

**MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2005
COLLEGE UNION ROOM 7**

Ms. Kayla Fessler called the meeting to order at approximately 3:33 p.m.

Voting Members in Attendance: Dr. Kristy Bailey, Dr. John Boyd, Ms. Kayla Fessler, Mr. Tim Green, Mr. Douglas Gregory, Mr. Ken Harrelson, Ms. Carlotta Hill, Mr. Romeo Opichka, Ms. Mary Punches, Dr. Jessica Sheetz-Nguyen, Dr. Susan Tabor.

Absent Voting Members: Dr. Jo Ann Cobble, Ms. Judith Martin.

Others in Attendance: Mr. Steve Barslou, Dr. Patti Buxton, Dr. Jim DeChenne, Dr. Martha George, Ms. Molly Henderson, Ms. Alexa Mashlan, Dr. Jim Schwark, Ms. Susan VanSchuyver.

Announcements: Kayla Fessler informed the Committee that there will be no more meetings scheduled for this fiscal year. Kayla announced that Ken Harrelson, Romeo Opichka and Jessica Sheetz-Nguyen will be rotating off the Committee.

Approval of Minutes

- Mary Punches made the motion to approve the November 30, 2004 Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee minutes.

Carlotta Hill seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Role of AOAC Committee Members

The Committee briefly discussed and mentioned that the role of each individual committee member is to review the assessment plans and to be a resource representative for their division. The responsibilities of the Committee are on page 10 of the *Handbook for Faculty Program Assessment* which is located at the following website:
<http://www.okccc.edu/institutionalcommittees/Academic/handbook.pdf>

Assessment Review Process

The Committee had a lengthy discussion about how to process assessment reviews and presented the following suggestions:

- the review process be similar to the curriculum committee process – department representative present their proposal to the Committee and the Committee makes the recommendation
- the Committee be more involved in reviewing the plans
- very helpful if the Committee had models of critical thinking from other members of the Committee so everyone know what other departments are doing
- Committee will receive different perspective on what other departments are doing if they view each department's plan

- form a subcommittee to review programs and the present to the Committee
- have the program faculty attend AOAC Steering Committee along with the respective dean to discuss the program review
- have the review process in regular Committee meetings and not in Steering Committee meetings
- get better information from people who wrote the program reviews
- find other ways to measure – look at what others do – don't quantify

Currently all assessment reports and plans are reviewed each year. Due to the large number of programs, it was suggested that each program be reviewed once every five years. However, no resolution was reached concerning changing the current process.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:10 p.m.