**Summary of Feedback on the Revised Curriculum and Assessment Proposal**

Following the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on Nov 18, 2013, the proposal leaders (Bruce, Rob, Craig, and Niranjan) facilitated discussions regarding the revised “Curriculum Expectations Proposal” with Faculty Senate Committees (UGC, UCC, UAC, Lib Studies, ACCA) and the College Curriculum Committees, since these bodies will be involved in the implementation of the policy.

**Faculty Senate Committees**

|  |
| --- |
| **University Assessment Committee (UAC)*** Strong support for the revised proposal.
* Identified that the idea for pulling curriculum and assessment together had emerged from the UAC, based on the need to use assessment results for continual improvement of student learning.
* It was noted that training and support for the committees would be needed.

**University Curriculum Committee (UCC)*** Strong support for the revised proposal.
* Re-iterated the need to have criteria for reviewing curriculum, and ensuring that the same standards are being used across campus.
* It was noted that training and support for the committees would be needed.

**Liberal Studies Committee (LSC)*** Endorsed the revised proposal and felt that it addressed the concerns the LSC raised about the initial proposal.

**University Graduate “Executive” Committee (UGC pre-review)*** No further feedback concerning the expectations or the re-design of campus committee processes.
* Recommended latitude in assessment approaches, as long as these meet the criterion of providing feedback to the degree program about student learning, and that findings are used for the continual improvement of the program.

**University Graduate Committee**  * The committee wanted to better understand the role of the UGC, and how these changes would affect their daily operation.  We discussed how the forms would change to include the new criterion, but the daily operations of the committee would likely not change.
* Recommended that Figure 1 be revised to show the UCAC as a resource, rather than as a committee, and ensuring that the UCAC appears in the background, to show how it would coordinate and support the other committees.
* Recommended that we clarify the differences between the UCAC and OCLDAA (Office of Curriculum, Learning Design, and Academic Assessment), and how their work relates to this process.

**Advisory Council for Curriculum and Assessment*** Strong support for the proposal and the process of obtaining comments and incorporating them into the proposal for its improvement.
* Recommended identifying how the Extended Campuses would be addressed by this proposal and where their curricular process fits, particularly since Extended Campuses uses its own curriculum committee (ECCC) to pass undergraduate curricula, but uses the University Graduate Committee and the Liberal Studies Committee to pass curricula for graduate programs or Liberal Studies, respectively.
* Identified that the Charge of the ACCA has responsibilities that align with the proposed responsibilities of the University Curriculum and Assessment Committee. As ACCA develops the implementation plan, it should pay attention to potential overlap of these two groups and actively work towards a solution of defining their relationship through the implementation phase of the proposal (including such possibilities as combining the groups, eliminating the ACCA, etc.).
 |

**College Curriculum Committees**

|  |
| --- |
| **W. A. Franke College of Business** * They already have college-level curriculum and assessment committees, thus they recommended that we change Figure 1 to read “College Curriculum and Assessment *Processes*” rather than “College Curriculum and Assessment *Committees*”
* They noted that they thought the new process and expectations would help colleges align their assessment and curriculum endeavors (similarly to how Franke does it), and would improve the coordination of University and College curriculum and assessment activities.

**University College** * Identified the proposal as a good step forward in asking degree programs across campus to articulate outcomes and assessment strategies.
* Noted that programs would need support to achieve these expectations.

**Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences** * Expressed that the concept was a good one and moved directly to a discussion of how the committee would accomplish the work required. Various ideas emerged as possibilities, such as splitting up the work across the academic year (focusing on curriculum in the fall, and assessment reports in the spring), developing sub-committees that reported to the larger committee, etc.
* Identified the need for training and support in providing feedback on assessment reports.
* Noted the need for program-level support to implement expectations. Without the time and support to accomplish these changes in a thoughtful manner, it will be done on paper, but not in practice.
* Identified that this proposal is resolving key issues important to the University, including aligning curriculum and assessment (to ensure the curriculum is designed to promote student learning), and aligning the expectations used to review curriculum at the college and university-levels.

**Education*** Discussed and brainstormed possible ways to accomplish the new work of the committee. Training and support for college curriculum committees, as well as the University-level committees, was identified as highly important in maintaining consistency across committees.
* Faculty expressed the importance of ensuring the curriculum process focus only on design elements, and that maps are used to describe how a program has decided to implement the teaching and learning in their program and convey this to others. Ensuring the cultivation of innovation in teaching and learning will need to remain a priority throughout the implementation process. Questions were raised about adding another bureaucratic layer to the curriculum and assessment process through the creation of the UCAC. Suggested changing Figure 1 to represent that the UCAC would coordinate and provide resources to the rest of the committees.
* Requested that a new draft of the proposal, including changes that were incorporated based on the feedback, be sent out to college curriculum committees in advance of the scheduled Senate vote to allow senators time to hear from their college curriculum committees prior to the Senate vote.

**Arts and Letters*** Identified the importance of articulating curriculum design elements, yet the corresponding fact that this documentation increases workload of faculty.
* Suggested changing Figure 1 to represent that the UCAC would coordinate and provide resources to the rest of the committees, and to modify the hierarchical nature of Figure 1 to highlight the importance of faculty members within the process.
* Acknowledged the benefits of integrating curriculum and assessment processes, in that it reduces the feeling that assessment is a “fifth wheel” to curriculum, rather than being an integral part of the curriculum design process.
* Noted that it would be helpful for departments to know how long it typically takes to accomplish each of the degree expectations.

Presentations of the revised proposal are scheduled for the following committees in January and February:* College Curriculum Committees:
	+ Health and Human Services Curriculum Committee (Jan. 27, 2014)
	+ Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Committee (Feb. 4, 2014)
 |