**University Assessment Committee Agenda**

**March 1, 1:30 – 3pm**

**Science Lab Facility, Rm. 111**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present – voting members** | **Present – ex officio members** | **Absent** |
| Rob Till (Chair) | K. Laurie Dickson | Bruce Fox, voting |
| Yuly Asencion-Delaney | Sue Pieper | Julia Ragonese-Barwell, voting |
| Dierdra Bycura | Melinda Treml | Cynthia Conn, ex officio |
| Sharon Cardenas |  | Sami Cross, student rep |
| Laura Crouch |  | Patrick Deegan, ex officio |
| Ding Du |  | Karen Pugliesi, ex officio |
| Peter Mangan |  | Margot Saltonstall, ex officio |
| Marianne Nielsen |  | Gerald Wood, ex officio |
| Krista Rodin |  |  |
| Kathee Rose |  |  |
| Vicki Ross |  |  |
| Allen Saunders |  |  |
| Niranjan Venkatraman |  |  |

1. Call to order

Meeting called to order 1:32 P.M.

1. UAC Business
	1. Approval of the UAC minutes from Feb. 1, 2013 (see attachment)

Unanimously approved

Recommendation to spell out all acronyms in the future

* 1. UAC input for the UAC Report to the Senate (handout provided at meeting)

Additional actions to include in report:

* Annual Assessment Report Inventory
* Development of new Website
	+ Website Resources and Support for Reporting
* Request to have the Senate charge the UGC and UCC with collecting degree program student learning outcomes and working toward displaying the outcomes centrally
* NCATE/ SPA Template and rubric work
1. Discussion about faculty outreach and engagement (handout provided at meeting)
	1. Alternative language for “assessment;”
		1. The purpose of this conversation was to discuss (1) how the UAC perceives itself; (2) how faculty appear to perceive the UAC and what it does; and (3) whether we need to make any changes to bring into alignment our perception of ourselves with the By-Laws and to align faculty perceptions of what we do more consistently with how the committee thinks of itself.
	2. Discussion/ comments were as follows:
		1. As a Faculty Senate committee, the UAC provides advisement, suggestions for improvement, but has no authority about whether any recommendations or changes are made; Seen as a resource and support to faculty, not an authoritative body for making change, degree programs have to select and implement for themselves.
		2. At this time, we won’t get away from the term assessment, though we can provide more context regarding the goals and purpose of the process.
		3. A word that works well from the list provided is “analysis.” Analyzing information; analysis of student learning, asking what are we doing for our students, what are our students getting out of this?
		4. Need to have campus community focus on learning. If teaching is to be evaluated, it should be connected to student learning. Help faculty focus on thinking about student learning outcomes, how we can make that something you can measure; then how do we know they have learned, then a plan for how to improve the areas where we feel they are not learning as well.
		5. The focus of the committee is for departments to DO something and let us know what they are doing relative to ensuring student learning and trying to enhance what they are doing. Take some sort of action, start somewhere. Come up with something you want to look at and see where that leads you in the assessment cycle. Need some action to build upon. Don’t mention accreditation.
		6. Assessment was seen as an initiative of the moment; it’s lost its focus as an initiative of the institution, and how can we give it visibility? Perhaps revise workload policies, and find a way to give faculty credit for doing something, because otherwise, if it is something that doesn’t have space carved out for it, it won’t be done.
		7. Franke College of Business is using the term “student assurance” to capture the process of ensuring students are learning.
		8. The Committee will continue this discussion by reading through the UAC Charge and Objectives and determine whether they fit. A follow-up conversation will occur next meeting.
	3. Selection of activities and tentative timelines for implementation
		1. A list of Faculty Outreach and Engagement activities was provided to the committee to consider prior to the next meeting and identify areas within which they desire to engage.
2. Providing good feedback on Annual Assessment Reports
	1. Review a report in the new template and apply the new rubric (see two attachments – AAR on Bus Admin BA, UAC Feedback Rubric)
		1. This conversation is a follow-up to UAC feedback from the previous meeting that they wanted to review a report with the new rubric
		2. Sue will offer additional training sessions, providing more specific training, at times that will work for multiple or single individuals from the UAC (due to so many conflicts and busy schedules)
		3. NCATE/ SPA folks were interested in doing a training session about the NCATE/ SPA reporting template
		4. The committee talked about their overall impressions of the report and how to provide feedback
	2. Values in providing feedback-Discussion
	3. Methods for reviewing reports-Discussion
		1. Discussion areas and activities that would be useful
		2. Send “advanced” curriculum maps to the UAC and post on the website
		3. A key value is to ensure people have a positive experience with assessment and reporting so that they want to do it again. A focus on what people are doing poorly will push people away from the process. Instead, focus on what people are doing well.
		4. Develop a Feedback Rubric without any labels, so that people are not put off by the labels; Labels will discourage faculty from doing anything
		5. Faculty aren’t students-they don’t need feedback like students do on how to do assessment, even if they are just learning how to do assessment
		6. Negative assessment experiences drive people away from doing it
		7. College-level sharing—create an ideal report out of pieces from many different reports, so that a College can see what an ideal looks like, and a host of people can be celebrated about what they are doing well
		8. A lot of people have lost track of time in terms of their annual reporting. The UAC could send out e-mails to remind people of their reporting. Rob will send out an e-mail after Spring Break from the UAC to submit their reports, and provide some information about the Assessment Fair, etc.
		9. Provide a resource to Department Chairs to assist them in identifying tasks they can do to ensure assessment occurs.
3. Future agenda items

 a. Nomination/election of UAC chair for 2013-14

 b. Revision of UAC by-laws

1. Adjournment

ADJOURNED 3:00 P.M.

1. Remaining spring meeting dates: March 29 and May 3 (Science Lab Facility, Rm. 111, 1:30-3:00).

Respectfully submitted by Melinda Treml