Date: November 29, 2012
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee and University Community
From: Wes Chapin, Senate Executive Committee Chair
Subject: Agenda, Senate Executive Committee Meeting

The 2012-2013 Senate Executive Committee will meet on December 3 at 2:30 p.m. in 353 KFA.

Attachments:
1. Minutes from last EC meeting

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

Reports

PP-PAR Update

Second Reading/Postponements

1. Motion from the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee (David Rainville, Chair) to amend its description is already on the next Senate agenda.

2. Motion from the AP&P Committee (James Zimmerman, Chair) to adopt a new graduate program transmittal form. (postponed from last Senate meeting)

3. Motion from the AP&P Committee (James Zimmerman, Chair) to adopt a new undergraduate program transmittal form. (postponed from last Senate meeting)

Unfinished Business

1. Motion from the ad hoc Program Prioritization and Program Audit and Review Committee (Wes Chapin, Chair) to approve a standardized scale for use by all programs for indirect assessment. Programs on campus will adapt this to their indirect measures (e.g. senior seminar surveys or exit interviews) used to assess their program outcomes, and to implement its usage for spring 2013 (i.e. collect data). If programs do not have indirect assessments in place, they must adopt them and collect data during spring 2013. (Note: This motion is approving the process and table immediately below it. The other items are included for informational purposes only).
Process: Each program will administer an exit survey to graduating students that provides indirect measures of program learning outcomes. The standardized scale, approved by Faculty Senate, will be used for each survey.

Please fill in the circle that best reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place outcomes in this column</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material below is for informational purposes only:

The chair will report the resulting data on an overall percentage basis (i.e. the percentage of overall responses scoring in each of the six approved categories). Note that there is no particular advantage or disadvantage to having more or fewer learning outcomes, as long as the totals are reported as aggregated percentages. Here is an example for a program with two outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Total Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program outcome ONE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program outcome TWO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical &amp; Percentage results</td>
<td>15/80 18.75%</td>
<td>20/80 25.00%</td>
<td>30/80 37.50%</td>
<td>10/80 12.50%</td>
<td>5/80 6.25%</td>
<td>0/80 0.00%</td>
<td>80 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting data will be report to the Program Audit and Review Committee, and programs will be slotted into one of the six categories after calculating a final figure. Strongly agree will be worth 30 points, agree worth 25, slightly agree worth 20, slightly disagree worth 15, disagree worth 10 and disagree strongly worth 5 points. Using the example above, the final score will be calculated as
\[
\frac{(18.75 \times 30) + (25.00 \times 25) + (37.50 \times 20) + (12.50 \times 15) + (6.25 \times 10) + (0.00 \times 5)}{100} = \text{Final percentage, or}
\]
\[
\frac{[562.5 + 625 + 750 + 187.5 + 62.5 + 0]}{100} = \text{Final percentage, or}
\]
\[
2187.50 / 100 = \text{Final percentage, or}
\]
\[
21.875 = \text{Final percentage}
\]

The table below will then be used to score the program. In the example above, 21.875 would place this program into the “agree” category, with its 20.001-25.000 range. This program’s score is the figure in the “agree” column, “score by category row (i.e. the bottom row), and results in a “score” of 25 points being assigned to this factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final percentage</td>
<td>30.000-25.001</td>
<td>25.000-20.001</td>
<td>20.000-15.001</td>
<td>15.000-10.001</td>
<td>10.000-5.001</td>
<td>5.000-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score by category</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Business

1. **Motion from the Executive Committee (Wes Chapin, Chair) acting as the Committee on Committees to approve the following committee membership appointments.**

Technology Council

Fourth Division, 2013-16: Daniel Vande Yacht

2. **Motion from the ad hoc Program Prioritization and Program Audit and Review Committee (PP-PAR, Wes Chapin, Chair) to approve the PP-PAR recommendation (see attached document)**

3. **Other Committee Motions**

Miscellaneous Business

Adjournment