

**Minutes**  
**Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) Meeting**  
**Monday, November 10, 2008, at 2:00 pm**  
**Executive Conference Room**

**Members Present:** Holly Adams, Brenda Campbell, John Dew, Tish Matuszek, Tracy Newvine, Lance Tatum, Sohail Agboatwala, Mary Ann Hooten

**Members Absent:** Larry Blocher (with notice), Meryem Boulale, Bill Grantham, Kim Jones (with notice), Judy McCarley (with notice), Jack Miller, Jared Sellers, Candice Howard-Shaughnessy (with notice), Dan Tennimon (with notice), and Lisa Vardaman

**Others present:** Edith Smith and Emily Brewer

**Handouts:** College of Arts and Science PERs

**Meeting Report:**

- 1) The meeting, held in the Executive Conference Room in Adams Administration Building, was called to order at 2:00 p.m.
- 2) Program Review for the College of Arts and Sciences:  
Dr. John Dew suggested breaking items that need improvement into two categories - minor problems and major problems. For programs that have major problems, all members of the committee will be given a copy of that programs' PER to review and discuss at the next scheduled meeting. After the committee has discussed the College of Arts and Sciences programs, a report will be written to provide the Dean with feedback.

**a. English Major - Mary Ann Hooten**

The English Language Arts program and the English Major are combined into one PER. There are ten student learning outcomes. The first four student learning outcomes relate only to the English Major and the others relate only to the English Language Arts program. The committee suggested separating the student learning outcomes by the two programs. The first four student learning outcomes are completely different. Even though the outcomes are all different, the same assessment is used and the outcomes all have the exact numerical value. These student learning outcomes are assessed through the English Subject Test from the Major Field Test. To help provide additional data, the committee recommended using sub scores in the Major Field Test. The student learning outcomes five through ten, which is for the English Language Arts program, has a lot of information. This program uses the Praxis II and an exit exam to assess student learning.

**b. Geomatics Major - Mary Ann Hooten**

The Geomatics program has data going back to 2001 but the data is very limited. The assessment instrument used to measure the program is the National Fundamentals of Land Surveying Exam. The percentage of students that passed the exam was reported but it did not state the number of students who took the exam. The committee suggested reporting the extent to which an outcome was met. The plans for improvements could not be located.

**c. Social Science Major - Lance Tatum**

The assessment instruments used to measure the Social Science program was the Senior Exit Exam and the Graduating Student Survey. This program has two student learning outcomes. The first one states that "Students will demonstrate an understanding of major Social Science theories, concepts, and methods, as well as, demonstrate the ability to critically evaluate Social Science data." Suggestions were made for this student learning outcome to be broken out into two goals. The number of students who took the exit exam and the mean score are given for each academic year, and the outcomes were met. The second expected outcome uses the Graduating Student Survey to assess student learning. The assessment data is by year and by the percentage of students who actually responded to each question in the Graduating Student Survey as either excellent or good. However, the total number of students who responded to the survey was not given. They did not meet the second student learning outcome.

**d. Sociology Major - Lance Tatum**

All of the locations where the Sociology Major is offered need to be added. There are five student learning outcomes with each having two benchmarks. The major uses the Sociology Exit Exam to assess the student learning outcomes. The percentage of students who scored at or below the given percentages are reported, but the number of students who took the exit exam was not. The committee suggested that the exit exam data be disaggregated by all locations where the major is offered.

**e. Political Science Major - Brenda Campbell**

The Political Science Major has four student learning outcomes, and the only assessment instrument used is the Major Field Test. There is limited data because the Major Field Test was only given for fall 07 and spring 08 and the number of students who took the test was very small. The committee recommended separating the data out by location. The number of students who took the test was given but the percentage was not.

**f. Master of Science in International Relations - Brenda Campbell**

Data needs to be collected from all locations where the program is being offered. This program has one student learning outcome with multiple components. The committee recommended separating or combining the components. The program uses the comprehensive exam option and the thesis option to measure student learning. The program met its objective in 06-07 but not in 07-08, but it states that they did achieve their objective. Brenda Campbell noted that Dr. Rinehart indicated that 95% selected the comprehensive and 5% selected the thesis option. The percentage of students that passed an exam or a thesis was reported but it did not provide the number of students who selected the comprehensive exam option and thesis option.

**g. Associate of Science in General Education - Tish Matuszek**

Plans for improvement are needed. The student learning outcomes are very specific and straight forward on what is expected. There are four student learning outcomes that deal with reading skills, critical thinking skills, writing skills, and math skills. Each of these relies on the MAPP test as a summative assessment. There was a recommendation for additional measures.

**h. Master of Public Administration - Tracy Newvine**

All locations that offer the program need to be added as well as collecting data from all the locations. The first student learning outcome reports the percentage of students passing the Capstone Course with a B or better. The committee suggested identifying what assessment measure they use in the capstone course, like a comprehensive exam. This would provide a much stronger measure of student learning. The second assessment instrument is a survey, which states it will be implemented July 2008.

3) Other Business:

December meeting – Complete the College of Arts and Sciences program review and discuss feedback from the Alabama Quality Award (AQA), which TROY received the Bronze level.

4) Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:05 pm. The next IEC meeting will be on December 15, 2008.