**University Assessment Committee Minutes**

**February 7, 1:30 – 3pm**

**W.A. Franke College of Business, Rm. 205**

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

1. **Approval of the UAC minutes from Dec. 6, 2013**

Minutes were approved by consensus.

1. **Update on revised Proposal for Change and response from Faculty Senate** (Rob)

Rob explained that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had charged the proposal leaders with the task of presenting/explaining the proposal to leadership groups, to Senate-charged committees, to the various college curriculum committees, and to the Extended Campus curriculum committee. This process is nearly complete and Rob will summarize feedback from these groups at the Faculty Senate meeting on Feb. 10. Following is the tentative calendar for upcoming events:

* February 19th: Attend and receive comments from the Extended Campuses Curriculum Committee
* Feb. 20 to Mar 14: Incorporate small changes to proposal based on comments
* Mar 24: Faculty Senate Executive Committee for approval to vote
* Apr 7: Faculty Senate vote on Proposal

1. **Update and Discussion: Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes (DPSLOs)**

* One point of discussion might be on the acceptability of re-submission/revision of DPSLOs as an Annual Assessment Report

There was discussion of the advantages of doing this. No disadvantages were noted.

The Committee decided to accept the DPSLOs as the Annual Assessment Report, and incorporate into the letter a statement about how the next step in the process is the creation of a Curriculum Map. In addition, the Committee was interested in focusing on Curriculum Mapping next year in the same manner that the UAC/ UCC focused on the collection of Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes this year. Further discussion and planning will need to occur on this topic to take action on this idea. In addition, identifying more ways to involve students would be very useful.

1. **Annual Assessment Reports**

* Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA with emphases in management, global business, entrepreneurship and small business, logistics and supply chain management, and marketing)—Ding Du and Sue Pieper
  + Ding noted how important it was to break down the process to allow people time to do meaningful thinking. It appeared from this (and other) reports that a “check-the-box” and \_”get-it-done” mentality can override a good report, as faculty attempt to complete the requirement, sometimes without understanding and engaging in the deeper meaning of engaging in these processes (e.g., for continual improvement).
* Technology Management (BAS with a specialization in Technology Management; BAIS with Technology Management emphasis; BSIS with Technology Management emphasis)—Julia Barwell and Sue Pieper
  + Cohesion across the report was noted as an issue, similar to Ding’s comments.
* MS Clinical Speech-Language Pathology—Laura Crouch and Sue Pieper
* BAS Logistics and Supply Chain Management—Peter Mangan and Sue Pieper

Various strengths of these AARs were noted and discussed. It was suggested that we might want to break phase I of the report cycle into sub-stages of reporting, perhaps dealing separately with SLOs, then curriculum mapping, and then on to big-picture aspects of the plan.

* + This report had the cohesion which the committee is seeking, yet at the same time, the report was 20 pages long.
  + Committee members will review the report with the goal of discussing how to assist faculty with increasing the cohesion of their reports with targeted questions.
  + As well, the committee will examine what information is necessary for a report, and what is necessary for an Academic Program Review, to ensure the workload for Annual Assessment Reporting remains manageable.

1. **Identification of future agenda items**

It was decided that UAC members will look at the AAR for the BBA in Logistics and consider whether to add questions to the current template so as to encourage reflective reports like this one.

It was suggested that there could be curriculum-mapping workshops next year and that there might be a link from the UAC web site to such information. If possible, the committee would like to engage in a workshop on curriculum mapping, similar to the workshop it did on Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes at the previous meeting. See below—the new #6.

The Committee would be interested in reviewing the new website for the UAC.

6. **Other Business:** An invitation to the Assessment Fair was handed out, with an invitation to

members to be involved in the Fair and engage their colleagues in the Fair. Round-table

discussions will occur prior to the Fair. Changing the Mission/ Purpose round-table to a round-

table on Classroom Assessment Techniques (a very popular topic at last year’s Fair) would

perhaps improve the round-table offerings.

7. **Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.**