

Minutes, Dec. 14, 2004 SOA meeting

Note: Original agenda is in bold. Note also that if you made a contribution to our discussion and your name is not linked with that particular contribution, I did not intentionally leave your name off the minutes. Because I am taking minutes and participating in the discussion at the same time, I do not have a perfect recollection of who has said what. When we are all fully engaged in animated discussion, I am particularly unlikely to chart names. When we go over the minutes, I will be happy to add credit where credit is due. Your understanding is appreciated.

Meeting attendance: Antonio Planells sent his regrets (illness). All other members were present.

- 1) SOA procedures/reporting protocol for Academic Program Review (only sections of the Academic Program Review pamphlet that are focused on SOA are included – not the entire pamphlet).**

Committee members discussed the reporting protocol for APR and how oversight of SOA work had moved from a university SOA committee to whom reports were made into the Program Review process.

- 2) Discuss template for heads' reporting on SOA work in yearly report to Dean.**

Schmitz pointed out that Music uses the reporting protocol on SOA originally required by the University SOA Committee. This could be a base for the new college template. Committee members compared the Music protocol with the structure of reporting described in the SOA section of the Program Self-Study document from the CAPR and discovered strong parallels. Reineke volunteered to pull the two forms together and draft a template for the committee to consider at their January meeting.

Additional observations made by committee members during this time:

- Berghammer suggested that, in addition to looking at student learning outcomes, we need to look at ways that faculty perceptions can be included in SOA reporting. For example, faculty need to be able to report when an absence of resources have limited their abilities to fulfill student outcomes.
- Colburn observed that, in disseminating a reporting template to heads, care needs to be taken so that heads do not “dump” the template on faculty and tell them that faculty have to complete SOA work for this report by May. Such a strategy will set back the work of this committee and efforts being made to achieve faculty buy-in.
- Baughman and others suggested that, given the strong links between curricular work and SOA, some departments may find their curriculum subcommittees the best location for advancing faculty buy-in. If those committees can recognize outcomes work as something they are already doing when they evaluate their curricula, outcomes may be able to become regularized more quickly into ongoing departmental

work. Some departments have SOA committees; some don't. Every department does curricular work, either by subcommittee or by the department as a whole. If a close relation between curricular work that already has faculty support and SOA can be demonstrated, faculty may come to perceive SOA work as more integral to their faculty lives and less of an outside mandate intrinsically unrelated to their faculty roles.

- d) Baughman indicated that parts of the 1991 SOA document are interesting and worth discussing. The committee decided to look at this document more closely at the next meeting. Members will review it and come to the meeting prepared to direct the attention of the committee to specific features of the 1991 document they would like to discuss.
- e) Committee members discussed having alternates attend one of the meetings together with their committee counterparts to introduce them to the big picture on which we are working. We will try to time the visit to one of our more pleasant agendas – perhaps sharing materials Reineke has acquired at workshops rather than the NCA document discussion.

3) North Central Accreditation Criteria: See especially Criterion Three and Four.

We ran out of time and did not have the opportunity to look at these materials. Berghammer suggested that NCA criteria be kept in mind while we were thinking about yearly reports to the Dean. She suggested that we need to see if we can build links between the CAPR expectations and the NCA expectations in our yearly departmental work on SOA. Reineke suggested that we should do this when we are reviewing the draft of the template that she will bring to the January meeting.

4) SOA Plans from:

- a. Communication Studies**
- b. Philosophy and Religion**
- c. Music**

In the process of working on #1 and #2 above, we began to look closely at the Music SOA report. Much discussion was generated on how Music conceived their plan and how it exemplifies an outcomes approach to program evaluation. The committee members see review of departmental plans as a productive learning exercise for thinking about how outcomes based evaluation is accomplished. The committee wants to continue to look at Music at the next meeting and move on to the other samples thereafter.

5) Plans for next semester meetings: alternates, e-mail grid early in January

- a) Early in January, Reineke will send a “never available” grid for the spring semester to committee members in search of a time once a month during which we can all meet

together. Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays between 12-2 should be looked at closely because that was the best time this semester.

- b) Committee members will invite a colleague to serve as an alternate on the committee and bring that name to the January meeting. Committee members may invite the alternate or solicit the assistance of their department head in this task based on their own understanding of their department and their colleagues.
- c) Agenda items for January will be to 1) look over draft reporting template of yearly report by heads to dean on SOA work in their department that academic year; 2) come to the meeting prepared to highlight any features of the SOA university documents a committee member wishes to discuss with the entire committee; 3) Look at the Music SOA plan more closely.