MEMBERS PRESENT:
Ken Stevenson, Chair and EDLP Rep.
Ed Dickey, ITE Rep., Representing Nathan Carnes
Kellah Edens, EDST Rep.
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Michele Taylor-Brown, Richland 2 Rep.
Catherine Luthren, Accreditation & Quality Assurance Office
Renee Connolly, Accreditation & Quality Assurance Office

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Eva Monsma, PE
Nathan Carnes, ITE

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS
Dr. Stevenson called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m. and asked for introductions from the members.

II. QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE OVERVIEW AND STRUCTURE

A. REVIEW OF FOLDER DOCUMENTS AND CHARGE OF COMMITTEE
Dr. Stevenson provided a short overview of the committee’s work over the past four years and what year five will include for reviews. Dr. Van Scoy explained the structure of the committee and how it began four years ago in relation to accreditation and quality assurance issues. She highlighted the committee’s role in the established Unit-wide assessment system that includes academic programs and now support office initiatives.

Dr. Van Scoy explained the documents provided to the committee members including a review sheet for comments, procedures and rubric for ratings, a list of committee members with contact information, and the conceptual framework. Specifically, she explained the review sheet so committee members could begin to understand expectations of the review process.

B. PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING SUPPORT OFFICE REVIEWS
Dr. Van Scoy reminded the members that some criteria have been developed to assess support office quality and efficiency. Dr. Connolly explained the process for review and report development for the committee’s actions and report compilation. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the group that these reports will be presented to Administrative Council for their review and inclusion in any necessary discussion. Dr. Dickey expressed concern regarding a broader review of support offices that are housed across the University such as the library, University technology services, the Provost’s Office, etc. The committee entertained discussion on the value of reviewing these offices, including comments on that this function as a first start in reviewing support offices and that in some regard this yearly review may be limited. Ms. Byrnes commented that the College of Arts and Sciences has appointed a task force that has chosen specific elements related to student achievement and progress such as advising, registrar’s office, etc. Dr. Edens suggested that each office under review be asked to mention its role in relation to the larger context of the University and external agencies. Specifically, they might mention how their internal roles work in conjunction with these outside entities and fulfill responsibilities.
III. COMMITTEE REVIEW OF OFFICE OF ACCREDITATION & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Dr. Connolly and Ms. Luthren presented the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance roles and responsibilities page, taking time to highlight each of the specific roles, as defined within the table. Since the table was new to the committee during this review year, Dr. Connolly highlighted what each column entailed and how her office interpreted those columns and completed the information. She and Ms. Luthren focused on the office’s work with Unit and College surveys and analyses, database management and creation, internal and external report compilation, and data collection and reporting. The members entertained some questions and answers regarding the information and discussion followed. Dr. Connolly commented that in addition to providing feedback for her office, the committee might consider focusing on the value of the information provided, its format, and the helpfulness of the committee’s review sheet.

IV. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF OFFICE OF ACCREDITATION & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Dr. Dickey asked how the AQA Office has been evaluated by other offices that it serves and what external data Dr. Connolly’s office has. She addressed this concern by highlighting the Support Office Survey that was completed college-wide three years ago, but has not been repeated since. The committee continued discussion on what the goal of these office reviews are – a focus on internal quality or a focus on what external contributors have to say about the office. Dr. Dickey asked a broader question about the use of external members of QCom from the State Department and a school district and their relevance on a committee like this. Ms. Luthren suggested that a review of offices is helpful from a staff perspective to better understand the effectiveness of what they do and if any current practices or processes could be revised. Ms. Larkin asked for clarification on the AQA’s role, in order to understand how additional offices may act and react during this year of reviews. Ms. Byrnes expressed an interest in results and how the support offices lend to the compilation of these results.

In continuing their clarification of their charge in reviewing the support offices, Dr. Edens asked for information on what offices are responsible for – goals/mission or functions/responsibilities. If this can be defined more clearly, then this could help guide the office’s submission of materials. The committee suggested a correction for the review sheet to include clearer wording that will assist offices in this review process and the committee in their review of data.

Dr. Stevenson asked for consensus on the major issues: clarify language on #1 and #2 on green review sheet, additional data from external groups on office quality, change “quality” in #3 to focus on office “productivity”, no indication of a “plan for ongoing internal assessment of office quality and efficiency, make 3e a separate number to itself”. Dr. Stevenson suggested that he, Dr. Van Scy and Dr. Connolly review the green review sheet for additional changes to be implemented for the next review session. Dr. Stevenson asked Dr. Connolly to email the members and ask for two items: 1) a preliminary rating criteria and 2) additional suggestions and comments for continued progress within the office tasks.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Dr. Connolly reminded the members that the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 12, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. At this time, the Office of Student Affairs will be reviewed.

B. Due to time constraints, the spring 2008 Meeting Schedule will be discussed at the December 12, 2007, meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.