



UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: April 8, 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 3/25/11 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Feedback from open forums
- Draft Annual “Compliance” Survey
- Plan to address:
 - Feedback on program review documents (Provost offered to attend AAC meeting)
 - Campus-wide survey on assessment
 - Issues of tracking majors/graduates
 - Funding issues: equity, base, PBAC
 - AAC Website
- Finalize April meeting schedule:
 - Meet 15th?
 - Meet 29th?
 - When will we elect chair for AY12?

Information Items

- Work Schedule for AAC on the Academic Assessment Policy & Procedure document:
 - 4/4-4/15 Open forums
 - 4/6 10:00-11:00am, LIB 302A, offered via audio conference
 - 4/7 10:00-11:00am, LIB 214, offered via eLive
 - 4/11 1:00-2:00pm, RH 303, offered via audio conference
 - 4/12 2:30-3:30pm, LIB 302A, offered via eLive
 - 4/13 2:30-3:30pm, UC 145, offered via audio conference
 - 4/8 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 4/15 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 4/22 AAC Meeting (Work Session) 11:00-3:00pm, AHS 147 (final draft, summary of changes, and track change version completed)
 - 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
4/8	12:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
4/15	12:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
4/22	11:00-3:00 pm	AHS 147
4/29	12:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
Spring 2011 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
Cheryl Siemers, 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 March 25, 2011

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 3/18/11 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Feedback from the Forums
 - Goal of today's meeting is to produce a revised document, revised document with track changes and a summary of changes (if deemed necessary)
 - Need to determine if/how this committee will work – need some ground rules
 - If people are more in support of having OAA lead assessment efforts on campus, we can go this route, however the original idea was to have faculty-led assessment
 - We need to hear from the people that support the document – it is harder to get the “pro” side motivated to voice their approval
 - Many feel that the proposed process is more cumbersome. Since assessment is not attached to strategic planning or how people are funded it doesn't mean very much in the long run
 - People don't want to turn in reports that are not reviewed or don't have any value
 - We may need to more clearly state what components are required and what the real purpose of the process is (program improvement, reporting to BOR)
 - Outline of Major Items to Address
 - Annual Updates vs. Three Year Reviews
 - Timing (when documents are due)
 - Purpose (introduction)
 - Things we can't address
 - Discussion of Major Items
 - Annual Updates vs. Three Year Reviews
 - Will the annual updates serve the purpose that we want them to?
 - People are not doing these or possibly turning in previous year's reports
 - Having annual updates does not necessitate that people will be more prepared for the three year review – people will continue to choose to do or not do the updates
 - What about having programs on a three or five year cycle?
 - Not all programs have enough data to report every year, so a cycle could be beneficial
 - Would like to keep the face to face meeting option – this is beneficial for discussion



- We are used to annual thinking – a cycle would have breaks which may encourage program's to procrastinate
- If BOR requires a report every year, can we just report that we have a cycle process in place and explain which programs we will be reporting on each year?
- We need a process that doesn't drive people away – a cycle may help accomplish this
- What about replacing the annual updates with a survey on assessment participation?
 - Would still keep the three year review in place. Survey would entail having a summary of results annually and a full analysis every three years with the three year review
 - There are many things that we can report on to document learning without having to have an annual update
 - Instead of requiring the annual updates we need to focus on providing training/resources/examples to assist faculty with assessment. We should be allies with faculty in helping them write their reports
 - NWCCU would probably be more interested in knowing that we are trying to train people to do better assessment rather than just getting paperwork from people
 - Should we put the value back in the annual reports instead? What about asking for programs to only report on a few outcomes or specified number of outcomes?
 - Need to either simplify the annual reports or not require the three year review.
 - Policy does not create culture change – it creates compliance
 - We need to make process look different – to help address the negative feedback we received
 - The email survey would be sent to assessment coordinators
 - Would also like to send out an anonymous survey to all faculty on campus – this would be a separate survey
 - **Motion passed (8 in favor, 1 opposed): Change Annual Update to Annual Compliance Survey. Survey to be sent to assessment coordinators for them to document how they are progressing**
 - This survey would indicate the level of compliance and show if people are on track
 - No change in three year review
 - Should we put in a sunset clause – that this is a pilot process?



