February 5, 2013 AOAC

Attached is the list of questions you should use to evaluate the program review for 2013 that you were assigned. A list of the groups/pairs is also attached, so that you will know who you are working with. If you were absent at the February 5, 2013, meeting, Catherine Kinyon will be sending you hard copy of the program review materials.

As you prepare to provide feedback, a few things will be helpful to remember:

- Review the curriculum of the program as it's written in the current college catalog.
- Read through the entire program review, but focus your feedback on the assessment component of the document.
- Schedule time to get together with your AOAC partner or group, so that you can collaborate and discuss the feedback you are providing to the program faculty.
- Remain positive and constructive in your feedback so that it can be useful to the program faculty.

Your feedback is due by February 28, 2013.

Thank you for help!

Bertha Wise and Catherine Kinyon

Questions for Feedback to Program Faculty from AOAC:

A subgroup of the Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee will be asked to consider the following questions when looking at your program review. As you write your program review, you may want to have these questions in mind.

1) How many student learning outcomes are listed for the program? Is the number reasonable? (Three to five outcomes are generally fine. More than eight should generally not be necessary.)

2) Does each student learning outcome encompass only one or two expectations or are individual outcomes overly broad and try to cover too many areas/skills? Can you suggest how statements of the student learning outcomes can be improved?

3) Do the student learning outcomes focus on skills or areas of knowledge that seem appropriate to the discipline? Can you list any skills or areas of knowledge that might be missing?

4) Do the program outputs seem appropriate for the program? Can you suggest additional outputs that might be appropriate?

5) Is there evidence of the collection and use of trend data for program evaluation?

6) Is there evidence in the program review document that decisions about the program (resources, curricula, etc.) are being influenced by the assessment process? If so, how?

7) Is the program using any additional information beyond the annual assessment data to examine and improve the program? If so, what data are being used?

8) Are the program strengths, concerns, and recommended actions reasonable? Can you suggest any additional strengths, concerns, or recommended actions?

9) Are any program strengths or concerns supported by information obtained through the assessment process? If so, how? If not, can you suggest how any strengths or concerns can be linked to what has been learned through assessment?

10) Is the general education assessment artifact data being used to inform program strength and weakness? If so, how?

AOAC sub-committees will be reviewing the program assessment plans for programs that will be reviewed in the following academic year.

The questions listed above are those that program faculty receive at the beginning of their program review, so that they know what the sub-committees from AOAC will address in the feedback related to assessment. The feedback the program faculty receive should help identify the program's strengths and challenges as well as help make recommendations and decisions to improve the program. Of utmost importance is your input in this process.

2013 Program Assessment Sub-Groups—to be distributed on Feb. 5, 2013

Haining Chen	Manufacturing Technology
Chris Oehrlein	Manufacturing Technology
James Bothwell	Electronic Technology
Michael Snyder	Electronic Technology
Kim Jameson	Database Management
Beverly Schaeffer	Database Management
Mendy Barr	Network Technology
Karen Jordan	Network Technology
Gyanendra Baral	Enterprise Communication
Mendy Barr	Enterprise Communication
Chris Oehrlein	Applied Technology
James Bothwell	Applied Technology
Michael Snyder	Biotechnology
Kim Jameson	Biotechnology
George Risinger	Film and Video
Gyanendra Baral	Film and Video
Stephanie Hayes	Graphic Communications
Haining Chen	Graphic Communications
Karen Jordan	Computer Aided Technology
George Risinger	Computer Aided Technology
Beverly Schaeffer	Computer Science
Stephanie Hayes	Computer Science

2014 Review Sub-group assignments—distributed in Dec. 2012

Michael Snyder	Clinical Medical Research
Stephanie Hayes	Clinical Medical Research
Kim Jameson	Sociology
George Risinger	Sociology
Chris Oehrlein	Modern Languages
Gyanendra Baral	Modern Languages
Mendy Barr	Diversified Studies
James Bothwell	Diversified Studies
Beverly Schaeffer	Diversified Studies
Haining Chen	Music
Karen Jordan	Music