

Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee

Meeting Agenda

December 4, 2012

3:00-4:00 p.m.

Meeting Facilitators: Catherine Kinyon and Bertha Wise, Co-Chairs

Invitees: Below are the members currently listed and their divisions:

Beverly Schaeffer, HP
Dr. Haining Chen, IT
Dr. James Bothwell, IT
Kim Jameson, AH
Dr. Michael Snyder, AH
Gyanendra Baral, BUS
Mendy Barr, SS
Karen Jordan, HP
Chris Oehrlein, SM
George Risinger, SM
Dr. Stephanie Hayes, SS
Susan VanSchuyver, Academic Deans

The following are resource members:

Student Representative (TSLC) – Tamara Madden representing
Greg Gardner, AVPAA
Alexa Mashlan, AA Director
Barbara King, Library
Joyce Morgan, Institutional Effectiveness
Dr. Janet Perry, Institutional Effectiveness
Dr. Courtney Vahlberg, General Education Chair
Academic Deans

- I. Call to order—snacks too!
- II. Sign in Sheet—to help keep a record, please sign next to your printed name. If you are replacing someone listed above, please notify one of the co-chairs.
- III. Approval of minutes from last meeting—November 3, 2012
- IV. Distribution of Assessment Plans for programs to be reviewed in FY14:

Diversified Studies
Modern Languages
Music
Sociology
Clinical Medical Research

The Questions for Feedback will be attached, but if you wish to have those sent electronically, please let one of the co-chairs know.

Reviewers should have their feedback ready no later than February 1, 2013. It should be sent to both Catherine Kinyon and Bertha Wise.

- V. Adjournment

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.