

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: November 18, 2011

12:00 – 2:00pm LIB 306

Audio conference: 1-800-893-8850

Participant code: 1664738

eLive: May be accessed through Blackboard

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 11/11/11 Meeting

Continuing Business

- AAC website
- Checklist for three year review
- Invitation letter to solicit new programs for pilot review

New Business

- Pilot Assessment structure

Scheduled Meeting Dates Fall 2011		
Date	Time	Location
11/18	12:00-2:00pm	LIB 306
12/9	12:00-2:00pm	LIB 306
Fall 2011 schedule: 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th Fridays		

Expected Attendees

Keith Cates (Chair), COE	Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate	Bart Quimby, OAA
Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate	Deborah Mole, LIB	Melissa Huenefeld, OAA
Brian Bennett, CTC	Bill Myers, CAS	
Kim Bloomstrom, MSC	Soren Orley, CBPP	
Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate	Cheryl Siemers, KPC	
Jennifer McFerran Brock, SOE	Tara Smith, Faculty Senate	
Jesse Mickelson, KOD	Kathi Trawver, COH	

*Note: Confirmed meeting attendees are marked with "C."
Those unable to attend are marked "N." Those calling in are marked "P."*

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Minutes November 11, 2011

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 10/28/11 Meeting
- Chair Update
 - Our charge has been officially changed to what was accepted in the handbook last spring
 - The regulations state that any changes to the charge have to go to Faculty Senate in a motion – our change was part of the handbook
 - Faculty Senate agreed that our revised charge has been approved
 - ILOs are no longer a part of our charge, however, this may come back for discussion at some point
 - There is currently no GER assessment – this needs to be figured out still since this is an accreditation requirement

Continuing Business

- AAC website
 - We need to have consistency with what is listed in the handbook when titling headings on the flow chart
 - “One Year Report” should be changed to “Annual Assessment Survey”
 - “Report Forms” should be changed to “Survey Forms”
 - What is the status of figuring out what CMS can support?
 - Bart should be talking to IT to determine our options with CMS (what it can and cannot do)
 - Who will be tasked with creating the website?
 - This still hasn’t been determined. IT does not usually create websites for departments – they usually just give them the tools/training to do it themselves
 - We should have Bart ask them if they can provide help in creating the website
 - A schedule of when programs are up for review needs to be added to the flow chart
 - This should be added as a second level item and should be titled “Assessment Sequence and Due Dates” to match the handbook
 - How should this be organized?
 - Could put programs in alphabetical order by college
 - There should be three years listed
 - The programs that participate in the pilot will be exempted from the first run – since we don’t know which programs these are, it is difficult to create the sequence until after the spring semester
 - Need to put this section as “Under Construction” or something similar until we are able to figure out the sequence of programs
- Board of Regents policies
 - There hasn’t been a deadline set for this so we should have more time to work on this if we need it

- If anyone has any more comments please send them to Keith
- Memo to Faculty Senate regarding the revisions and simplification of BOR Academic Policies and Regulations
 - Bill is happy to revise the rationale if necessary – please send him any additional edits if you have any
 - We should leave the rationale as fairly brief – we can provide clarification or expansion if requested
- Are all these revisions to BOR policy going to be sent to Faculty Senate to be compiled into a greater document of recommendations?
 - Not sure at this point. The original instructions said to send revisions directly to the President's Office
 - It would be more strategic if these revisions came from Faculty Senate
 - Faculty Senate hasn't divvied these out yet, however, Kimberly Swiantek said that she could forward our revisions directly to the EBoard
- Discussion of concerns of assessment as being a part of program review
 - All the other items listed under program review are metrics of quantity. Adding one item that deals with quality doesn't fit; it also doesn't encourage honest assessment
 - Since this section focuses on administrative review of a program, we should focus on compliance rather than the quality of assessment
 - If we make this suggested revision should we give something more in its place?
 - Less is more for BOR policy – gives more flexibility to each MAU
 - Do we need to indicate in our rationale that we are not trying to get rid of assessment?
 - The quality of the program is important, but should only be used internally
 - Should we include the language from our motion last spring to Faculty Senate in our memo?
 - This could be a preamble or introduction to the motion
 - Keith will add this as a preamble and will place it in Blackboard for review and comment
 - Should change the word “solely” in the motion to “fundamental purpose” or something similar
 - Keith will email Bhatta and ask what the plan is for how Faculty Senate is going to handle all of these BOR policy revisions

