



UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: September 17, 2010
11:00am – 2:00pm ADM 283
Audio conference: 1-800-893-8850
Participant code: 1664738

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 9/10/10 Meeting

Continuing Business

- Assessment handbook issues for consideration:
 - Section 2 Diagram
 - Review of Sections 3 and 4

New Business

- (Baccalaureate) General Education Assessment Methods

Expected Attendees

Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate
Allan Barnes, CHSW
Brian Bennett, CTC
Kim Bloomstrom, MSC
Keith Cates, COE

Tom Dalrymple, KPC
Nicolae Lobontiu, SOE
Jesse Mickelson, KOD
Susan Mitchell, LIB
Kenrick Mock, Faculty Senate

Bill Myers, CAS
Jack Pauli, CBPP
Tara Smith, Faculty Senate
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: September 10, 2010

General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 4/16/10 Meeting
- Election of Chair for AY11
 - Tara unanimously elected as chair

Continuing Business

- Note: Due to director vacancy MSC unable to submit assessment reports for June or October deadlines. Per KB a skeleton report will be submitted, working with OAA to determine what should be addressed.
- Assessment handbook issues for consideration
 - Memo from Summer Working Group
 - Rubric drafted last year was distributed by email, but is difficult to read in its current marked up version. Need to make a more useful version for discussion at 9/24 meeting.
 - Discussion over usefulness of rubric – might be more helpful as guidelines rather than a rubric that grades like a check sheet
 - Want to provide consistency in feedback to programs – for the committee to keep on track as well as to communicate with faculty what is needed
 - Does committee want to move from rubric to set of guidelines or at least agree upon a set of guidelines and wait to create a rubric until the guidelines are set? What will committee use to evaluate programs?
 - Discussion on pros/cons of this approach – not all members in agreement
 - Members agree that they need to view most recent version of rubric (with comments) as a final proposed copy to be able to make an informed decision
 - Discussion over where program enforcement will come from – AAC will only provide peer-review/advisory feedback, not to enforce assessment changes
 - Plan for submission of handbook to Faculty Senate
 - Deadline for making changes is Sept 27 for Oct 1 Faculty Senate
 - Institutional Learning Outcomes – what is required for accreditation?
 - TS to find out requirements in Oct site visit
 - Motion to revise Sections 1 & 2 of handbook today – all in favor
 - Will set aside summer working group concerns until appropriate sections are reviewed
 - **Section 1 Discussion**



- Introduction paragraph 2 (page 1): Replace “assure that...” with “...and to promote systematic academic assessment university wide...” Passed unanimously.
- Concerns expressed about “evaluating” in charge, no change to wording at this point. May be discussed/defined later.
- AAC Charge, letter C (page 1): Faculty “know how to” change to “Faculty and staff are properly informed how to access support”
 - Motion to approve – passed (7 in favor, 1 opposed)
- **Section 2**
 - Diagram on page 2 is confusing – especially 4th year on the diagram
 - Is the 4th year a break – what do programs do while they are being reviewed?
 - Programs do not take a break – they keep on submitting their regular reports and may not be able to implement comments until the following year
 - Discussion on timeline
 - Confusion over 2 year or 3 year. What does 3 year review mean – reviewed on 4th year?
 - Intention was to see 3 years worth of data together; meet with AAC every 3 years and submit memos in intervening years
 - Suggestion to get rid of diagram and list Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 and use text to indicate meeting with the committee every 3 or 4 years (or whatever timeline is decided)
 - Brian will develop wheel diagram for distribution by Melissa to members for comment.
 - Possible sample/example table suggested to help programs keep track where they are at in review process. Tara will develop and send to Melissa for distribution to members for comment.
 - Side note: Page 8 – special circumstances for programs being exempt from a review discussed. Will be discussed in Section 4 discussion in future.

New Business

- (Baccalaureate) General Education Assessment Methods
 - Skipped

Future Business

- Next Friday: Sections 3 and 4 in the assessment handbook
 - 3rd recommendation from summer working group may come up
- TS to coordinate with MH on getting rubric with actual changes in a printable format for 9/24 meeting

Information Items

- Accreditation report is now posted on the Accreditation website. An email has been sent out to the AAC.



- Agendas and minutes will be on a public site rather than blackboard per MC. Blackboard will continue to be used for committee discussions and projects.
- Allan thanked Tara for backing up committee and providing feedback on ILOs for accreditation so quickly. The rest of the group concurred.

Attendees

N	Osama Abaza, Faculty Senate
C	Allan Barnes, CHSW
C	Brian Bennett, CTC
P	Kim Bloomstrom, MSC
C	Keith Cates, COE

N	Tom Dalrymple, KPC
C	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	Tara Smith, 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."*