AOAC Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 21, 2017

1:30-2:15 in SEM 2F1

I. Call to order

Dr. Jeff Carlisle called the meeting to order 1:30 in SEM 2F1.

II. Attendance

Committee Members for 2017: Fonda Scott, Pamela Stout, Brent Noel, Jennifer Allen, Changjiang Zhu, Chris Oehrlein, Stephanie Wallace, Kamille Soutee, Sara Mathew, Ann Raia

Dean: Susan Tabor

Ex-Officio Members: Kim Jameson, Makenna Green

III. New business

a) <u>Committee assignments:</u>

Group 1: Fonda Scott, Jennifer Allen, Chaingjiang Zhu, Chris Oehrlein.

Reviewing: Digital Cinema Production and Computer Science: Associates in Applied Science Options: CS Computer Programming, Computer System Support, etc.

Group 2: Kamille Soutee, Sara Mathew and Ann Raia

Reviewing: Clinical research Coordinator, etc., and Digital Media Design, Graphic Design, Photography, etc.

Group 3: Pamela Stout, Brent Noel, and Stephanie Wallace

Reviewing: Computer Aided Technology, Computer Science: Management Information System, etc., and Engineering Technology.

b) <u>Directions:</u> Your first assignment is to look over the attached program reviews with your assigned partners (you have each been grouped with other members of the committee who are included in the e-mail). Whether you meet in person to discuss it or meet virtually is up to you, but you will need to communicate with each other to decide how to go about with your review. Using the attached

question sheet, critique the program review. If you notice any issues that you think should be addressed/corrected do not hesitate to mention them, but also remember that the authors of the plans have put a lot of time and effort into them so be professional and courteous as well. I recommend that each of you look through the entirety of each review, making comments then get together to discuss and meld the comments into one document to return to me or Makenna. I will need your responses by Monday, February 19. Thank you for your time and service on this committee. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or Makenna Green.

c) Questions: 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.

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.)

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? Is the SLO explained in a clear, jargon-free manner in which anyone reading it would understand?

Do the student learning outcomes focus on skills or areas of knowledge that seem appropriate to the discipline? What is the measure being used?

Do the program outputs seem appropriate for the program? Can you suggest additional outputs that might be appropriate?

Is there evidence of the collection and use of trend data for program evaluation? What/how is the trend data being used?

Is there evidence in the program review document that decisions about the program (resources, curricula, etc.) are being influenced by the assessment process? What decisions have been made based upon assessment data?

Are the program strengths, concerns, and recommended actions reasonable? Can you suggest any additional strengths, concerns, or recommended actions?

Are 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?

Has the program review provided evidence that shows faculty participation in the submission of artifacts for general education assessment? What kinds of artifacts has the program submitted? Comment or provide feedback on the types of artifacts, if any.

Is the general education assessment artifact data being used to inform the program of its strengths and weakness? If so, how?

How has the program used the general education assessment data to address program weaknesses in order to improve student success in achieving general education outcomes in the program as well as general education?

IV. Adjournment

Dr. Jeff Carlisle adjourned the meeting at 2:15 pm.