

**Agenda: CAC meeting 8 February 2012 , 2-3 pm Kayak**  
**1-800-893-8850 Participants' PIN: 1109306 Convener/Chair's PIN (Rainer): 1109371**

**A. OLD Business**

1. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave
3. 'stacked' courses -- comments by Tony?

**4. Proposed motion:**

**The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:**

EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

\*\*\*\*\*

CAPS = Additions    [[ ]] = Deletions

**UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY**

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information  
Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum  
Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic assessment  
Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning

An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **1. PROPOSED MOTION:**

To amend catalog language to clarify the difference between dean's List and chancellor's List. Currently, the catalog states that dean's list is for students with a GPA of >3.5 and chancellor's list for >3.9. Presumably, then, this logic means that a student with >3.9 is on both Dean's List AND Chancellor's List. The intention was that dean's list would be 3.5 to 3.89, and chancellor's list > or = 3.9.

Current catalog language (Under "ACADEMIC HONORS" on page 49)

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 and the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 or higher.

#### **CHANGE TO:**

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 or higher, and the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89.

#### **EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012**

**RATIONALE:** The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when our intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

2. X wants to teach microbio BIOL 240 next semester because there is a high local demand. However, most of those students already take A&P 112, and experience says that they can't handle 2 such big classes in one semester. So X hopes to can teach microbio 240 spread out over 2 semesters instead, fall 2012 and spring 2013. X has taught the class before in a traditional 1-semester setting so X is already approved as an instructor, but what process would be needed for a 2-semester format?

In effect, students would register for the 4 credits in Fall 2012, but the lecture and lab would be spread over the September to May time frame, with a grade not being posted (or credit earned) until May.