

Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) Meeting
October 22, 2015
12:00-1:00pm
Nevaldine South Rm. 133

Present: Renee Campbell, Patrick Casselman, Jondavid DeLong, Ken Erickson, Marela Fiacco, Tatsuhito Koya, Mike Newtown, Molly Mott, Wil Rivers, Rachel Santos, Jennifer Sovde, Christine Thompson, Sarah Todd,

Missing: Rashid Aidun, Paul Bowdre, Kirk Jones, Doug Scheidt, Jennifer Waite

The meeting was convened at 12:00 p.m.

1. Individual Studies is up for AIM this year. S.Todd recommends a 1 year extension. This should push back their AIM's in the future by 1 year as well. The Committee agreed.
2. S.Todd also recommends an extension for all AIM's this semester – the departments don't even know that they are supposed to do them yet, so a December deadline is not reasonable. The AIM's need to be done in Taskstream. These need to be reviewed within the campus before they are sent to the external reviewers. The original December deadline was in line with the spring budget process, pushing the deadline back to February for AIM's would not allow enough time to submit budget items. The departments can work on lining up their external reviewers now, even though the AIM's are not yet in progress. A suggestion was made to change the deadline for AIM's to January 15th – the Committee agreed.
3. GER Sub-Committee
 - a. K.Jones was not present at the meeting, however he did email everyone notes, see attachment.
 - b. There was an attempt to schedule a meeting, but it will have to be rescheduled. S.Todd will be developing a rubric to assist with the methodology – currently most aren't doing them or they are really not good.
 - c. Each person on the Sub-Committee has been assigned one GER and they are to research the methodology for that GER and bring it back to the Sub-Committee.
 - d. There is a desire to make the process more transparent in general so the individual faculty aren't "needed" as we move forward.
 - e. SUNY Albany has a great Gen.Ed. Assessment website – S.Todd suggests everyone Google it! There is also a 10-minute video to watch. If everyone likes their process, perhaps we could adopt it and make it our own.
4. AIM Clean-up Committee
 - a. The committee has reviewed ECHD, Powersports, and Computer Information Systems
 - b. Still need to review Accounting, Vet Tech, and Automotive
 - c. On each there is a disconnect between the institution, program, and school missions
 - d. Assessment is their biggest weakness, there is not much there
 - e. The sub-committee made some recommendations for action plans, and for online courses to be more flexible.
 - f. For the Powersports and CIS programs there was no self-study, they just had a scorecard
 - g. The sub-committee will report on the other programs at the next meeting.
 - h. Powersport and CIS did not have outside reviewers which caused concern for the sub-committee.
 - i. D.Scheidt, J.Waite and S.Todd met, and S.Todd was assigned the task of coming up with a form that will provide a guide on how we will be doing the assessments.
 - i. There will be a section includes the findings, who they have been shared with, and their recommendations
 - ii. The AAC will have a section for our recommendations
 - j. The committee is now looking at old assessments that were not completed well, and some programs' assessments were not completed at all.
 - k. Discussion on what to do about these old, or missing, assessments.
 - l. There seems to be some consistency in the answers on all of the assessments for the Canino programs that don't seem to work for all the programs – they need to be more individualized.
 - m. Internal review of the assessments MUST be completed before they are sent to external reviewers – some of the assessments that were sent out were not of a high quality.
 - n. The question was raised as to why the curriculum coordinators do not know that the AIM's are due this year. It was determined that this question need to be taken to the Dean's Cabinet and the Provost.
5. AIM Orientation Committee
 - a. S.Todd sent out an email about to come up with a time to meet.
 - b. The committee is meeting late and are far behind
6. Update on Program Goals Committee

7. Committee Concerns

- a. Could we give the curriculum coordinators a complete list of dates and how-to's?
 - i. The coordinators likely don't know the AIM's are due because they are not actively seeking out that information
 - ii. S.Todd and E.Voisin will work on putting something together to give to the Curriculum Coordinators
 - iii. A list will be created of questions to be answered on the how-to's.
 - iv. One of the questions is whether students who do not take the assessment should be counted as a "failure", or be removed from the cohort completely? Discussion ensued.
 - v. These questions and answers will be collected as they come up and will be answered on the how-to's.
 - vi. This year, if every program does an assessment, good or not so good, it is better than nothing!
- b. There was discussion about exploring the option of buying the other TS module that will link with Bb.
 - i. Items cannot currently be tagged in Bb for TS.
 - ii. S.Todd will look at the test bank for functionality.
 - iii. It was agreed that the next step needs to be sooner rather than later.
 - iv. The cost is \$45,000 per year for full implementation
 - v. S.Todd will contact TS and ask them for a demonstration at the next AAC meeting.

The meeting ended at 12:50pm

*The next meeting is on November 5th in Nevaldine South Rm. 133. (The room is on the cool side)