**University Assessment Committee Retreat Minutes**

**August 24, 2012, 12:00 to 3:00**

**Cuvee 928**

Members present: Rob Till (Chair), Allen Saunders, Yuly Asencion-Delaney, Krista Rodin, Sharon Cardenas, Bruce Fox, Niranjan Venkatraman, Dierdra Bycura, Julia Ragonese-Barwell, Vicki Ross, Marianne Nielsen, Ding Du, Gerald Wood, Kathee Rose, Margot Saltonstall

*Ex officio:* Laurie Dickson, Cynthia Conn, Kathy Hildebrand, Sue Pieper, Melinda Treml

1. Call to order 12:20, welcome and introductions, review of goals for the retreat
2. Lunch: Astrid Klocke, Lead faculty on the Council of Learning-Faculty Senate, spoke of the Council of Learning’s initiatives concerning curriculum and assessment and emphasized…

 a. belief that curriculum committees and assessment committees are addressing related aspects of student learning, and that these interconnections should be explored

 b. strong need for assessment, particularly in making the case for a program

 c. need to address issues surrounding campus-wide perceptions of assessment as a tool leading to improved student learning vs. a tool exposing programs’ weaknesses

 d. need for faculty to take the initiative and own the assessment process

1. Group Photo
2. Minutes of April 2012 meeting were approved
3. Nominations and Elections
	1. Nominations for UAC Chair included: Niranjan Venkatraman (declined), Krista Rodin (declined), Sue Pieper (not eligible to serve as an Ex officio member), Joe Anderson and Rob Till
	2. Rob Till was elected by vote as UAC Chair for AY 2012-13
4. Recommendations for Seals:
	1. Criteria for Seals in Assessment:
		1. Excellence: 80% or more of “yes’s” from Rubric for all three phases
		2. Achievement: 80% of more of “yes’s” from Rubric for phases 1 and 2
	2. Criteria for Seals in SLCD:
		1. Excellence: Completion of intensive work on Curriculum Map, Analysis, and Curricular Re-Design, including extensive elements of their curriculum in the re-design
		2. Achievement: Completion of intensive work on the Curriculum Map, including exploring the Course Learning Outcome and lesson/ assignment/ activity level
	3. Discussion: what is required of degree and non-degree programs in assessment?
		1. How do we reward those who are doing good assessment in their program, even if it is not a degree program?
		2. What assessment requirements does the UAC have for degree programs and non-degree programs?
		3. Need further conversations and exploration of these questions
	4. Following discussion and consensus on the awardees, the UAC acknowledged, as per the seal procedures, that Dickson should seek endorsement of recipient list from the Provost and Vice Provost. OCLDAA will present the Seals to the respective units during fall semester.

Recipient List

Seal of Excellence in Assessment

* FCB Common Core Courses

Seal of Excellence in Student Learning and Curriculum Design

* Dental Hygiene BSDH
* Geographic Sciences & Community Planning BS
* History BSEd
* Mechanical Engineering BSE
* Electronic Media & Film BS
* Geology BS

Seal of Achievement in Assessment

* Clinical Speech Pathology
* Finance
* Graduate Certificate in Assistive Technology
* Management
* Mathematics and Statistics
* Spanish

Seals of Achievement in Student Learning and Curriculum Design

* Special Education BSEd – New Degree Program development using curriculum mapping
* Construction Management for Curriculum Mapping
* Design 4 Practice for Curriculum Mapping
1. Efforts currently underway to bolster the quantity of assessment efforts on campus
	1. Review of the Annual Assessment Report (AAR) Inventory and acknowledgement that the frequency and regularity of assessment reporting across NAU’s programs is lower than expected
	2. Discussion points and ideas for Dickson when she meets with Deans and Associate Deans regarding the AAR Inventory
		1. There is little or no incentive and no sanctions concerning faculty engagement in assessment
		2. Inclusion of assessment as a significant factor in SOEs, Deans need to reinforce faculty members work on assessment and ensure they receive “credit” for the work they do
		3. Discussed the possibility that the UAC focus more on non-accredited programs, since there is a lower engagement in a “culture of assessment” in these programs (on average)
		4. Identify mechanisms for checking in with units concerning their assessment responsibilities to help make this a higher priority for Chairs
		5. Frequently faculty don’t see how their data collection efforts filter back into changes in the department, which leads to feelings of expending time and energy without seeing the results.
		6. Engage Chairs to assist in convincing faculty to do assessment
		7. Identify different models for “cycling” through the phases, such as collecting data in the Spring, then analyzing and identifying changes in the Fall; provide models for different cycles on the website
		8. Request that Chairs include Assessment as an agenda item, a check-in, every other meeting, to keep it on faculty members’ radars in terms of their responsibilities in data collection, etc.
		9. Find ways to better incorporate assessment into the syllabus (sent to the UCC during new-course approval process) to ensure that good assessment measures are not lost when new individuals teach courses
		10. Improve structure and communication around assessment
2. Efforts to improve assessment quality on campus:
	1. Received feedback from UAC on changes for Rubric/ Template
	2. OCLDAA will implement changes and e-mail these to UAC members the week of August 27 to receive feedback prior to posting on the website (to get the current template and rubric up and the old ones down; future small changes can be incorporated)
3. Revised UAC Assessment Policy:
	1. Review of Assessment Policy; feedback from the UAC was incorporated into the policy
	2. Next Steps: Dickson and UAC Chair will bring the revised assessment policy to Faculty Senate and ACC for feedback and then seek approval by the Faculty Senate and the Provost.
4. Meeting was adjourned at 3:00.