

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING
April 20, 2010 MB 2N3

Dr. Steve Shore called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. with a quorum.

Voting Members in Attendance: Dr. Kristy Bailey, Mr. Chris Oehrlein, Ms. Sara Mathew, Dr. Germain Pichop, Mr. Mark Schneberger, Ms. Beverly Schaeffer, Mr. Brent Stafford, Ms. Bertha Wise

Absent Voting Members: Dr. Jo Ann Cobble, Mr. Tim Green, Ms. Catherine Kinyon, Mr. Markus Smith,

Non-voting Members in Attendance: Dr. Janet Perry, Mr. Tom Ashby

Absent Non-voting Members: Greg Gardner, Ms. Barbara King, Dr. Molly Henderson, Ms. Joyce Morgan-Dees, Mr. Jon Inglett, Mr. Max Simmons, Dr. Susan Tabor, Ms. Susan VanSchuyver, Dr. Jim Schwark

Agenda Item 1: Mr. Mark Schneberger made a motion to accept the minutes from the March 9, 2010 meeting. Dr. Kristy Bailey seconded. The minutes were approved.

Agenda Item 2: The committee approved the amended by-laws (or description of the committee's structure and function).

- The committee discussed suggestions from Associate Vice President Greg Gardner in response to the draft document that had been sent to him after the March 9th AOAC meeting. Mr. Gardner communicated that he would like to maintain student representation on the committee. The committee discussed the practical difficulties in identifying students who would regularly attend, the potential benefit to students from AOAC discussions, and implications of listing a student member who never attended. Dr. Steve Shore stated that if the committee agreed to keep a student representative on the committee that he would be more active in working with Darin Behara, Director of Student Life, to get a student appointed to the committee for next fall. The consensus was to maintain a student voting member on the committee.
- The committee discussed additional changes to the section titled "Committee Actions." The committee discussed who might initiate proposals that would be made to the committee and whether or not originators could withdraw proposals. Given the current role of the committee in providing feedback and recommendations to programs on program reviews and on assessment plans and reports, the committee agreed that proposals that might need to be withdrawn could be handled informally through the Chair. The language stating that only originators of proposals could withdraw proposals was removed.

- Ms. Bertha Wise made a motion to accept the by-laws (or description of the committee's structure and function) document as amended by the consensus of the committee. Dr. Kristy Bailey seconded. The motion carried.
- The by-laws as approved will be forwarded to Mr. Greg Gardner, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and will then go to the Dean's Council for approval.

Agenda Item 3: Dr. Shore presented the revised *Handbook for Program Outcomes Assessment* to the committee.

- Dr. Shore pointed out sections that had been significantly edited and sections that were new. Dr. Shore asked for committee members to provide feedback via email on the document, in particular on the new section on how to write an assessment plan. Feedback would be incorporated into the *Handbook* which would then be forwarded to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the Dean's Council.
- Dr. Shore reported that upon approval, the updated handbook would be distributed to all faculty at the general faculty meeting during the Fall 2010 prep and planning week.

Agenda Item 4: Reports on the status of reviews of assessment plans and reports.

- Some of the members who had recently completed reviews of assessment plans and reports discussed their impressions of the process. One member said the process had been instructive in that it provided insight into what other programs were doing. Other members reported that the process had been less cumbersome than anticipated.
- The committee discussed whether the feedback on the plans and reports should be provided to the group looking at the five year program reviews the following year to see if and how program faculty responded. Since the feedback and recommendations provided are primarily for use by the program faculty, it was agreed that such a follow-up was probably not appropriate. However, it was expressed that some mechanism for learning if and how faculty used the feedback provided by the committee would help "close the loop" on the committee's review process.

Agenda Item 5: There was no old business to discuss.

Agenda Item 6: There was no new business to discuss.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm.