

**Assessment Coordination Committee
on Administrative Support Services**

**Report to the Assessment Oversight Committee
April 25, 2016**

The Assessment Coordination Committee on Administrative Support Services met on Monday, April 25, 2016 in the Chancellors' Conference Room, Administration Building 328, at 2:00 p.m. Members present included Patty Flowers, Bud Grimes, Joe Henderson, Stephanie Kolitsch, Terry Lewis, Jamie Mantooth, Desiree McCullough, Petra McPhearson, Tim Nipp, Scott Robbins, Victoria Seng, and Andy Wilson.

The Committee began by considering three different templates for use with administrative support services annual reporting. After discussion, the Committee recommended that administrative support services units use a new template that combined the best features of the three templates under discussion. This new template will be distributed to unit heads for use beginning with the spring reports due in May, 2016. The Committee also recommended that annual due dates be set in December each year to help units prepare for upcoming budget presentations.

The Committee then examined strengths and weaknesses of the administrative support services reports that were submitted in February. Identified strengths included:

- There was a wide range in what units defined as goals and how attainment of the goals were measured.
- It is clear that a shift in the culture and mindset of staff in these units is underway in terms of the incorporation of assessment into day-to-day operations.
- Recent day-to-day campus communications from various units have included references to assessment, data collection, and data-informed decisions.

The Committee identified several weaknesses and challenges in the reports. These include:

- Some of the identified goals may be difficult to measure. One example was the care of the grounds; the "evidence" is visual in the sense that it is clear to everyone whether or not the grounds are being maintained. Documenting this visual evidence could be difficult.
- Many of the units considered as "administrative support services" historically have collected a lot of data but have not documented the use of the data to inform decisions or have collected data that was unused or irrelevant to impending decisions.
- For many of the administrative support services units, decisions tend to be more "reactive" than "proactive."
- Staffing levels currently are down in various units, and the increased workload on remaining staff members is affecting the procedural analysis of the data.
- Units need to deliberately include assessment and data collection into existing and new processes so that it becomes routine.
- Some units have difficulty articulating goals. In some cases, there may be one "big" goal that requires several sub-goals spread out over a long period of time, and units tend to

include the “big” goal but the assessments and data really address one or more of the sub-goals.

- Some of the administrative support services units administer surveys to gauge customer satisfaction with their services. However, the campus faculty and staff as a whole tends to ignore such surveys, which undermines the assessment efforts of these units.

To address these weaknesses and challenges, the Committee made several recommendations:

- Periodic reinforcement of the importance of assessments, data collection, and data-informed decisions in day-to-day operations is essential. Various ideas included:
 - a minimum of one workshop per year with a preference of one workshop per semester that focuses on assessments, data collection and analysis, and data-informed decisions
 - the most important information, such as due dates and the inclusion of data to support requests, needs to come from the top level of administration
 - all staff need to stay engaged in the process, especially with the impending leadership changes
- UT Martin should consider creating an assessment handbook or assessment check-sheets to help ensure that assessment and data collection are considered with all new processes.
- UT Martin should continue conducting a “hard review” of the reports and providing detailed feedback to units to ensure continued improvement.
- Encourage faculty and staff to recognize the importance of customer satisfaction surveys sent out by UTM units and to participate in these surveys.

The Committee elected Joe Henderson to act as its representative on the Assessment Oversight Committee that will be meeting this summer to review the reports of all five Assessment Coordination Committees.

The meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.