

Joint Meeting of AEC, IPR and General Education Committees

Meeting Date: January 30, 2009

Time: 1:30 pm to 2:30 pm

Location: HBC, Room 201

Agenda Item 1: **Welcome**

Presenter: Soon Merz and Mike McCarthy

Discussion: S. Merz made opening comments and welcome to the joint AEC, IPR and General Education meeting.

M. McCarthy noted that SACS published a new edition of *The Principles of Accreditation*, with changes that affect ACC. One important change is Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 which brings a new emphasis on “3.3.1.1 educational outcomes, to include student learning outcomes”

3.3 Institutional Effectiveness

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

3.3.1.3 educational support services

3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

Decisions: None

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: None

Agenda Item 2: **Presentation:** *Student Learning Outcomes – The Untold Story*

Presenter: Ron Johns

Discussion: Professor Johns presented example of matrices intended to record educational program level outcomes for the academic transfer and workforce programs. Dr. Johns also shared a flow chart that he prepared showing how student learning outcomes inform and impact campus-wide assessment, effectiveness, and planning practices. These documents are titled Transfer Example, Workforce Example, and Comp Process and available online at <http://www.austincc.edu/oiepub/aec/2008-09/index.php>.

Dr. Johns explained that we may need several templates/matrices for educational programs to account for different accountability standards. For instance, the use of Exemplary Educational Outcomes for academic transfer programs in contrast the SCANS used for workforce courses.

Ron noted that, in addition to the Coordinating Board and SACS, other accrediting agencies are setting standards requiring documentation. In particular, a number of ACC's nursing programs are separately accredited.

Dr. Johns took comments and responded to questions.

Question: What do these agencies do with the data we provide?

Answer: The agencies do not themselves use the data. The agencies want to see that ACC uses the data for improvement to programs. We need to document how we identify and measure program level outcomes and how we use those results to improve programs.

Question: What does the state do with our data?

Answer: THECB uses the Exemplary Educational Outcomes to ensure transferability of ACC coursework to other State colleges and universities.

Comment – R. Wallace: We need to define our outcomes before government define them for us.

Comment – R. Johns: If we have this data in an organized and accessible form that is used in meaningful ways, then SACS visits will not be the nightmare they have been in the past.

Comment - S. Merz: The reason for the joint meeting is to begin a dialog to identify improvements to the IPR process. The IPR committee is central to identifying and driving these improvements.

Comment – R. Johns: We want to meet with different groups, talk about program assessment, including SLOs. We will ask and support departments to identify:

1. course-specific SLOs
2. program-specific SLOs
3. review intellectual competencies and EEOs for each course

Decisions: None

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: None

Adjourned 3:00