Meeting Called to order 3:10 p.m.

Announcements
OIRA – Amount of NSSE survey responses, to date, is almost half of what it has been in the past. It was requested that faculty members with freshmen and senior students remind their students to complete the survey.

Minutes from Feb. 4, 2019 Meeting
Minutes for February 4 were reviewed and were approved (Nunn/Mulrooney) with one abstention.

Departmental Assessment Reports Scored
It was discussed how Aqua provides only 1000 characters in the Comment box for scorer comments. The Aqua platform does not allow for scorers to link their individual comments to each respective criterion. Therefore, scorers should clearly label their comments (LO1, D5, etc.) in order to be able to later identify which comment is aligned with which rubric criterion. It was suggested that if comments exceed the 1000 character limit, please put them to Richard Kirby so that they can be compiled and available to the AAC member writing the departmental feedback letter(s). It was also recommended to keep a list of Aqua issues that members may have during scoring to later report these findings to Aqua representatives at the end of the year.

Chairperson, Broadus-Garcia, recommended that scorers also keep notes of issues with AAC rubric language for end-of-the-year discussions regarding rubric language changes.

Masters in Biological Science
Discussion of Biological Science report. Recommended feedback to program faculty was provided by AAC members.

Masters in Graphic Information Design (GID)
Discussion of M.A. in GID report. Recommended feedback on program report was provided by AAC members.

Review of Revisions to Academic Program Review Policy Statement
Upon recommendation by the Senate Steering Committee, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs—Planning and Resources, Dr. Marianne Fallon, presented an updated Academic Program Review Process: Policy Statement document with recommended changes for AAC feedback. This document articulates the policy governing external reviews for non-accredited academic programs. Proposed changes were presented based on Dr. Fallon’s consultation with Academic Deans and OIRA Director, Yvonne Kirby. Clarifications and elaborated questions within the self-study and external reviewer report were presented. The document’s intent is to help departments better prepare their self-study, help external reviewers better prepare their reports, and help the Provost’s Office and the Deans better work with Departments to discuss planning and resources that would improve academic programs.
Dr. Fallon reported that 9 departments (17 programs) are scheduled to begin the self-study process in Spring 2019. She noted that it would be helpful for them, as they prepare their self-studies, to have an updated version of the guidelines.

The introductory Policy Statement, including Background and Rationale, The Review Cycle, and Coordination of the Program Review Process was reviewed without comments or suggestions from the AAC members.

Discussion followed regarding the “Questions the Department Should Address in the Self-Study” and “External Reviewers will answer these questions” sections. Suggestions included, but were not limited to, maintaining previous questions (v:22) related to Faculty. AAC members discussed how proposed v:23 Faculty questions sounded evaluative in nature and prescriptive as it related to instructional methodologies and practice. Dr. Broadus-Garcia commented that the listing of instructional practices implies that these are required as part of one’s teaching/load credit. Discussion as to whether the questions were phrased to intentionally link to CCSU’s Strategic Plan (i.e., “…to improve students’ professional, or workforce development) ensued. Dr. Fallon made clarifications regarding questions for External Reviewers. Dr. Broadus-Garcia made a recommendation to rewrite External Review question #4 to read, “Discuss the way in which the department has used data to inform programmatic decision making.”

Dr. Broadus-Garcia reminded AAC members that the AAC Bylaws and Primary Functions, as outlined by the Faculty Senate, do not include matters related to Program Review. Therefore, a vote was not put before the committee regarding to accept or not accept the Academic Program Review Process: Policy Statement, but rather the document with suggested revisions was forwarded to Dr. Fallon for consideration.

It was announced that the next AAC meeting would take place on March 18th. Reports should be scored and scores uploaded to Aqua by 8:00am on 3/18/19. Reports to be scored include Dance Education, and the MSN in Hospice and Palliative Care. One additional report will be uploaded for review, as well, possibly the B.A. in Art full assessment report.

Remaining meetings for the Spring 2019 semester were announced: March 18th, April 1st, April 15th and April 29th.

Meeting adjourned 4:27 p.m.

Submitted respectfully,
Martha Kruy
Secretary