

**Co-Curricular Assessment Committee (CCAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**October 27, 2016 2:00pm**  
**Library 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**Meeting called to order:** by Chairperson Dr. Summer DeProw

**Members present:** Ms. Heather Brake, Dr. Summer DeProw, Ms. Dominique Hallett, Mr. Matt Huckaby, Ms. Tiffany Johnson, Mr. Robert Robinette, Ms. Beth Silverthorn, Dr. Topeka Small, Ms. Martha Spack, Mr. Chad Whatley, and Dr. Karen Wheeler.

**Members absent:** Ms. Patience Bartunek, Dr. Jill Simons

**Proxy:** Ms. Barbara Doyle for Dr. Jill Simons

**Guest:** Mr. Kyle Davis, Intern- Student Affairs

**Welcome and introductions-** Attendees introduced themselves and told what area they represent.

**Meeting Minutes from October 6, 2016.** Members reviewed the minutes from the last CCAC meeting. Chad Whatley motioned to approve; Motion was seconded; Members voted to approve minutes.

**Review of 2 Institutional Models for assessment in co-curricular, student services and university services' areas.**

Model 1 - Uses University Learning Outcomes (ULO's) as each division's outcomes. Model 2 – Each Division develops learning outcomes and aligns them to the ULO's.

Discussion and Questions:

Model 1 Disadvantage- ULO's are under review and may change. Delay in the process waiting for the revised ULO's.

Model 2 – Would be similar to Academic areas.

Question: What is HLC's opinion? - Every university is different. As long as there is alignment to some of the ULO's it should be fine either way.

Time is an issue if we wait for the review of the ULO's. If we pick Model 2, we might be able to collect data in the spring.

Student Affairs- would we be set apart from the rest of the university if we pick Model 1? Using a different model than the academic side?

There are pro's and con's either way.

ULO's are important. Every graduate should have these outcomes and everything should contribute to them.

Dr. Topeka Small called to vote for a show of hands:

All who voted selected Model 1. No votes for Model 2.

### **Review of the three-part co-curricular test**

Members were asked what activities in their areas meet the three-part test.

Several activities were mentioned from the various areas. Dr. DeProw asked members to start thinking of outcomes from the activities that were mentioned.

### **Discussion and Questions:**

Question – If our area already has done our outcomes do we scrap them? – No, just pause on it. They can still use them for their area regardless.

### **Review Assessment Plan Template:**

#### **Comments:**

We could use some examples.

Members were shown the links in the PowerPoint presentation for various examples to each area and discussed them.

Question regarding qualitative data vs. quantitative data – ex: Global ULO- 40 students go on a trip as compared to 30 last year. Improvement of 10 students. Where would we get Qualitative data? – Survey the students- ex: GPI, Global Perspectives Inventory could be used.

Dr. Small mentioned an institution required the students to write a paper after a Study Abroad trip and it was graded by a panel.

Suggestion was made to use the Assessment Plan Template to start filling in the targets, benchmarks, (Rows 2, 4, 5 & 6) and get a head-start. We will compare notes at the next meeting in 2 weeks.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:10pm.**