New Business

- Checklist for three year review
 - Bill basically cut and pasted from the “Three-Year Review Documents” on page 9 of the handbook
 - Bill to make various minor word/grammatical edits to the checklist as offered in the meeting
 - Will change the bullets to boxes



- Does this checklist get the basic idea across? What if someone is fairly new to assessment – is it clear what we are asking for?
 - Yes
- For data collection purposes Bart would like the outcomes, measures and results listed
- People should be directed to the handbook for more information – the checklist shouldn't give too much information. We need to provide enough information for them to do it correctly, but still encourage them to refer to the handbook
- Are there definitions of these items?
 - Yes, in the “Terms, Definitions & Guidance” portion of the handbook
- The checklist is helpful because it makes the process simpler – it helps people verify that they have done everything
- Invitation letter to solicit new programs for pilot review
 - We only have two meetings left. What is our plan for a schedule? Can we get something in this semester?
 - We need to send out a letter prior to the break and begin right at the start of the spring semester
 - Faculty need to know what we are doing and what our plans are – a letter is important in communicating this
 - The letter should include options for coming for a visit as a group or college – we need to decide what type of groupings we are willing to accept. The letter also needs to indicate what programs should bring – see the checklist
 - Some programs have questions about the qualifications for exemption
 - The COE has accreditation at the college level, however, not all the programs with COE are accredited
 - Programs should apply for exemption and we will evaluate their qualifications
 - Do we want to send out an information letter and an invitation letter?
 - We should just explain in the invitation letter that this isn't a judgment and to ask programs to bring what they want to discuss
 - We should send out the invitation letter to the entire university
 - If we get more programs than we can accommodate then we can prioritize on a first come first serve basis
 - We should finalize this letter at our next meeting and send it out before the Thanksgiving break. We should also include a deadline date.
 - Deadline will be February 1, 2012
 - Keith will work on drafting a letter including all of these ideas – he will post the draft letter to Blackboard for review and comment. We can discuss this at our next meeting
- Structure of pilot review
 - Are we in agreement on what the reviewing will look like?
 - Do we have a process or a rubric that we are planning to follow?
 - We need to make it clear that this is a discussion not an instruction session
 - One of the main reasons we didn't want to make this committee an approval body is the concern that someone from one discipline may not be a good judge of what the outcomes should be for another discipline

- It would be helpful if the committee is able to have commonality of vision and purpose
- The “Terms, Definitions & Guidance” section started as a rubric, however, the committee agreed not to list this as a rubric
- We should let programs explain their reasons for why their outcomes are good - we should ask if this is working for their department
- Over time we are hopefully going to gain experience and get better

Information Item

- Please take the LibQUAL Survey – open from 11/7-11/21

Expected Attendees

C	Keith Cates (Chair), COE
C	Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate
C	Brian Bennett, CTC
P	Kim Bloomstrom, MSC
N	Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate
C	Jennifer McFerran Brock, SOE
P	Jesse Mickelson, KOD

C	Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate
C	Deborah Mole, LIB
C	Bill Myers, CAS
C	Soren Orley, CBPP
P	Cheryl Siemers, KPC
C	Tara Smith, Faculty Senate
C	Kathi Trawver, COH

N	Bart Quimby, OAA
C	Melissa Huenefeld, OAA

*Note: Confirmed meeting attendees are marked with “C.”
Those unable to attend are marked “N.” Those calling in are marked “P.”*