**University Assessment Committee MINUTES**

**October 4, 1:30 – 3pm**

**W.A. Franke College of Business, Rm. 207**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present – voting members** | **Present – ex officio members** | **Absent** |
| Rob Till (Chair) | K. Laurie Dickson | Julia Ragonese-Barwell, voting |
| Joe Anderson | Sue Pieper | Judith Montoya, voting |
| Ding Du | Melinda Treml | Patrick Deegan, ex officio |
| Allen Saunders |  | Karen Pugliesi, ex officio |
| Laura Crouch |  | Cynthia Conn, ex officio |
| Bruce Fox |  | Margot Saltonstall, ex officio |
| Peter Mangan |  |  |
| Kathee Rose |  |  |
| Niranjan Venkatraman |  |  |
| Jay Farness |  |  |
| Dierdra Bycura |  |  |
| Anne Hart (by phone) |  |  |
| Yuly Asencion-Delaney (non-voting) |  |  |

1. Call to order

Called to order 1:30

1. Approval of the UAC minutes from Sept. 6, 2013

Minutes were corrected to delete the name of Kathy Hildrebrand who is no longer at NAU. Approved by consensus.

1. Discussion of Proposal for Change

 In initiating discussion, Rob suggested that we consider the WHY, the WHAT, and the HOW of the proposal. This framework was made in part in anticipation of how we might best open discussion of the proposal at any of the upcoming presentations (e.g., presentation to the Faculty Senate next week).

 Why? We are here seeking feedback regarding strengths, weaknesses and possible improvements to the proposal. What? The proposal is a long-term vision for how we might strengthen learning opportunity for students and enhance the role of faculty as stewards of the curriculum. How? The proposal offers possible structures and processes that would clarify the links between curriculum and assessment through some reorganization of the way faculty committees might accomplish this.

 Comments during discussion:

 Give emphasis to student learning, make it easier to understand at all levels

 To facilitate student learning

 To couple traditional disconnections in the separate processes

 Provide a quality control loop for each program

 Frequently, the assessment process is forgotten in the curriculum processes

 For some units this may already be unified

 SLO’s are foundation for design of curriculum

 This proposed new structure allows better communication with faculty.

 Caution for formation of a giant super-committee

 This is the beginning of a conversation with the senate to continue the process

 Could lead to continuous improvement of courses (classes) and SOE process

 Do all units have master syllabi which the course sections have to conform to?

 Perhaps liberal arts courses have less clear SLO’s?

 Much interaction between curriculum and assessment will happen at unit level

 There are a lot of resources available to help with this at the unit level.

 Peter: In presenting proposal, ask how we can do this rather than telling them what we’re going to do.

 Ask faculty what resources they need to make this happen

 Specific dates for implementation of the proposal may not work well with units’ other obligations for assessment…

 Timeline may be more for committee structure change rather than for the activities of reporting units

1. Orientation to annual assessment reports and the feedback rubric

 Sue led the discussion based on the recent assessment report from one program

 Reviewed positives, examples of feedback, and areas for improvement

1. Observations from the Summer Working Group (which emerged from responses to vision and purpose questions last spring)

 Reiterated goal of moving toward evidence of program quality

 Different working groups studied different components of quality programs

 Examined models from other universities

 Noted that a curriculum map as an example or benchmark would be really helpful

 Training in the use of curriculum maps might be a good experience for UAC members.

1. Future agenda items
2. Adjournment – Adjourned at 3:00 PM

 – Respectfully Submitted by Joe Anderson