Academic Services Committee Minutes Index Fall 2008

Meeting: Page:

ASC Meeting

Date:	**Monday, 22 September, 4:00 pm**
Location:	**School of Education Conference Room, B&E 207**
Meeting called by:	**Academic Services Committee (ASC)**
Attendees:	**Bill Pirkle, Carla Coleman, Lisa Simmons, Tieling Chen, Gary Senn, Robert Leach, Rayito Calderon, Kieth Pierce; Stephanie Foote and Anne Vermont (present for first portion of meeting)**
Secretary:	**Carla Coleman**

I.   The meeting was called to order at 4:00.

II.   Minutes from the August 20 meeting were reviewed and approved by acclimation

III. Report from Stephanie Foote and Anne Vermont about the Academic Success Center. Stephanie introduced Anne, the new coordinator of tutoring services. Anne then spoke about her efforts to better coordinate tutoring services and expand those services as needed.

   a.   In terms of communication, she sent out a card to introduce herself to all faculty teaching 100 level courses, as well as created fliers about Chemistry tutoring walk in hours. She also posts walk-in hours weekly in the library study carrel since they tend to change from week to week.

   b.   In terms of tutoring demands, so far there have been 55 requests for tutoring (9 for math; she has filled 41 of those requests. There have been 273 visits to the writing room and 306 to the math lab, as well as 30 visits to subject tutors. (These numbers are reported each fall and spring to the involved department chairs.)

   c.   Anne is currently interviewing students for tutoring jobs, particularly in Biology and Business.

   d.   Both Anne and Stephanie clarified the fact that students can choose either to have forms sent to their instructors about their use of the tutors, or choose not to. They also clarified that instructors cannot require students to attend, but can strongly recommend it.

IV. Business from last meetings minutes:

   a.   Bill was supposed to talk to Mike Lemons and he did. We will be reviewing computer services in the spring with a focus on the *service* aspect. We will also be looking at printing.

b. Bill also talked to Stephanie about our reviewing the Academic Success Center next year; we will be doing that.

c. Randy Warrick wants ASC to have a representative on the "Students at Risk" Action Committee as we did last year. A move was made to nominate Gary Senn to continue in this capacity from last year; in spite of protests that he was being "railroaded," Gary was gracious enough to agree to continue to serve.

V. Discussion about the program review of Instructional Services/Center for Teaching Excellence with Keith Pierce.

a. After a brief discussion in which Bill suggested a meeting with himself, Keith and Lloyd Dawe before our next meeting as a full committee, Bill opened the floor to Keith.

b. Keith provided an overview of the goals and services of CTE:
    i.   One of the goals of CTE is to provide workshops to help faculty improve teaching in areas such as PowerPoint and Excel. Some are conducted by Keith, some people are brought in from Columbia.
         1. Website has a running calendar and registration page.
         2. Topics are chosen via faculty suggestions, as well as a liaison group (the CTE advisory counsel, a group of about twelve faculty members.)
         3. Attendance is normally 10-18/workshop.
         4. Workshops generally run about 90 minutes.
    ii. CTE videotapes workshops and is creating some on-line teaching resources.
    iii. CTE also does a significant amount of one-on-one training.

c. Keith provided an overview of Instructional Services, the department involved with the media world on campus.
    i.   Distance education (satellite feeds, TV)
    ii. Media in the classroom (Smart boards, LCD projectors, etc.)
    iii. Lots of production work
         1. TV studio in the Ruth Patrick Center
         2. Work with instructors to create supplementary material
         3. Video editing
         4. Interactive video conferences (Note: We can't do video classes here at USCA yet, but other campuses do have that capability)

d. Bill asked how Keith assesses activities:
    i.   They are currently working on a database to help with assessment.
    ii. He meets with faculty as regularly as he can. (Though this isn't a "hard" data-gathering method, this will work until the database is in-place.
    iii. Possibly working to develop an email protocol for getting workshop requests and feedback.

e. Bill also asked how Keith would describe his department's relationship to Computer Services
    i. The distinction, according to Keith (and Mike Lemons), is that CTE/IS does MEDIA while CSD does the TECHNICAL side of computers themselves.
    ii. Example: CSD puts PowerPoint on the computer and makes sure it functions. Keith works with the training of faculty.
    iii. There is grey area, but not as much as one might think.

f. The committee decided to resume discussion towards the end of October, once Keith has been able to finish his review. He will be invited back on October 20th for our next meeting.

VI. Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

ASC Meeting

Date: **Monday, 20 October, 4:00 pm**

Location: **Vice Chancellor's Conference Room**

Meeting called by: **Academic Services Committee (ASC)**

Attendees: **Bill Pirkle, Carla Coleman, Tieling Chen, Lisa Simmons, Lloyd Dawe, Keith Pierce**

Secretary: **Carla Coleman**

I.   The meeting was called to order at 4:00.

II.   Minutes from the September 22 meeting were reviewed and approved—with editorial changes—by acclamation

III.   Bill passed out and discussed the new rubric that Lloyd wants us to use for assessment.

IV.   Lloyd passed out a new table created using the school's "Trackdat" software, incorporating Keith Pierce's 2008-2009 Program Review for the Center for Teaching Excellence and Instructional Support as our example (since it is the focus of our current review). Much of the rest of the meeting was spent with Lloyd talking Keith through how to reword his program review to conform to the way the Trackdat software organizes data.

       a.   Example: Keith's two missions have been turned into "Goal" statements:

            i.   Goal 1: Promotion of Teaching & Learning Effectiveness

            ii.   Goal 2: Audio Visual Communication Services

       b.   Old "Objectives" are now "Outcomes."

