University Assessment Committee Agenda

November 1, 1:30 – 3pm

W.A. Franke College of Business, Rm. 205 (not 207)

The Meet-Me phone line # is the same for all meetings this semester: 928.523.7886

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

1. Call to order

Called to order 1:30.

2. Approval of the UAC minutes from Oct. 4, 2013

Approved by consensus.

3. Update on the Proposal for Change process and Outcomes feedback process (Rob)

* We solicited and integrated feedback from the following groups: Advisory Council on Curriculum &Assessment (ACCA); Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Provost’s Academic Leadership Council (PALC); Academic Associate Deans Academy (ACADA); University Assessment Committee (UAC); Faculty Senate; Liberal Studies Committee (LSC); University Curriculum Committee (UCC); Academic Chair’s Council (ACC); University Graduate Committee (UGC).
* Strengths of the proposal:
  + Formal adoption of expectations for curriculum design and assessment;
  + Combination of curriculum and assessment processes, since useful data about students’ ability to achieve learning outcomes should drive curriculum design;
  + Incorporation of a review of curriculum design and assessment of student learning into the Academic Program Review process; and
  + Assurance that we have institutional practices that satisfy the requirement of NAU’s regional accreditor (the Higher Learning Commission) that all accredited institutions engage in practices of assessment of student learning for continual improvement.
* Areas of concern included the following:
  + Implementation issues (i.e., “too much, too fast”);
  + Workload for chairs and faculty;
  + Workload and training of committee members to quickly adapt and learn a new process;
  + Requirement of the Continuous Course Improvement Documents (seen as “busywork”);
  + Perceived duplication of reporting requirements for programs that have discipline-specific accreditation; and
  + Perceived limitations on curricular design (i.e., standardization of curricula).
* Rob will take the revised proposal to the Senate on Monday, November 4, 2013
  + In response to campus feedback, the proposal was revised. With the revised proposal, we address the concerns of “too much, too fast” and workload for faculty, chairs, and committee members by clarifying the timeline for implementation, removing the Continuous Course Improvement Document from the proposal, and reducing the workload of University Curriculum and Assessment Committee members by removing the responsibility of reviewing and providing feedback as part of the review of degree programs within the Academic Program Review process.

4. Feedback on the Annual Assessment Reports Archives (Sue)

* In response to feedback, files prior to 2010 will be re-labeled as either plans or reports and files after 2010 will be named by Phase.
* Questions to consider…
  + Non-NAU access to the Archives?
  + UAC member access to feedback? There will be a “shadow sharepoint” available to UAC members to see the feedback.

5. Discussion of current annual assessment reports and the feedback (Sue)

The first three reports were discussed at the meeting.

* Educational Psychology (PhD Educational Psychology-Counseling Psychology; PhD Educational Psychology-School Psychology; MA Counseling; MEd School Counseling; EdS School Psychology; MEd Counseling-Student Affairs; MEd Human Relations) – Bruce Fox
  + Report had mission statements, student learning outcomes and the curriculum map. Noted that the learning outcomes were very similar across the programs.
* Department of History (BSEd History/Social Studies) – Judy Montoya and Dierdra Bycura
  + Primarily a Phase I report. Good student learning outcomes. Measures linked to standards from accrediting body. Recommended that program specify whether courses introduced, reinforced or mastered outcomes, articulate relationship between course grades and particular student learning outcomes, discuss manageability and feasibility of their design, and include rubric standards.
* Department of Theatre (BABS Theatre) – Allen Saunders
  + Good mission statement; faculty participation, etc. Recommended that program connect student learning outcomes more clearly to the unit mission statement, differentiate student learning outcomes for each degree emphasis, use a rubric that holistically captures student learning outcomes, and highlight how their curriculum map could be used as a tool for assessment.

Other reports reviewed in the fall:

* Institute for Human Development (Graduate Certificate in Positive Behavior Support) – Niranjan Venkatraman
* College of Education (MEd in Special Education-Early Childhood) – Kathee Rose
* Institute for Human Development (Graduate Certificate in Assistive Technology) – Yuly Asencion Delaney
* Department of English (BA English) – Margot Saltonstall
* Personalized Learning (Bachelor Degree Liberal Arts; Bachelor of Administration Computer Information Technology; Bachelor of Small Business Administration) - Yuly Asencion Delaney
* College of Education (Elementary Education BSEd) – Jay Farness and Joe Anderson
* Department of Business and Administration – Yuma  (Master of Administration) – Yuly Asencion Delaney

6. Identification of future agenda items

* Yuly: Discussion of new teacher evaluation process?

7. Adjournment

Adjourned 3:00 PM