

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: February 10, 2012

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 1/27/12 Meeting

Continuing Business

- AAC website
- Exemption Requests
- Identification of assessment coordinators
- Review of Computer Information & Office Systems (Rep: Darlene Gill, 12p, via eLive/phone bridge)
- Review of BoR policies

New Business

- Review Reporting format

| Scheduled Meeting Dates Spring 2012 | | |
|---|--------------|----------|
| Date | Time | Location |
| 2/10 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 2/17 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 2/24 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 3/9 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 3/23 | 12:00-2:00pm | RH 303 |
| 4/13 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 4/20 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| 4/27 | 12:00-2:00pm | LIB 306 |
| Spring 2012 schedule: 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th Fridays | | |

Expected Attendees

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| | Keith Cates (Chair), COE |
| | Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate |
| | Brian Bennett, CTC |
| | Kim Bloomstrom, MSC |
| | Jennifer McFerran Brock, SOE |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| | Deborah Mole, LIB |
| | Bill Myers, CAS |
| | Soren Orley, CBPP |
| | Cheryl Siemers, KPC |
| | Tara Smith, Faculty Senate |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| | Bart Quimby, OAA |
| | Melissa Huenefeld, OAA |
| | Helena Wisniewski – Ex Officio |
| | |



| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| | Jesse Mickelson, KOD |
| | Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate |

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| | Kathi Trawver, COH |
| | Vacant, Faculty Senate |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |

*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 January 27, 2012

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 1/20/12 Meeting

Continuing Business

- AAC website
 - Skipped
- Exemption Requests
 - Skipped
- Identification of assessment coordinators
 - Skipped
- Review of Small Business Assessment Plan
 - Holly Bell is on the phone as the program representative
 - Background information
 - This is the first attempt at an assessment plan for Small Business
 - Items to consider regarding this plan:
 - Majority of students do not graduate from Mat-su, but from other MAUs – this is why the focus is not just on graduates
 - There are mostly adjuncts teaching these courses – have chosen to assess primarily at the course level
 - Adjuncts are given the objectives of the course – they are responsible for designing the assessment and recording the results
 - Indirect assessment via student survey (perceived learning)
 - Discussion
 - Likes the focus on course level assessment
 - Will there be a yearly committee reviewing this information?
 - Holly will ultimately review – there are no other full-time faculty members to assist with this
 - Mat-su is looking into hiring an assessment coordinator to gather this data
 - Do you anticipate having to follow-up with adjuncts on items that may need to be clarified?
 - Yes
 - Is there a reason the goals and objectives are grouped the way they are?
 - Some of the outcomes and goals are broad – they list competencies underneath them
 - Will not look all of the objectives each year – one goal per class
 - This will be implemented on classes taught by full-time instructors first, then it will be rolled out to adjuncts



- May want to consider having a meeting with adjuncts at the end of the year – they can do some analysis to reflect on their own performance and consider ways to improve
 - Holly sees this as an evolving document – continuous improvement process
 - Will the final report split out actual Mat-su majors vs. the students that are supported by Mat-su?
 - Yes; will probably have a large group of undecided students – would like to determine which MAUs these students belong to
 - Are you going to look at graduates?
 - Yes, are planning to keep student specific results – will be able to look at graduates in a few years once this process is in place
 - One suggestion is to create class roster type sheets rather than individual student sheets
 - Holly would need assistance in developing this – would like to work on this when a coordinator is hired
 - May need to consider the bias of individual instructors
 - Could gather adjuncts and faculty that teach in the program at the end of the year and discuss expectations (e.g. not met, met, exceeded examples)
 - Holly is hoping to develop an applied rubric
 - The AAC agrees that Holly has put a lot of hard work into this – the organization is great; are encouraged that she is committed to reevaluation and revising the plan as needed
 - The AAC will compile our review in a summary report
- Committee comments on first review
 - It is helpful having a program representative present
 - It appears that the rubric will come over time for the program – it might be helpful for this to be in place prior to the start of the process so time isn't spent collecting data that may be meaningless
 - Will the course material measure anything?
 - If instructors are using different types of projects or measures, it may be difficult
 - If the expectations (not met, met, exceeded) are refined it will matter less what instrument is picked – should be looking at meeting the outcomes rather than focusing on the approach
- Review of Diagnostic Medical Sonography Assessment Plan
 - Ryan Parnell (program director) is in attendance as the program representative
 - Background Information
 - This is a new program – the curriculum is on the schedule for BoR
 - Ryan put together assessment report by following the guidelines of CAHEEP (are hoping to become accredited) – this was put together very methodically
 - Discussion
 - Is there a mission statement?



- Yes, the mission statement is the first part of the introduction paragraph
 - This could be separated out
- Suggest adding a mini appendix after program outcomes
- What does entry level knowledge mean? Is there a definition within the document?
 - It isn't defined – this is the language CAHEEP uses
- An employer will fill out a survey for each graduate – should be completed by the lead sonographer or director
 - This will be a sampling – won't be a direct measure
- Ryan is the only program faculty as of current – will be spending two years with each student
- Employer and graduate surveys quite often receive low response rates – this is something that should be considered
- The capstone takes place the last 8 weeks of the second year – is one extra means of checking that students are qualified to enter the field
- Is it better to have a yes/no format for the Clinical Competency Evaluation rather than use a likert scale?
 - Preferred to list yes/no because these competencies are crucial – also provides consistency in evaluations
- Do the accrediting bodies require multiple measures for the competencies?
 - No, they don't get that specific
- Both the employer and graduate survey includes questions with a lot of “ands” (double-barreled questions).
 - Most of these go hand-in-hand – they wouldn't be separate
 - Asking these type of questions will not provide as specific feedback – this could be a concern
- One minor error on the graduate survey: rating 1 and 4 are both listed as strongly agree
 - Ryan will edit this
- The graduate survey is mostly a formality – CAHEEP requires it
 - Suggest that Ryan make this tool as meaningful as possible
 - Can compare the graduate survey with the national test (can only compare trends, not student-by-student data)
- How can you get data that is valuable for making program changes?
 - Can make adjustments based on results of students passing the national exam
 - Can make adjustments based on feedback from the precept sites
 - It might be helpful to systemize some of these things, such as a collection of material on what the preceptors think about the program – could get valuable feedback this way
- The AAC will compile our review in a summary report
- Send comment forms for these two programs to Keith – he will compile all the documents



- Keith will see if any of the 5 or 6 program volunteers we have left are able to attend our next meeting
 - Kathleen Voge will not be ready for another month or two

New Business

- Review of BoR policies
 - Bhatta sent all the Faculty Senate committee chairs an email with a breakdown of what each committee has been asked to look at – some of these are random assignments
 - Keith will email this to the committee and will attach the breakdown sheet
 - Please send all edits/comments to Keith and he will compile them

Information Items

- Bart is planning to send an email to the faculty list serve about updating the catalog with current program student learning outcomes
 - Has listed AAC as a resource for developing good SLOs
 - Programs will be allowed to submit just the revised SLOs and a PAR form
 - If programs choose not to revise their SLOs, we will take what they have listed on their most current assessment plan and publish them in the catalog
 - Having the SLOs in the catalog will bring us in compliance with NWCCU criteria

Expected Attendees

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

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

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| 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."*