open

2. IR Report—not addressed

Discussion:

Conclusion:

Action Items:

Responsible Person(s):

Due Dates:

3. MAAP Handout

Discussion:

A MAAP handout was distributed and IEC members were encouraged to go to the ETS website to learn more about the instrument. The IEC will need to formally support this tool prior to adoption so members will need to evaluate whether the MAAP provides sufficient coverage of assessment of USFSP's General Education. There is a possibility that ETS may conduct a webinar for the IEC in the weeks ahead.

Conclusion: open

Action Items:

Contact ETS for the possibility of a webinar; follow-up on specifics of the MAAP in re GE

Responsible Person(s):

JEG

Due Dates: open

4. A&S Report—Mark Pezzo

Discussion:

Mar Pezzo met with faculty in A&S to discuss the assessment back-fill project, and so far, he reports that his discussions have been favorable and the faculty that are agreeing to participate in the assessment backfill project will be able to do so relatively easily. The bulk of the work however will occur in the fall. MP asked about administrative access to Blackboard. JEG reported that he had contacted Blackboard support folks at Tampa and they reported that: 1. Bb content was archived back to 2003; 2. Tampa could provide guidance to faculty members so that they could reactivate their courses; and 3. Tampa could run a system check and indicate the level of Bb utilization, etc. Tampa provided JEG with a URL to an administrative site that included a demonstration of module utilization information. This level of reporting was aggregated and it showed reasonable use by all faculty; but only a more detailed report at the faculty-level would yield meaningful information. This requires submitting some sort of work order/ticket—JEG has not done so at this time. JEG reported that administrative access to course material could be granted by individual faculty members. Finally, JEG reported that the original purpose of checking with Blackboard administrators was to gauge usage/utilization by faculty members prior to asking them to retrieve course content. Returning back to MP, he noted that we won't know at this time which faculty might need to rely on archived Bb files.

JEG also reported that he had recently learned of two limitations in Blackboard and that prior to announcing to faculty that Blackboard could be used to support a full repertoire of assessment practices we should probably investigate Bb strengths and weaknesses more carefully.

Conclusion: open
Action Items: open
Responsible Person(s): open
Due Dates: open

5. Next meeting—(see item #7)

Discussion: Next meeting is scheduled for Monday 8/18 in BAY 208 Conf Room—1:30-3:00
Conclusion: It was decided to lengthen the meeting time to 1-½ hours.
Action Items: Chair will check on room availability.
Responsible Person(s): JEG
Due Dates: 8/18/08

6. Discussion of learning objectives for English

Discussion:
Morgan Gresham initiated discussion of changing the learning objectives for English from the ones developed by the Provost (and in use by the IEC) to the ones that were developed by the English faculty after consideration of the material prepared by the Council of Writing Program Administrators. MG noted that the WPA materials were used by the faculty to develop the assessment rubric in English that is in place.

Conclusion:
The IEC agreed that since assessment activity is in place that addresses student learning outcomes developed by faculty based on WPA standards—then those should be the learning outcomes of record.

Action Items:
It will be reported to the Provost that the IEC supports changing learning outcomes in English as follows:

To:

1. Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge by focusing on audience, purpose, context, medium, and message;
2. Students will demonstrate critical thinking, reading and writing by developing writing over time through a series of tasks including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing sources into their own ideas, and discussing language, power, and knowledge;
3. Students will demonstrate composing processes through prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing individually and with peers in a range of composing media;
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of conventions by controlling tone, mechanics, and documentation in a variety of common formats and genres.

From:

1. Demonstrate the ability to form ideas, to specify audience and purpose, to express ideas appropriately with technical proficiency, and to interpret, critique, summarize and paraphrase intellectually challenging texts.
2. Demonstrate the ability to find, evaluate, analyze and synthesize primary and secondary sources.
3. Demonstrate the ability to strengthen written work through the process of drafting, revising, and editing in a variety of genres.

7. Discussion of lengthening weekly meeting times to 1-½ hours—(see item #5)

The conference room is available for a 1-½ hour meeting.
