UAA Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee
Minutes: November 21, 2014
11:00a – 12:30p, ADM 204
Lync (Audio/Video) Conferencing Information: Provided in Email

General Business

- Guest(s): Dr. David Yesner
- Approval of agenda
  - Approved
- Approval of minutes from 10/17/2014 (pgs. 3-5)
  - Approved
- Vice Provost report

New Business

- Assessment Plan Reviews
  - 11:00 am – Doctor of Education (EdD) in Education, Culture, and Leadership
    - Program Representatives: Dr. Ed McClain, Dr. Hilary Seitz, Dr. Timothy Jester
    - Summary: The Doctor of Education is a professional doctorate designed to prepare leaders in P-12, higher education, and community-based educational contexts. The student learning outcomes are based on the outcomes developed by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate.
    - Program faculty will collaborate a significant amount to ensure students are able to meet the required outcomes. Students will create Professional Portfolios which will be used for annual assessment of the program.
    - The program is continuing to work on an assessment management plan to help them manage the collection and evaluation of artifacts.
    - The program representatives will many any changes necessary and submit the final plan to OUAA.
  - 11:30 am – Bachelor of Science in Computer Systems Engineering
    - Program Representative: Dr. Frank Moore
    - Summary: The Bachelor of Science in Engineering (BSE) program is being split into three separate degrees: Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Computer Systems Engineering. The Academic Assessment Plan for the Computer Systems Engineering program is very similar to the existing BSE plan with slight revisions to reflect this shift. The program expects to make several changes to the plan as the program develops in the coming years.
    - Suggestion was made to revise lead-in language for the Program Student Learning Outcomes to "At the completion of this programs, students will demonstrate…"

Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508-4614
T 907.786.1050, F 907.786.1426
www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/

- ▪ The program representative will make any changes necessary and submit the final plan to OUAA.
- Follow-up on Mid-Cycle Accreditation Site-Visit
  - o Thank you for your participation in the Mid-Cycle Accreditation Site-Visit on October 29 &30.
  - o NWCCU provided a rubric used for evaluating academic assessment process and progress (attachment 1). The plans reviewed by the evaluators at this visit were ranked as developed and highly developed.
  - o The institution will need to have quick access to academic program assessment reports for future accreditation visits.
    - ▪ The Committee discussed creating a share drive for assessment reports and there was general agreement that this would be a good approach. OUAA will explore this option further. Other options might include a database or using the new ePortfolio system.
    - ▪ The Committee discussed providing a basic report template (attachment 2) for programs to use for annual reporting. It was agreed that this is a good idea but the Committee would like to consider allowing programs to use other templates or models if they would like.
      - • The Committee will review the draft template and provide feedback at the next meeting.
  - o Assessment Plan updates and PSLO updates in catalog
    - ▪ Assessment funding responses will be sent out to colleges before Thanksgiving. Each response will include information on the assessment status for that college's programs, including which programs are missing plans or PSLOs in the catalog.
  - o OUAA is working on a one page workflow and structure description of the various stages of the assessment processes. This project will require information from the colleges and campuses about their assessment structures and processes. OUAA will draft questions and provide them at a future meeting for feedback. This questionnaire will be helpful for the Committee's work on reviewing the college and campus level assessment structures and processes.
- Review the college and campus level assessment structures and processes
- Spring 2015 Academic Assessment Workshop Series
  - o The Committee brainstormed some ideas for spring workshops:
    - ▪ Workshop for programs that do not have an assessment plan
    - ▪ Annual reporting workshop
    - ▪ Rubrics workshop
- 2015 Academic Assessment Seminar theme/topic and speaker

Continuing Business
- Assessment tracking and archives of artifacts, data, and reports
- Update and adopt Committee bylaws

Future Business

- Erin Holmes, Director of Institutional Research, to talk about possible collaborations with IR.

Informational
- CAFE, in partnership with OUAA and Student Affairs, will be hosting an all-day event on Tuesday, February 24, 2015 on High Impact Educational Practices, featuring national expert Dr. George Kuh, Director of the Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University. More information including session details and registration information will be shared through the faculty and staff dynamic listservs soon.

Attendees

C	Alan Peabody, CTC	-	*Vacant*, COE	C	Maria Stroth, OAA
P	Scott Downing, KPC	-	Jennifer McFerran Brock, CoEng	C	Susan Kalina – Ex-officio, Vice Provost
P	Cindy Trussell, KOD	C	Kathi Trawver, COH	-	Helena Wisniewski – Ex-officio, Vice Provost
-	Holly Bell, MSC	C	Tim Benningfield, Faculty Senate		
C	Rebecca Moorman, LIB	P	Rachel Graham, Faculty Senate		
C	Bill Myers, CAS	C	Deborah Mole, Faculty Senate		
-	Kathleen Voge, CBPP	C	Brian Bennett, Faculty Senate		

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

Academic Affairs
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Scheduled Meeting Dates Academic Year 2015		
Date	**Time**	**Location**
8/29	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
9/5	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
9/19	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
10/3	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
10/17	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
11/7	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
11/21	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
12/5	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
12/19	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
1/16	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
2/6	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
2/20	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
3/6	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
3/20	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
4/3	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
4/17	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
5/1	11:00-12:30p	ADM 204
Academic Year 2015 schedule: 1st & 3rd Fridays unless otherwise noted		

Rubric for Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Assessment Planning	No formal plan	Relies on short-term planning	Clear multi-year plan	Clear multi-year plan with several years of implementation
Assessable Outcomes	Non-specific outcomes. Do not state student learning outcomes	Most outcomes indicate how students demonstrate learning	Each outcome describes student demonstration of learning	Outcomes describe demonstration of student learning. Outcomes used for improvement.
Assessment Implementation	Not clear that assessment data is collected	Evidence collected Faculty have discussed relevant criteria for reviewing	Evidence is collected and faculty use relevant criteria	Evidence collected, criteria determined and faculty discuss multiple sets of data. Data is used.
Alignment	No clear relationship between outcomes and curriculum	Some alignment between curriculum and outcomes	Clear alignment between curriculum and outcomes	Curriculum, grading and support services are aligned with outcomes
Valid Results	Little to no evidence that measures are valid	Majority of measures are valid	Valid measures in regular use	Multi-year use of valid measures
Reliable Results	No process to check for inter-rater reliability	Faculty preparing inter-rater reliability	Faculty check for inter-rater reliability	Multi-year use of process and evidence of good inter-rater reliability
Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts	No person or committee provides feedback to departments on quality of their assessment plan	Occasional feed back by person or committee	Annual feedback by person or committee. Departments use feedback.	Annual feedback, departmental use and clear institutional support.
Results are Used	Results for outcomes are collected but not discussed.	Results collected, discussed but not used.	Results collected, discussed and used.	Results collected, discussed, used and evidence to confirm that changes lead to improved learning
Planning and Budgeting	Outcomes not integrated into planning and budget	Attempts at aligning outcomes and planning and budget	Alignment of outcomes and planning and budget occurs informally	Alignment of outcomes and planning is systematic and intentional

Program Name:

Program Level:

College:

Academic Year:

1. Please list the Program Student Learning Outcomes assessed in your program this academic year.

2. For each Program Student Learning Outcome assessed this academic year, please describe the method of assessment.

3. Describe the results of your program's assessment activities this academic year. What do they tell you about student learning in your program?

4. Describe the process by which faculty reviewed your program's assessment results and decided on the actions and/or revisions that were needed.

5. Describe the program and assessment process improvements or changes that were implemented (or will be implemented) in response to your program's assessment results this academic year.