- Since we want to promote stability we shouldn't put this in
- Timing (when documents are due)
 - Annual survey will be due June 15
 - Will three year review draft be due in June or in Oct?
 - Having a June due date corresponds with summer assignments
 - It is unlikely that we can come up with a date that works for everyone
 - Final review will be due Oct 15
 - Should list timing in the handbook as part of the explanation. Review should be completed in the summer, then be reviewed by the program faculty in the fall
- Purpose (introduction)
 - Why do it?
 - Accountability/stakeholders
 - Do we need an entire chapter on purpose or do we need to develop the introduction?
 - People don't seem to understand why we are doing this or what is required (continuous improvement process)
 - This would be better addressed in training support rather than making changes to the document
- Things we can't address
 - GERS
 - Compensation/equity
 - While Bart decides how much money goes to each college, he doesn't decide how the funds are dispersed within each college
 - We don't need to put anything in writing on this – can address this at forums
- Exemptions
 - We received various feedback on this topic
 - Do we want to make any changes to the current exemption process?
 - What about departments that don't have a degree program in the courses they offer? Are they exempt?
 - Assessment should still play a role, however, at an institutional level we are not asking programs to submit anything
 - Programs with low numbers of graduates would still participate in the annual compliance survey, however, they wouldn't have to meet the three year requirement until they had 10 graduates
 - Having a face to face meeting would solve any format problems – programs could present their data and explain it
 - We shouldn't force people to put their material in a format that is friendly to us – we should work with what programs have



- How does translating the accreditation document benefit the program? Is it beneficial for them to translate the process with us? Is our feedback going to be of any value to them?
 - Even if a meeting is not beneficial to the program, it may be beneficial to AAC
 - Do we want to get rid of outside accreditation as a possible exemption for the three year review?
 - No
 - Do we want to increase the number of graduates to 10 per year instead of 10 per 3 years?
 - No
- Defining the Annual Compliance Survey
 - Tara will email this out next week for everyone to vote on
 - Need to send out the revised document next week so people have time to review the changes before the April forums
 - Possible questions to be included in survey:
 - Do you have an assessment plan on file?
 - In the last year, have you made changes to your assessment plan?
 - Did you collect data according to the assessment plan?
 - Have you compiled or aggregated the data?
 - Has the data been reviewed with the program's faculty?
 - Have there been recommendations for changes to the program based on the data?
 - How many of your outcomes are being met "above expectations," "at expectations" or "below expectations?"
 - Would your program like assistance from the AAC in development or implementation?
 - Some of the questions could be "yes" or "no." Others might require a dialogue box option.
 - Brian to write a draft survey and send to Melissa
 - Implementation, results and institutional planning are points directly derived from BOR policy
 - Survey should help give Bart the info he needs to report to BOR

Information Items

- Assessment Plans in Program Review
 - Tara received an email from Tom Miller listing BOR policy in relation to assessment and program review
 - Policy states that program assessment needs to be a part of program review, however it does not specify how
 - Motion discussed at Faculty Senate
 - Provost commented that as written our motion is in contrast to BOR policy – motion tabled



- He encouraged us to provide feedback directly on program review documents
 - Deans don't appear to be accountable for assessment, just program review
 - We need to address this in the near future
- AAC Future Items to Address:
 - Feedback on program review documents
 - Campus survey on assessment
 - Issues of tracking majors/graduates
 - Funding issues: equity, base, PBAC
- Work Schedule for AAC on the Academic Assessment Policy & Procedure document:
 - 3/25 AAC Meeting (Work Session) 11:00-3:00pm, AHS 147 (draft for second reading, summary of changes, and a track change version completed)
 - 4/1 Faculty Senate (document not on agenda)
 - 4/4-4/15 Open forums
 - 4/6 10:00-11:00am, LIB 302A, offered via audio conference
 - 4/7 10:00-11:00am, LIB 214, offered via eLive
 - 4/11 1:00-2:00pm, RH 303, offered via audio conference
 - 4/12 2:30-3:30pm, LIB 302A, offered via eLive
 - 4/13 2:30-3:30pm, UC 145, offered via audio conference
 - 4/8 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 4/15 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 4/22 AAC Meeting (Work Session) 11:00-3:00pm, AHS 147 (final draft, summary of changes, and track change version completed)
 - 4/29 AAC Meeting 12:00-2:00pm, ADM 283
 - 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
C	Keith Cates, COE
C	Cheryl Siemers, KPC

C	Sue Fallon, Faculty Senate
C	Nicolae Lobontiu, SOE
N	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."*