

Curriculum and Assessment Coordinating Committee Notes of Discussion

October 4, 2019, 12:30pm- 2:00pm, SAS 434

Meeting called by: Sandra Davis, Chair
Type of meeting: Curriculum and Assessment Coordinating Committee
Facilitator: Sandra Davis
Note taker: Barbara Branton

Voting members: Marieke Taney, Kyle Winfree, Gioia Woods, Lynsey McClintock

Non-Voting members: Melinda Trembl, Jeff Berglund, Ricardo Guthrie,

Skype: Cynthia Conn, Karina Collentine

Excused: Bruce Fox, Shadow Armfield, Dawn Clifford

Visitor:

Agenda and notes of discussion

Topic	Discussion
Welcome	Call to Order. Quorum was not present.
Approval of Minutes	Notes of Discussion for April 5 were presented and deferred due to lack of quorum.
Business	
Update University Policy Portal	M. Trembl reported that the syllabus requirements and the Curriculum and Assessment policy, that the committee worked on last spring, are in the policy portal.
Liberal Studies Task Force	<p>M. Trembl and Liberal Studies Director Berglund reported on the charge of the Liberal Studies Task Force and the recently approved ABOR general education policy. The efforts of the task force will also include responding to the LS site visit completed last December under its academic program review. The TF is comprised of faculty who teach liberal studies courses in each college, plus students and representatives from Student Affairs.</p> <p>The ultimate goal is to align NAU with the ABOR general education policy and be able to articulate the program more easily to students, parents and faculty and its importance in creating a well-rounded graduate and not about taking more credits and paying tuition. The new policy will require assessment through more than the Capstone. This year TF will focus on alignment, next year on operational constraints. The reviewers complimented the program on its assessing of general education/liberal studies.</p>

	<p>Regular updates will be provided to ABOR over AY 19-20. As the discussions progress, information will be brought forward to the Faculty Senate curriculum committees.</p> <p>The Task Force started discussing the existing distribution blocks compared to the ABOR policy and is starting to define what want students to learn. Using the ABOR policy and reviewers comments, may help with better clarification around Diversity/inclusion and Cultural Understanding and Social and Political Worlds. Committee members suggested models from their own disciplines and suggested asking individual departments to help identify the courses from 100-400 that scaffold the concepts ABOR wants taught.</p>
<p>Student Representation on CACC</p>	<p>As the results of the Liberal Studies assessment rubrics were shared, it was obvious that the student perspective/input was missing when data was rolled out. As such, student representation was sought and it grew into seeking representation for the various curriculum committees. Lynsey McClintock is ASNAU VP for Academic Affairs and has been asked to join CACC. Student representatives have joined the other Faculty Senate curriculum committees and are bringing their perspectives on curriculum, teaching and testing. By being proactive, they hope to minimize the poorly planned class. The current ASNAU leadership hopes to develop an ongoing plan for student representation on all the curriculum committees with involvement of students outside of ASNAU. Sharing this student involvement with ABOR during its November Call to the Audience might be helpful or it could be included in the ASNAU's president's report. It is hoped that students could participate on the college curriculum committees too.</p>
<p>Syllabus Review approach and College Committee and Liberal Studies feedback</p>	<p>Members discussed student participation at the college curriculum committee level. Concerns included applicable feedback and whether students have the ability to do this, voting/nonvoting, and need for bylaw changes. While the college curriculum committees do not have bylaws (one may), the faculty senate committees do. At least one of the F/S committees was recently requested to change a section of their bylaws relative to the section on minor bylaw changes. Administration will check in with the other committees to see if they have the same request. Further discussion on undergraduate student participation with the college committees is needed before this is brought to the Associate Academic Dean's council.</p> <p>The discussion shifted to how syllabi are lengthening to meet the requirements of the various review committees and connecting of the purpose statement to the learning objectives. In the syllabus of record there are concerns that faculty are not given guidance on what can/cannot change when they individualize the course. Some colleges, due to accreditation requirements, may not deviate from a syllabus of record while others can change parts/new readings or assignments, etc. Some faculty are asked to create courses without a background in course design. This may be a larger topic and perhaps could be facilitated with support from Faculty Development and focused training(s). A new toolbox is being developed and may be helpful with some of these training needs. Another solution might be through the Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS). This might ensure that new faculty receive the information/guidance during their onboarding. Receiving specific information/assignments/and how the materials ties too learning outcomes on a weekly basis is more helpful that spelling it out in one long document on the first day of class. This</p>

	conversation will continue and be brought back to CACC for input after departments and colleges have had a say. The goal is to create efficiencies when proposing new courses.
Alternative Programs	Alternative programs, sometimes referred to as micro badging, are being proposed. These are generally noncredit courses with the focus on achieving a certificate of completion acknowledging specific skill development. NAU is seeking to grow professional programs through this process. These will not involve accrediting or qualify for financial aid. Several examples were mentioned (MIT, U of PA, Stanford, Kellogg as well as U of Arizona). The old Yuma entrepreneur program will be launched in January 2020 under this model. The current plan is these micro badging programs will not reside in PeopleSoft and the programs may have their own terminology separate from students/program/tuition etc...
Number of units for a major with an emphasis	The current policy relative to majors with/without emphasis requires 36 units for those without an emphasis and 42 units for those with an emphasis. Is this necessary? History shows that the additional credit requirement may be impeding student progression to a timely graduation. The thinking is an emphasis adds depth to the degree. At one time students were required to take a minor, could this credit difference be connected to that old practice. This topic/conversation will be discussed at a future meeting.
Good of the order	
Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned.