

Minutes of the Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee Meeting
Tuesday, December 13, 2011
Library 401

AOAC Co-chair Dr. Steven Shore called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. with a quorum.

Voting Members in Attendance: Gyanendra Baral, Melinda Barr, James Bothwell, Kim Jameson, Catherine Kinyon, George Risinger, Zachary Sumner (student member),

Absent Voting Members: Haining Chen, Karen Jordan, Chris Oerhlein, Beverly Schaeffer, Susan VanSchuyver

Non-voting Members in Attendance: Tom Ashby, Alexa Mashlan, Susan Tabor, Courtney Vahlberg

Absent Non-voting Members: Greg Gardner, Jon Inglett, Joyce Morgan-Dees, Janet Perry, Jim Schwark, Max Simmons

Agenda:

1. Follow-up to HLC visit – What can we do better?

Committee members that had attended the session on assessment with the evaluator/consultant commented on the positive tone of the meeting and how well attended the session had been. Members discussed how many questions there had been on the “metaprocess” of assessment at OCCC and on how assessment is informing budgetary decisions and the allocation of resources in addition to it is influencing curriculum content. While members were able to supply specific examples (e.g. construction of the speech lab, moving to all group labs in chemistry and physics), there was a discussion of the need of emphasizing the connection between assessment and budgetary decisions in the future. One avenue discussed was the upcoming feedback the committee would be providing on program reviews – looking for the connection and making sure to comment on its absence in the review documents if needed. A couple of members suggested that we should think about adding a section to the annual assessment report forms specifically labeled “Budgetary Implications” or “Budget Requests” to make it clearer to faculty completing the reports that they need to be thinking about how their assessment results could inform their resource requests.

2. Proposal for change in assessment plan process

Dr. Steve Shore presented a request from a department director asking the AOAC to consider a modification in the current requirement for a five-year plan that is updated every year. The department director had expressed that if a department is satisfied with its plan and is essentially just updating the years, the plan should not have to be resubmitted every year. Steve Shore presented the following language for a formal motion:

“Programs are required to submit a five year plan covering a five-year review period by the first Monday of November after the five year program review is submitted. No other plan would need to be submitted until after the next five-year program review. However, program faculty would have the ability to change a five year plan during a five year cycle if they wanted or needed to make a change to the original plan. A revised plan would be submitted to the appropriate Dean by the first Monday of November of the first full year that the revised plan would be in place. The revised plan, once approved by the appropriate Dean, would then be forwarded to the Director of Curriculum and Assessment.”

Melinda Barr made a motion to approve the proposal as presented. Kim Jameson seconded the motion.

After a brief discussion of the implications of the proposal and risk of department faculty forgetting the timeline they had established in an officially submitted plan, the motion carried by majority vote of the voting members present. Steve Shore stated that he would therefore submit the proposal to Greg Gardner, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs who would then likely bring the proposal to the Dean’s Council.

3. Update on timeline for receiving program reviews and returning feedback

Steve Shore reported that members could expect the program reviews when they returned from Christmas break. They would have approximately three weeks to provide feedback that would be forwarded to the program faculty involved in the reviews.

4. What will we be looking for?

Steve Shore distributed a list of the questions that members would be asked to address when looking at the five-year review documents. He emphasized that it is especially important to make sure that at least some of the strengths and challenges presented in the review be tied in some way to what was learned through the assessment process. The need for attention to the connection between budgetary decisions and assessment that was discussed earlier was mentioned again.

5. Old business

There was not old business to discuss.

6. New business

There was no new business to discuss.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.