

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: April 29, 2011
12:00 – 2:00pm ADM 283
Audio conference: 1-800-893-8850
Participant code: 1664738

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 4/22/11 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Program Review
- Assessment reporting spreadsheet
- AAC website

New Business

- Election of chair for AY12

Information Items

- Work Schedule for AAC on the Academic Assessment Policy & Procedure document:
 - 4/29 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 5/6 Faculty Senate (document on agenda for second reading)

Scheduled Meeting Dates Spring 2011		
Date	Time	Location
4/29	12:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
Spring 2011 schedule: 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th Fridays		

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

Expected Attendees

	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 April 22, 2011

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 4/8/11 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Feedback from open forums
 - What items should we discuss that might need to be addressed in the handbook?
 - Exemption
 - Face to face
 - Curriculum process interface
 - Document name – Handbook?
 - Purpose discussion – expand/develop
 - Example student learning outcomes and measures
 - Work plan and goals for AY12
 - Should we add some more detail? Does the language need to be made more accessible?
 - Recommend that we address this through a FAQ that can be posted on the website
 - Exemption
 - Are asking that all programs tell us about their assessment process – we are asking them to communicate this through the annual survey
 - Programs need to assess all their outcomes within the three year cycle – can divide them up among the three years
 - Does our current process really help programs with outside accreditation? Is there a simpler way to do this?
 - There is nothing that we can construct that will not add to their workload
 - The survey is less burdensome
 - We need to determine if programs are engaged
 - Do we like the current exemption language?
 - Should we change it to at least every 8 years to accommodate more programs?
 - Accreditation cycles can be even longer than this – some can have 10-12 year cycles
 - **Motion failed (2 in favor, 3 opposed): Keep current language under III, D, “Regular (at least every 7 years) review of assessment data by the accrediting body”**
 - **Motion passed (5 in favor, none opposed): Remove “at least every 7 years”**



- Removing the year limit will allow the committee to decide on a case by case basis
- Face to Face
 - Should we better explain this in the document?
 - We need to try and encourage face to face interaction
 - Minor adjustment made to language
- Curriculum process interface
 - Reference location in Curriculum Handbook added to III, A – this should provide clarification
- Document name – Handbook?
 - Should we change the name from Policies and Procedures back to Handbook?
 - Policies and procedures show up in other handbooks on campus
 - Handbook is a less confrontational/constraining name that Policies and Procedures which sounds dictatorial and programmatic
 - To maintain consistency on campus, it makes more sense to use the title Handbook
 - **Motion passed (5 in favor, 1 opposed): Change name from Academic Assessment Policies & Procedures to Academic Assessment Handbook**
- Purpose discussion – expand/develop
 - Bart has found some great language from the ABET evaluator training website – we could possibly cite some of this language
 - Overview of ABET evaluator training website
 - Has some helpful definitions
 - Terminology differences came up in one of the forums for student learning outcomes – should clarify that we mean program level student learning outcomes
 - Website gives an overview of all the important aspects of assessment
 - Do we need to expand the purpose of the introduction?
 - We should clearly communicate the purpose/uses of the handbook
 - Uses = who is going to look at this and use it – meeting the demands of external stakeholders
 - Since we are trying to make a broad statement of mission, we don't need to list all of the uses
 - **Motion passed (5 in favor, none opposed): Accept revisions to the first paragraph to add that the purpose of academic assessment is improvement of learning**
 - Why aren't we being clearer about what BOR needs? Programs need to understand the purpose of assessment and why we are requesting this information from them
 - Should list program review as one of the uses



- Would prefer to not to specifically list program review in the handbook, especially since we will be working to address this concern at our next meeting
 - Motion to end the first paragraph by listing the additional uses of academic assessment to include accreditation, BOR, OAA and program review
 - Motion not seconded
 - **Motion passed (6 in favor, none opposed): Accept the handbook as is with these changes**
- Should we make the excel spreadsheet (previously removed) available in the handbook?
 - We could create a new version and post it on our website, however, we would need to remove the reporting format requirements
 - Kenrick is currently working on editing the spreadsheet – can discuss this at our next meeting
- Example student learning outcomes and measures
 - We received feedback asking that we make more examples of student learning outcomes available
 - This should not be in the body of the handbook
 - Could rearrange the appendices to include this
 - Samples are included in appendix C – Academic Assessment Plan Template
- Program review
 - Keeping the assessment component as part of program review will hurt assessment efforts
 - This has not be resolved yet, however, it is on our 4/29 agenda to discuss
 - Need to send out the current versions of program review to the committee to consider what changes we would like to request
- Discussion on assessment and tools/measures used
 - Should look at components of core courses – there is no need to recreate the wheel
 - Major problem is that faculty do not talk to each other. How do they know if their program is doing well?
- Various language modifications made. Goal is to remove mandating/dictatorial type language while still being clear in what programs are expected to do
- Timeline in handbook
 - Discussion about due dates listed
 - We should change the assessment survey due date to June = draft deadline and October = final deadline
 - Faculty need to have a chance to review the survey and this could be accomplished with the October deadline. There is more of a chance of receiving faculty input if we do this



- Since the data isn't being reviewed (only aggregate is being used), then there is no need to have a draft deadline and final deadline later
 - We should leave the dates as is – it is a simpler process now. Since we are trying to catch the lowest common denominator, we should try to keep those who are already doing assessment on board. OAA has received very few final submissions with the October deadline in the past
 - Assessment should be reviewed by program faculty prior to being submitted to AAC
 - Work plan and goals for AY12
 - Need to have the handbook in place before we can move forward.
 - Do we have a contingency if this is not approved?
 - Are we interested in putting together a work plan and emailing this out with the handbook?
 - Tara will send out a list of items that we will try to address next year
- Draft Survey
 - Where can people access this survey? Can we include a link on the document itself?
 - The survey will be entered online. This is just a listing of the questions, so a link should not be necessary
 - Can we include a section that says reviewed by department head or deans? Can we state that the survey will be emailed to the department head (this could be possible through Bart's website)?
 - Is there a place for people to respond beyond a yes or no?
 - Yes, there will be comment boxes after each question
 - Various changes to language discussed and approved
 - The date should be populated by the survey tool or website
 - **Motion passed (All in favor): Include the survey (as modified today) as an appendix in the handbook**
 - We should note that this survey may change over time
- May 13th Meeting: off contract
 - **Motion passed (All in favor): Cancel the 5/13 meeting as it will occur after faculty contracts end**

Information Items

- Work Schedule for AAC on the Academic Assessment Policy & Procedure document:
 - 4/29 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - Will discuss the website, elect a chair for next year, talk about program review and review the revised spreadsheet to be sent out by Kenrick
 - 5/6 Faculty Senate (document on agenda for second reading)



Expected Attendees

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

N	Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate
N	Nicolae Lobontiu, SOE
P	Jesse Mickelson, KOD
N	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."*