Academic Assessment Committee Meeting
October 25, 2012
Faculty Office Building 620

Present: Amani Awwad, Susan Willette, Anthony Signorelli, Mike Spearance, Mark Hill, Richard Hu, Mike Newtown, Maureen Maiocco, Ken Erickson, Brian Washburn, Dave Wells, and Karen Spellacy.

The meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m.

At the last meeting members were asked to review the '*Guide for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs*' and come prepared with any questions that may need to be addressed. Discussion followed.   Student learning outcomes should be reported that are more specific and significant to the program being reviewed. External Program Reviewers were discussed. It was determined that the campus would like to see three reviewers. The reviewers should include: 1) someone with an academic background (faculty from another campus/community college or for certificate programs, someone from BOCES) and 2) employers in the industry/field. Each program should have a blend of reviewers – could be two faculty and one person from industry or one faculty and two people from industry.

Suggestions for canned responses:
1) Appendix D (Page 44) - Characteristics of the student (III. B.) – General application procedure – provided by Admissions
2) Appendix D (Page 44) – Characteristics of the student (III.B.) – Graduates – Information will be provided by Saran Todd, Director of Institutional Research, on program report cards. Graduation rates are based on first time freshmen. In the narrative of the report, explain the graduation rates by program and by college. Some students may successfully graduate from the college but maybe not from the program that they actually first were enrolled in. This should be part of the self-study.
3) Appendix D (Page 44) - Faculty Quality (IV.)
   a. Hiring Programs and Number of Faculty
   b. Faculty Responsibilities
   c. Tenure and Promotion Policies
4) Appendix D (Page 44) -Support, Resources and Facilities (VI.)
5) Executive Summary – Description of the students (Page 28) – Recruitment – Compare the student diversity of the program to that of the institution, other institutions, the region, and the state (#3.d.)
6) Executive Summary – Description of the students (Page 29) – Special Student Services (#5)
7) Executive Summary – Description of the students (Page 30) - General Student Life (#7)
8) Executive Summary – What is the role of administration in supporting program evaluation? (Page 33) (XII.)

Canned responses are adequate, but each person completing a self-study should review the canned responses to see if the information provided is true for their specific area and then identify things that are not working for their program.

The purpose of the self-study is to assess the program and to help the program go forward. It is not to evaluate the faculty within the program. If the self-study shows that students are not learning what they are supposed to be learning, it doesn't mean that faculty are not doing their job, but that the campus has an issue that needs to be addressed. If there is something valuable in the program that is not included in the self-study, it should be added to the self-study. The self-study should show what the program is doing. The person completing the self-study can also make recommendations – they don't have to be just recommendations from the reviewers.

The next meeting will be held during finals week (December 4-7). Updates will be given and the program reviewer's document will be developed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Livernois, Recorder