**University Assessment Committee Minutes**

**September 14, 2012, 1:30 – 3pm**

**Science Lab Facility, Rm. 111**

**Meet Me Phone in room: 928 523-7886**

Members present: Rob Till (Chair), Joe Anderson (Vice Chair), Allen Saunders, Yuly Asencion-Delaney, Krista Rodin, Sharon Cardenas, Dierdra Bycura, Marianne Nielsen, Ding Du, Peter Mangan, Gerald Wood, Kathee Rose [Julia Ragonese-Barwell by phone]

*Ex Officio:* K. Laurie Dickson, Sue Pieper, Cynthia Conn, Melinda Treml

1. Call to order

*Meeting was called to order at 1:30 PM*

1. UAC Business
	1. Approval of the UAC retreat minutes from August 24, 2012 (see attached)

*Approved, seconded and unanimously passed.*

* 1. Announcement of the UAC Vice Chair

*Joe Anderson*

* 1. Website update with website resources (see attached)

*Melinda reported on the status of the development of the OCLDAA website which will include the UAC page.*

*Website resources are being developed for each aspect of the Annual Assessment Report template. These resources will help the report writers “walk through what they need to do and how they need to do it.”*

*Melinda sought UAC volunteers to provide feedback, from a faculty member’s perspective, on these resources. Yuly & Krista volunteered (they will focus on this task for the coming months rather than reviewing AAR submissions).*

*Website should go live next Friday (Sept. 21.)*

* 1. Review of UAC membership and subcommittees (review teams)

*Laurie will configure the review teams with the guidelines outlined by the UAC - Two-person teams, pairing less experienced members with more experienced members. Two teams will specialize on NCATE submissions. Laurie will send out the team configurations.*

*The issue of having people review AAR from their own college was discussed with advantages and disadvantages noted. The UAC decided that AAR would be assigned at the meetings and these issues could be addressed on a case by case basis*

* 1. Discussion: Assessment connections from UAC to UGC

*The question, “Do we need someone from UGC (Graduate College) as a voting member on the UAC?” was raised. Several issues were noted, including the potential to increase AAR for graduate programs, current UAC members have significant experience with graduate programs, the Graduate curriculum committee is requesting that all graduate programs clearly articulate their student learning outcomes as the foundations for assessment planning. The UAC decided to not to increase the membership by requesting a Graduate College representative sit on the UAC. Laurie noted that the Faculty Senate Council of Learning is pulling together leaders of different bodies to better connect curriculum and assessment.*

* 1. Discussion: Should copies of the UAC meeting materials be provided at the meetings?

*People will bring their own copies – Passed unanimously.*

* 1. NAU outcomes: What should graduates be able to do? (Laurie’s brief comments) - *Group of people were tasked to pull together existing outcomes (degree, GLI, liberal studies, diversity).*

*There is a draft and now seeking feedback on pulling together what’s already out there.*

*Gerald – And if we have them, what should they drive? Program development…? Questions have been brought up about these topics. Peter – There are other schools farther along on this process than we are. These outcomes should be part of the assessment and program development process. University level outcomes should be assessed as we assess other level programs. Gerald – Need to assess the abilities, not just the knowledge. Dierdre – “Another box on the AAR – what university outcomes does this address?” Peter – Learning outcomes that every single program will have (University level)… then discipline-specific outcomes. Examples from Yuma.*

*Overarching learning outcomes – appropriate for graduate programs, too, or just UG? An important part will be: Who do they apply to? – Laurie raised this topic as the main idea of university level outcomes came up in the UAC and in the Liberal Studies Committee in spring 2012. When conversations come up, you should be informed about this topic so we can encourage feedback, etc.*

1. Revised NAU Assessment Policy (see attached)
	1. Thoughts about having Dickson and UAC Chair attend first Faculty Senate meeting in Fall 2012 (after draft had been forwarded to Senate), have senators get faculty feedback on policy, invite faculty - via Faculty Senate - to attend UAC meeting in October, other suggestions?
	2. Thoughts about having Dickson and UAC Chair attend first ACC meeting in Fall 2012, (after draft had been forwarded to ACC), have Chairs get faculty feedback on policy, invite faculty to attend UAC meeting in October, other suggestions?

*Policy Documents: On Faculty Senate agenda for 17th, UCC agenda for the 19th. Discussions at the meetings, will invite faculty come to our next meeting and talk to us about the revisions.*

*UAC suggested that Laurie and Rob attempt to collect suggestions by a certain date. The issue of having faculty get “credit” for their work on assessment was raised and Laurie let the committee know that she will raise this issue in all of the meetings that discuss this policy, including conversations with Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, etc.*

1. Annual Assessment Report (AAR) template and UAC feedback rubric (see attached)

*Melinda – reported on some changes to the draft document. Peter – In the past we have been less prescriptive, and operated with a level of trust in departments' judgment. We have tried to avoid asking for units to submit their assessment tools, so that the UAC could focus on the process.*

*Gerald – May be wise to keep the developmental process separate from the assessment process. Leave it more open-ended, submission of assessment tools is optional if unit wants feedback on the tools, and encourage information regarding alignment between the measures and the outcome goals.*

*Changes to number 6 (Assessment measures) if #5 can be referenced with a resource guide. Passed unanimously. Will be put on the website as it goes live.*

* 1. Café meetings: Proactive AND for feedback

*Pre-consultation is getting more and more popular among the departments.*

* 1. AAR tracking process: Sue will monitor UAC feedback turn-around time, read all reports to increase feedback consistency, and arrange training for new UAC members
1. Repository of annual reports will be publicly available on the UAC website with assessment seal recognition noted. UAC feedback to units will password-protected.

Fall meeting dates: Oct. 5th (Franke COB room 207), Nov. 2nd (Science Lab Facility, Rm. 111), and Dec. 7th (Science Lab Facility, Rm. 111) (all meetings are Friday 1:30-3:00).

Adjournment

 *Adjourned at 3:00 PM*

**Items 5 and 6 to be discussed further at next meeting.**

1. Strategy for “rolling out” of revised Assessment Policy and AAR process
2. UAC/OCLDAA introduce revised AAR templates and assessment policy at each college chair meeting and seek input if they want UAC/OCLDAA to introduce revised AAR templates and assessment policy at department meetings
3. OCLDAA offer curriculum map workshops and assessment strategy consultation
4. Tasks for AY 12-13:
5. Develop new seal criteria based on new feedback rubric
6. Revise UAC by-laws
7. Small programs/one person programs: What reporting requirements should they have?”