

Minutes of the Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee Meeting Tuesday, March 8, 2011 Library 401

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

Voting Members in Attendance: James Bothwell, Kim Jameson, Chris Oehrlein, Beverly Schaeffer, Annalyn Gill (student member), Bertha Wise, Susan VanSchuyver

Absent Voting Members: Kristy Bailey, Haining Chen Yuthika Kim, Germain Pichop, Julie Rice-Rollins

Non-voting Members in Attendance: Tom Ashby, Barbara King, Max Simmons, Susan Tabor

Absent Non-voting Members: Jon Inglett, Alexa Mashlan, Joyce Morgan-Dees, Janet Perry, Jim Schwark, Catherine Kinyon

Agenda:

1. Program review process.

Co-chair Steve Shore asked for impressions from the subgroups on the quality of the program reviews they had read and how they viewed the assessment components of those reviews. The comments were generally positive although some of the programs were still tending to present only one year's worth of assessment data in the five-year reviews.

2. Discussion of learning outcomes example.

Co-Chair Steve Shore provided the committee with a copy of some of the feedback that one of the subgroups had given to the faculty involved in one of the program reviews, including comments that he had added to the subgroup's report. The questions the co-chair posed included whether or not "demonstrate knowledge" was too vague as an outcome and whether or not the suggestions for making the outcome less vague had been appropriate. A very lively discussion ensued about whether or not the suggestions that had been made were too prescriptive, whether the suggestions offered were more appropriate for the measurements, and whether or not "demonstrate knowledge" could be a reasonable outcome.

3. New plan form.

Co-Chair Steve Shore presented a modified version of the plan form that had some of the extraneous fields removed that members had expressed concern about in a previous meeting. There was a suggestion to keep working on a way to make the form more flexible. Tom Ashby, Dean of IT, said that there was a way to make the pdf expandable in response to response boxes or radio buttons in editable pdf's generated with Adobe Acrobat.

4. Process for review of plans and reports

Four programs are set for their five-year program review in FY 2012: Pre-Education, Psychology, History, and Political Science. Therefore subgroups consisting of two to three voting members will be

receiving copies of the FY 2011 plans and FY 2010 reports for these programs within the next two weeks so that members can give feedback on those plans and reports. Comments should help program faculty as they start to prepare their program reviews next fall. AOAC members would have until Monday, May 2nd to get their comments back to the co-chairs. Subgroup members were encouraged to meet face-to-face to discuss a united consensus response to the plans and reports.

5. New business

There was no new business to discuss.

No formal votes were taken at the meeting.