

8-18-2008

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting : 2008 : 08 : 18

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 : 18" (2008). *Institutional Research: Meeting Minutes and Agendas*. 3.
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/institutional_research_minutes_agendas/3

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: 8.18.08

Attached to the e-mail: Minutes from 8/11

Please go to: <http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets> and select MAAP from the menu or take the tour:

http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/MAPP/mapp_tour/mapp_demo.html

Agenda Topics

1. Presentation on the MAAP
2. Coordination of data requests for NCATE, AACSB and SACS
3. Presentation of CIRP and FETPIP data
4. IR Activity
5. Next Meeting—8.25.08 1:30—3:00

USFSP • Institutional Effectiveness Committee • MINUTES

Order of Business:

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

1. Presentation on the MAAP

Discussion: The committee discussed the MAAP and it was resolved that it would be administered in the fall to freshmen (with identified cohorts) and to rising seniors/upper-division students. The discussion focused on the notion of attempting to embed the MAAP as a course requirement or extra credit opportunity in exit-level courses. But since it is the week prior to the beginning of school, it seemed prudent to attempt an administration outside of the classroom and to evaluate the process for improvement in the next go around. Discussion also centered around the use of ETS “field” tests in Business as well as in A&S areas such as psychology.

Conclusion: IR will administer the MAAP in the fall and the research design will be evaluated for future administrations.

Action Items: Move to adopt the instrument for use in fall 2008. Will use findings to evaluate the continued use of this instrument if it is appropriate to assess USFSP’s GE.

Responsible Person(s): JEG

Due Dates: ASAP

2. Coordination of data requests for NCATE, AACSB and SACS (not discussed)

Discussion: This item was not discussed but it will need to be taken up as soon as possible in that IR needs to build a calendar/schedule of routine data and analytical reporting requirements for NCATE, AACSB, SACS, etc. This is related to IR workload.

Conclusion:

Action Items: Move to develop a master calendar

Responsible Person(s):

Due Dates:

3. Presentation of CIRP and FETPIP data (not discussed—see #4 IR Activity below)

Discussion:

Conclusion:

Action Items:

Responsible Person(s):

Due Dates:

4. IR Activity

Discussion: The purpose of this item is to begin the process of routinely reporting IR Activity to the IEC. This reporting function is important in that by serving in this advisory capacity the IEC tacitly serves as a buffer or agent that assists IR in prioritizing research projects/efforts. The CIRP and FETPIP were used to begin to illustrate the notion that since IR is central to the university assessment function—it has to model good institutional behavior: plan, execute, analyze and disseminate research findings for decision-makers to take action. IR cannot afford to be a black-hole in terms of collecting data—it has to report out. Also brought into the conversation was the notion of IR coordinating campus survey research activity—and on this matter, IR reported that in work with the Student Counseling Center, the center was willing to consider a change in schedule of a survey and after conversation—was willing to also consider a change in survey.

Conclusion: In the months ahead—IR would like to prepare a research agenda for consideration by the IEC. The IEC does not wish for involvement in negotiating scheduling campus surveys and leaves that coordination function to the discretion of IR. IR will include such matters in reporting to the IEC. The matter of the frequency of IR reporting to the IEC was left open.

Action Items: None at this time.

Responsible Person(s): JEG

Due Dates: Open

5. Next Meeting

Discussion: Next meeting is scheduled for Monday: 8/25 in BAY 208 Conf Room—1:30-3:00

Conclusion: With the start of the Fall 2008 semester, we will need to find a new meeting day and time.

Action Items: Identify a new meeting day and time.

Responsible Person(s): JEG

Due Dates: In time to find a new meeting day and time to re-schedule the 8/25 meeting.