



UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: November 19, 2010
11:00am – 2:00pm ADM 283
Audio conference: 1-800-893-8850
Participant code: 1664738

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 11/12/10 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Draft memo to GERC
- Website improvements
- Conference funding

New Business

- Funding Formula for Assessment Coordinators
- Feedback on handbook

Scheduled Meeting Dates Fall 2010		
Date	Time	Location
11/19	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
12/10	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
Fall 2010 schedule: 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th Fridays		

Expected Attendees

Tara Smith (Chair), Faculty Senate
Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate
Allan Barnes, CHSW
Brian Bennett, CTC
Kim Bloomstrom, MSC
Keith Cates, COE
Tom Dalrymple, KPC

Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate
Nicolae Lobontiu, SOE
Jesse Mickelson, KOD
Susan Mitchell, LIB
Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate
Bill Myers, CAS
Jack Pauli, CBPP

Bart Quimby, OAA
Melissa Huenefeld, OAA

*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 12, 2010

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 10/22/10 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Memo from GERC
 - AAC still needs to send our response to this memo. What type of response would we like to provide?
 - Background history of preceding events leading up to the memo provided by Kenrick and Bart:
 - GERC was concerned that there was no assessment of the capstone courses, so they decided to run a pilot program of selected capstone courses. Pilot consisted of 3 parts: submission of artifacts of student work, student survey and faculty survey.
 - The memo includes the recommendations and changes that should be made to future pilots.
 - GERC liked the idea of using some type of assessment instrument, so they have recommended the creation of the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) to provide GER assessment coordination.
 - GER Discussion
 - It would be nice to have GER classes address the 9 GER outcomes – there needs to be a connection.
 - How do you capture the outcomes in your courses and programs?
 - Data should be gathered from what faculty are already doing “boots on the ground approach.”
 - When do you assess that a student has met these outcomes? At the end?
 - If GER Tier 1 is not being regularly assessed, then this is a problem. We need to know the level that students should be at by the time they reach their major courses. English, Communication and Math are pillars of all the other programs. Once we define what we need from Tier 1, we need to figure out if we are reaching those definitions.
 - There isn't agreement on what needs to be assessed – formative vs summative. What are the assessment needs?
 - Reflecting assessment activities need to be reflected on workloads.
 - Integrative Capstones should be revisited to see if they are fulfilling their purpose.
 - Discussion over pros and cons of having a GEAC
 - Having another assessment committee might convolute the process.
 - GERs don't seem enough “like a program” for us to provide assessment.
 - GERs have outcomes, however, no one owns these outcomes.



- Would every program that has a GER course be responsible for providing GER assessment or would all Bachelor programs be responsible for assessing how their students have met GER outcomes?
- The model of a GER committee has worked for AA assessment in CAS.
- Would GEAC be a data collecting body only? Who will provide enforcement for changes that need to be made?
- GEAC should see how outcomes are being met, then give the results to the programs and let them decide what to do with the information. We need data that is relevant (for BOR and accreditation) and the GEAC could help determine this.
- There are a lot of questions that need to be investigated prior to approving GEAC.
- What about a possible taskforce whose charge is to figure out how we should evaluate GERs?
- We need to let GERC know what our questions and concerns are with the possible formation of GEAC
- **Motion passed (6 in favor, 2 abstentions, 2 opposed): We Recommend that GERC should approach Faculty Senate with this request. AAC agrees with the sentiment of this memo (assessment of GERs is important and should be addressed).**
 - Assessment of GERs should be improved. What they propose is a good idea. Since the ultimate authority lies with the Faculty Senate, approval should be sought there.
- Tara to draft memo of response to GERC and bring for committee review at our next meeting

New Business

- Assessment Institute Experience: Brian (added to the agenda)
 - Main topic/dominant theme of conference was eportfolios and rubrics
 - There are many tiers of portfolio usage
 - They help demonstrate how a competency was learned (possibly inside or outside of the curriculum)
 - Can be used at the course level – tell students goals and objectives of the course and have them place artifacts in portfolio to demonstrate their proficiency.
 - Eportfolios are being done for general education, liberal arts and at the institutional level.
 - Should piecemeal things together, rather than trying to do everything.
 - Most faculty and administrators that use eportfolios recommend that institutions use open sources systems or build their own.
 - Brian is willing to share documentation and literature from conference as well as websites for developing good rubrics. Members should contact Brian if interested.



- AY11 Goals & Planning
 - Assessment website needs to be updated
 - Susan, Jack and Bart to work on developing content
 - Need to look at addressing ILOs
 - This conversation should involve some of the Accreditation Steering Committee members.
 - Our charge currently states that AAC is to direct the collection and analysis of data for ILOs.
 - Should ILOs be moved to GEAC’s charge (if this committee is formed)?
 - Tara to try and locate memo on ILOs for continued discussion at our next meeting.
 - Assessment Plan Review Test Cases
 - There are two potential graduate certificate programs at GAB that will be submitting assessment plans. It would be beneficial for AAC to review these assessment plans as our “test cases.”

Information Items

- AAC&U Conference in Chicago, March 3-5, 2011
 - Anyone interested in the AAC&U Conference or any other assessment conferences should let Bart know.
 - OAA should be able to fund travel for 2 members.
- Tara has had technical difficulties in sending out the AAC Handbook to the faculty listserv. She will talk with Christine Lidren to try and get it sent out shortly.
- Meeting Schedule
 - Members agree that our 12/17 meeting should be cancelled. Our first spring meeting will be held on 1/14.
 - Members agree that meeting time should be shortened and will start at a later time (to accommodate a conflict in Tara’s schedule for spring)
 - Spring meetings will be held on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Fridays from 12:00-2:00pm.

Expected Attendees

C	Tara Smith (Chair), Faculty Senate
C	Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate
C	Allan Barnes, CHSW
C	Brian Bennett, CTC
C	Kim Bloomstrom, MSC
C	Keith Cates, COE
N	Tom Dalrymple, KPC

N	Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate
C	Nicolae Lobontiu, SOE
C	Jesse Mickelson, KOD
C	Susan Mitchell, LIB
C	Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate
C	Bill Myers, CAS
C	Jack Pauli, CBPP

C	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.”