V.   Suggestions for Keith in terms of revising the wording of his Program Review to better conform to the Trackdat software (primarily per Lloyd)

       a.   The transformation of Keith's two missions into goal statements means that Keith needs a new "Mission Statement" that integrates the two previous ones.

       b.   He needs to look at how each of his outcomes aligns with the University's "Strategic Plan" and reword if they are not aligned.

c.   He also needs to identify targets associated with each of the assessment measures. Doing so helps with out accrediting agency, which likes to see data being used to track improvements.

d.   SACS is also interested in "Proposed Actions." Assessment data is used to create proposed actions which in turn modify (in future reviews) the "Department Strategies." This "closing of the loop" is strongly encouraged by the powers that be.

  i.   Keith asked what happens if we can't "close a loop" due to forces outside of his control. For example, several years ago, his program had the money for installing a number of LCD projectors in the classrooms. There is an ideal timeline for replacing these projectors (every five years, after the warrantees run out). But, his current budget prevents him from implementing this Proposed Action).

  ii.   Solution? There is a category in Trackdat where a person can identify 'Obstacles" that stop implementation of strategies.

VI.   Suggestions for Keith (per the ASC committee) in terms of revising the content of his Program Review

a.   Bill made the suggestion that Keith do a study on the cost effectiveness of repairing projectors whose warrantees had expired and replacement, as well as a new one comparing the relative costs of replacing with projectors from a different company.

  i.   Keith says they've explored this to some degree, but that they could revisit it.

  ii.   He also noted that even simple repairs and regular upkeep are expensive— an LCD lamp, for example, can run $500, and they've had to replace five in the last month.

  iii.   When something breaks, they are supposed to return it to the state, but he does keep "broken machines" around for a year or so for the purpose of cannibalizing them for parts—a money-saving strategy, but one that only goes so far.

  iv.   Funding for these things is not a "line item"; he must made annual requests.

  v.   Another problem is that CTE and IS do not have extensive reserves of money.

b.   This last item led to the question (connected to Outcome 2.3) as to whether we should put a note in our report asking that Keith be given more reserves. (It was

noted that there are three check-out projectors that can serve as temporary fixes, but as more and more pieces of instructional technology age, the number that are out of order will increase, and these three may not be enough.)

c. It was also suggested that Keith add an assessment of needs about the importance of some sort of reserve because of growing faculty dependence upon technology—perhaps a survey of how many projectors we have, how often they go out, etc. (Keith noted that he already has lots of data on this from our campus.)

d. Bill asked whether Keith should add an assessment (already collected) on the number of service calls to add credence and support to requests.

e. Another suggestion related to the networking of classroom projectors: Should Keith list it as a strategy to have them all networked? The answer is "Probably." (Keith noted that 30 + projects are already networked and send back data on the number of hours per day/week in use. He is also able to turn them on/off from his office, something which helps lengthen lamp life.)

f. An additional suggestion was to add an assessment (related to 1.1) to measure the extent to which the information covered in teaching technology workshops makes it into the classroom.

g. Related to item 2.2 (and maybe 2.1), perhaps adding a "satisfaction of service" survey as an indirect measure of quality.

h. A final suggestion was that Keith more clearly define his "Targets."

V. After this discussion, it was determined that Lloyd would write something up for Keith which he can use to revise his review.

VI. The next meeting will be at 4:00 on November 24 in the Vice Chancellor's Conference Room. Please note that this is one week later than originally scheduled, because of a conflicting meeting on the Magellan Program in Columbia that Bill must attend.

VII. Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

ASC Meeting

Date: **Monday, 24 November, 4:00 pm**

Location: **Vice Chancellor's Conference Room**

Meeting called by: **Academic Services Committee (ASC)**

Attendees: **Bill Pirkle, Carla Coleman, Tieling Chen, Lloyd Dawe, Robert Leach, Lloyd Dawe, Stephanie Foote**

Secretary: **Carla Coleman**

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:00.

II. Minutes from the October 20 meeting were reviewed and approved—with editorial changes—by acclamation

III. Bill went over the letter to Keith that Lloyd prepared; it will be sent out under Bill's name on behalf of the committee.

  a. Several small editorial changes were made.

  b. Stephanie was not at the previous meeting, but commented that, as an "outsider looking in," she thought the letter would be useful.

  c. The letter was approved unanimously by acclamation.

IV. We discussed reviewing Computer Services for the Spring. Bill wanted to establish parameters to avoid not overlapping too much with CTC, as well as a time table for our review. It was commented that, though other committees do touch on Computer Services, we are the only one that touches on the assessment side for Administrative units. Elements on which we may focus our review are Student-centered functions and Faculty/staff functions that have either an indirect or direct effect on student outcomes (per Lloyd)

  a. It was suggested that we get a list/letter from CTC to see what elements they have focused on in the past.

  b. There was also some discussion of possible overlap with the PacerPrint program.

  c. One useful guideline might be to remember that CTC mostly looks at requests, not quality of service.

  d. Bill volunteered to go talk with Mike and ask for the whole Program Review, particularly the Mission and Assessment portions, with a focus on those that impact students and faculty. Some divisions that may be considered are:
    i. Client Services (help desk, software)
    ii. Hardware and Communication (PC, Telecommunication systems)

        iii.   Architecture (servers, email distribution lists, etc.)

V.   Lloyd discussed with the committee the idea of developing a template for future reviews. He suggested that we use something similar to what we used for Keith to ensure future consistency. Some of the language to be used on the template is as follows:

    a.   Goals/outcomes

    b.   Assessment plan

    c.   Assessment results

    d.   Proposed strategies and follow-up on action taken.

    He also suggested that we use the letter sent to Keith as a template. It was agreed that we will try this with the CSD review.

VI.   The next meeting will be at 4:00 on January 26 in the Vice Chancellor's Conference Room.

VII.   The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.