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 BoR policies

New Business
- Review Reporting format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>RH 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27</td>
<td>12:00-2:00pm</td>
<td>LIB 306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2012 schedule: 2nd, 3rd, 4th Fridays

Expected Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keith Cates (Chair), COE</th>
<th>Deborah Mole, LIB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Bill Myers, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Bennett, CTC</td>
<td>Soren Orley, CBPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Bloomstrom, MSC</td>
<td>Cheryl Siemers, KPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer McFerran Brock, SOE</td>
<td>Tara Smith, Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bart Quimby, OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Huenefeld, OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helena Wisniewski – Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesse Mickelson, KOD</th>
<th>Kathi Trawver, COH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Vacant, Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
  o 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
    o It might be helpful to systemize some of the 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
  o 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

| 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 |
| C | Bart Quimby, OAA |
| C | Bill Myers, CAS |
| C | Soren Orley, CBPP |
| P | Cheryl Siemens, KPC |
| C | Tara Smith, Faculty Senate |
| C | 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.”