



UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: September 24, 2010

11:00am – 2:00pm ADM 283

Audio conference: 1-800-893-8850

Participant code: 1664738

11:00 General Business

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes for 9/17/10 Meeting

11:15 Continuing Business

- Assessment handbook issues for consideration:
 - Section 2 Diagram and Table
 - Section 3, C, Number 3: College/Divisional Reviews and/or Site Visits
 - Section 1, Paragraph 2, Bullet 1
 - Appendices
 - Rubric/criteria
 - Assessment Plan template
 - Excel report template

1:30 New Business

- Accreditation Briefing

Scheduled Meeting Dates Fall 2010		
Date	Time	Location
9/10	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 201
9/17	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
9/24	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
10/8	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
10/15	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
10/22	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
11/12	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
11/19	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
12/10	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
12/17	11:00-2:00 pm	ADM 283
Fall 2010 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
Tom Dalrymple, KPC

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: September 17, 2010

General Business

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

Continuing Business

- Assessment handbook issues for consideration:
 - Section 2 Diagram
 - Wheel Diagram from BB discussed
 - Revisions to be made to design
 - TS to verify that it matches up with actual process
 - TS not able to create table for meeting. Would like to compare wheel and table together
 - TS to create table for next meeting and would like to hold off discussion until then
 - Table will be posted to Blackboard once completed
 - Review of Sections 3 and 4
 - Discussion over who is required to have assessment plans – new programs vs. current programs
 - Introduction paragraph 1 (page 3): Replace “Even so, all academic programs...” with “All academic programs approved by the Faculty Senate are required to document their assessment activities.” Passed unanimously.
 - Discussion of Section A
 - Faculty that can’t attend meetings may designate someone in their stead – but should be a faculty member
 - Section A, paragraph 2 (page 3): Replace “Faculty initiators or a qualified representative” with “Faculty initiators or a qualified faculty representative.” Passed unanimously.
 - Is 2 weeks a reasonable time period for review?
 - Members agree that this is a very tight cycle and should be changed to 4 weeks
 - Discussion over where report will go
 - Per TS report goes to program faculty, dean, OAA – not UAB unless requested
 - Paragraph 1 (page 4): Replace “within two weeks after the review” with “within four weeks after the review.” Passed unanimously.
 - Section B, paragraph 1 (page 4): Replace “programs must submit a short annual update on their data collection” with “programs must submit an annual update (see section IV B) on their data collection.” Passed unanimously.
 - Does this become a prescribing directive for annual update?
 - Yes per TS – Faculty Senate requires this



- Meaning of rotational basis discussed
- Text in Section C, first sentence (page 4) is confusing
 - Replace “Once every three years on a rotating basis, the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) will conduct a full review...” with “Every three years on a staggered basis AAC will conduct a full review...” Passed unanimously.
- Section C, number 2 (page 4): Replace “The three-year rotation cycle for every program will be available online.” With “The schedule for every program’s three-year rotation cycle will be available online.” Passed unanimously.
- Discussion about programs coming to AAC for review vs. AAC going to them (like a real site visit)
 - Members agree that this should be made optional – we should not mandate that programs host us for a “site visit”
 - If colleges/schools choose they may have a group “site visit” – this could be advantageous for some programs
 - AAC could possibly suggest groupings
 - Section C, number 3 (page 4): Add new sentence after first sentence: “Site visits may not be possible for extended campuses.”
- Discussion about number 3 combining too many items
 - Section C, number 3 will be split into 2 sections: College/Divisional Reviews will remain Section C, Number 3 and Site Visits will be the new Section C, Number 4
 - TS to split out sections for review next week
- Section C, number 4 (page 4): Replace “within two weeks of completion” with “within four weeks of completion.”
- Discussion over number of graduates in Section D, paragraph 2
 - Should those programs with 0 to 7 graduates be reviewed?
 - Not all members in agreement
 - Increasing number to programs with 0 to 10 graduates will help weed out smaller programs (would be more time efficient for AAC). AAC should not devote the same amount of time to smaller programs who show little growth as it does to larger programs
 - Smaller programs may need the review to help assess their problems (lack of program growth) so AAC should try to assist these smaller programs. Exempting smaller programs may cut out some community campuses from review process.
 - Section D, paragraph 2 (page 5): Change “programs with 0 to 7 graduates” to “programs with 0 to 10 graduates.”
 - Motion to approve – passed (5 in favor, 2 opposed)



- Are programs to be assessed separately if they submit the same assessment report (for ex: BA/BS programs in same discipline)?
 - Per TS they can be evaluated by how they submit their assessment reports
- Section D: Move paragraph 1 (All programs that are suspended...) directly below “D. Exemption Process” and delete “Suspended programs” bullet. Unanimously approved.
- Section D: Change sentence “There are three categories of programs” to “There are two categories of programs”
- Disagreement over “Criteria for Exemption from the Three-Year Review Based on Outside Accreditation” as underlined text
 - Members agreed to leave as is
- Discussion on Document Requirements (page 6)
 - What is the purpose of this section?
 - This section should be moved to a different location in document – does not fit in Document Requirements section
 - Move text below “Document Requirements” up to “A. Plan” to page 1, after paragraph 1
 - Disagreement on wording of first bullet
 - JP to create revised bullet for next meeting
 - OA to bring wording from Curriculum Handbook to assist in revising first bullet
- Section B Annual Updates, number 1 (page 6): Change “note current plan is on file” to “note that current plan is on file.”
- Section B, OPTIONAL (page 7): Move text from “Optional” to “The focused submission must address...” paragraph right before section C
- Section B, format 1 (page 7): Change last sentence from “The focused submission must address all 4 items listed above” to “The focused submission must address items 1-4.”
- Section C, paragraph 1 (page 7):
 - Delete second sentence “To put it simply...”
 - Change “The three-year should show this” to “The three-year review should show this.”
 - Change last sentence to: “Programs scheduled for a three-year review should ensure that the following documents are on file with the OAA by October 15.”
 - All changes approved unanimously.
- Section C, number 3, after bullets (page 8): Change italicized font to regular
 - Change Three-Year cumulative to “three-year review” and make lowercase any entries of “three-year review”
- Section D, number 1 (page 8): Change “0-7 graduates” to “0-10 graduates”
- Section D: Add extra line after 1, 2, 3 paragraphs and delete italicized word after each number (*Notification, Requests, Requests*)
- Discussion over what special circumstances and outside accreditation entails

- KB volunteered to proof handbook again
- Revised handbook must be submitted by 9/27/10 by 9:00am per TS

New Business

- (Baccalaureate) General Education Assessment Methods
 - GERC is recommending the creation of a funded faculty group - GEAC
 - This would be a standalone committee
 - There would probably be workload implications in report these things separately
 - GER will have to assess: What form and by who?

Future Business

- Next Friday: Appendices
 - Rubric/criteria
 - Assessment Plan template
 - Excel report template

Homework

- Review exemption memos

Expected Attendees

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

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

N	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."*