

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: February 24, 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 2/17/12 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Review Reporting format

New Business

- Assessment sequence and due dates
- Review Log
- Review Small Business and Sonography Reviews (available on Blackboard)
- Scheduled review of BBA program on 4/27
- Request to schedule Mathematics Assessment Plan
- Review Accounting Assessment Plan (Rep: Holly Bell, 1p, via eLive/phone bridge)

Scheduled Meeting Dates Spring 2012		
Date	Time	Location
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		

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

Expected Attendees

	Rebecca Moorman, LIB
	Bill Myers, CAS
	Soren Orley, CBPP
	Cheryl Siemers, KPC
	Tara Smith, Faculty Senate
	Kathi Trawver, COH
	Vacant, Faculty Senate

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

*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 February 17, 2012

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 2/10/12 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Review Reporting format
 - Would like to provide a nice format for our feedback since programs have to use our report for external purposes such as program accreditation
 - A consolidated list of everyone's comments should be placed in Blackboard by the assigned committee member – this member will then draft up a report based on these comments
 - Melissa will send the final report to the program (will copy OAA and the program's dean's office)
 - Comments/feedback on assessment plans
 - Small Business and Sonography – send comments to Keith
 - CIOS – send comments to Brian
 - Mechanical Engineering – send comments to Keith
 - Accounting – send comments to Soren after we've met with the program
 - This plan has been posted to Blackboard
 - Programs can resubmit plans to us if they wish (need to make sure that most recent plans are on file with OAA)
- Email distribution list to department heads
 - We previously discussed coming up with a distribution list to send information to assessment coordinators or department heads
 - There isn't a list like this in existence – creating one will require a lot of work and continual updates
 - Recommend that we just send information to the faculty list serve – all faculty should be participating in assessment. It is safer to include everyone

New Business

- SOE review (Rep: Jennifer McFerran Brock, 12p, LIB 306)
 - Background
 - Mechanical Engineering (ME) has previously participated in assessment with the other Engineering programs, however, per a suggestion from ABET, ME has created its own assessment plan
 - ABET is returning for a visit this fall – ME wants to have an approved and reviewed assessment plan on file to show their progress
 - Discussion
 - Are the outcomes from ABET?
 - Yes



- All of the program courses are listed at the beginning of the plan – is ME planning to use all these courses for evaluation?
 - No – this probably needs to be clarified
- Suggest moving the table from page 11 to page 7 – this may help the reader understand the definitions earlier
- Surveys are generally considered a consumer satisfaction approach rather than as a direct assessment measure
 - ABET has mentioned that ME has leaned too much on surveys in the past. To remedy this, Jennifer is trying to use at least one direct measure per outcome. Surveys can serve as indirect measures
- There is a lot of emphasis on course outcomes – might consider a rubric for the program outcomes
- Is the capstone course designed to capture the entire degree?
 - Yes
- Is the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam required?
 - No, but they recommend that students take it as it will help advance them in their career. Most students choose to take the exam
 - This isn't the highest level of assessment, however, it is a national standard that compares UAA students with other students around the country
- Might want to clarify what “multi-disciplinary teams” means – this refers to different disciplines within engineering
- Is there a schedule in place to regularly review the plan?
 - In practice ME is hoping to review the plan annually
 - Recommend that this be directly said and that an annual meeting be scheduled to view the data and make changes – this will help strengthen the plan
 - Jennifer will aim to hold an annual assessment workshop with ME faculty
- Discussion of rubrics
 - Some rubrics are clear and direct while others are more subjective
 - Subjective rubrics can be harder to use as they can be open to a lot of interpretation
 - Jennifer has taken each outcome and broken it out by indicator (ABET likes this method)
- Which courses are used for course level assessment?
 - See the table on page 14 – each outcome has at least 1 or 2 courses associated with it
- ABET makes a distinction between student outcomes (should be met by the time of graduation) and objectives (should be mastered 5 years from graduation) – Engineering tracks both of these
- Is there a particular code of ethics that students should learn?
 - Students should know the main engineering code of ethics, however, there are also other ethical standards that students need to understand

- Might consider refining this indicator to show this – or could leave it as is since it is a broad based measure
- ME is hoping to show ABET that they have received feedback from peers at the university level – this is one reason they wanted to meet with AAC
- ABET deliberately keeps things very broad – this can be frustrating when trying to put plans/reports together
 - Also have to deal with different opinions and suggestions from reviewers
- ME is hoping to be accredited for 3 years by ABET (the longest is 6)
- The plan has a nice layout that is easy to understand
 - It does seem like a lot of work
 - Since this plan has evolved out of a previous process, ME is trying to grow it into something that is sustainable
 - ME is planning to implement a two-year plan (assessing a few outcomes every semester) – this will hopefully reduce the workload

Information Items

- Bart has not yet heard back from Rachel Waters
- Melissa is updating the committee roster since there have been some member changes – roster sent around the room for corrections
- Kathleen Vogue would like to have AAC visit CBPP at the end of April – not sure if this is to review plans or for a complete three-year review visit

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
P	Jesse Mickelson, KOD
C	Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate

C	Rebecca Moorman, 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
N	Helena Wisniewski – Ex Officio

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