



10-2-2014

October 2, 2014

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "October 2, 2014" (2014). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 490.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/490>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the UND Publications at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting
October 2, 2014

1.

The October meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2014 in Room 113, Education. Chair Melissa Gjellstad presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Anderson, Julie	Hunter, Cheryl	Reesor, Lori
Anderson, Suzanne	Jendrysik, Mark	Reissig, Brad
Baker, Mary	Johnson, Brett	Routon, Claudia
Bridewell, John	Johnson, Chase	Schwartz, Rhonda
Burgess, Gaye	Jones, Nicholas	Senke, William
Cavalli, Matthew	Kenville, Kim	Smart, Kathy
Cerkoney, Marissa	Kurtz, Sharley	Stofferahn, Curt
Christopherson, Anne	Lawrence, David	Storrs, Debbie
Cowden, Kimberly	Lim, Howe	Sum, Paul
DeLong, Loretta	Marasinghe, Kanishka	Swisher, Wayne
DiLorenzo, Thomas	Martin, Will	Tanaka, Tomohiro
Drewes, Mary	McHenry, Laurie	Walker, Anne
El-Rewini, Hesham	Medina, Shannon	Walton, Susan
Ernst, Julia	Mikulak, Marcia	Weaver-Hightower, Rebecca
Gedafa, Daba	Milavetz, Barry	Wood, Robert
Gjellstad, Melissa	Munski, Doug	Zerr, Jessica
Harsell, Dana	Poochigian, Donald	Zerr, Ryan
Henderson, Pam	Popehn, Montana	
Hill, Robert	Quinn, Andrew	

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Anderson, Ernest	Geiger, Jonathan	Roux, Gayle
Badahdah, Abdallah	Grant, Vincent	Rozelle-Stone, Rebecca
Beattie, Robert	Halgren, Cara	Schroeder, Janie
Bradley, April	Jeno, Sue	Schuster, Shane
Brekke, Alice	Kelley, Robert	Sheridan, William
Brown, Ryan	Liang, Lewis	Smith, Bruce
Campbell, Katherine	Mitzel, John	Weber, Bret
Carivau, Cory	Mosher, Sarah	Williams, Margaret
Enright, Jeremiah	Murphy, Eric	Wynne, Joshua
Fevig, Ronald	Onchwari, Grace	Young, Tim
Frank, Daniel	Petros, Tom	
Franklin, Tanner	Rand, Kathryn	

4.

The following announcements were made:

- a. Student Body Vice President Brett Johnson provided a Student Government update. He shared what Student Government has been working on so far this semester. He indicated three areas: optimizing academic advising and

insuring that students have the best advising possible; outreach to students, specifically, voting in North Dakota and an open forum on Measure 3; and working with the city on possible partnerships, e.g., internships, etc.

- b. Sharley Kurtz, President of Staff Senate, first introduced the other two Staff Senate representatives, Pam Henderson and Shannon Medina. She then reminded everyone of the upcoming Denim and Diamonds celebration on October 17. Tickets are still available. Ms. Kurtz also shared that Staff Senate has awarded 40 scholarships of \$500 each to dependents of staff.
- c. Steve Light was called on to address promotion and tenure activity. Last year, University Senate reached out to college promotion and tenure committees, deans and others. A report was compiled with findings and presented to the SEC. Mr. Light indicated that he introduced a concept to SEC regarding the next steps of review of promotion, tenure and evaluation. Based on the range of potential issues, President Kelley's leave research, and interest by the academic cabinet and deans, President Kelley asked that the Provost and University Senate partner on this issue. Mr. Light plans to create a small working group for this matter which will be comprised of representatives from faculty, chairs and deans. A co-chair model will be used; Mr. Light and Ryan Zerr will co-chair. They will gather a group and share information widely with the campus. Mr. Light answered questions from the Senators.
- d. Ms. Gjellstad reported that a SCOFR member vacancy, due to the resignation of Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, has been filled by the next highest vote recipient from the election, Grace Onchwari.
- e. Ms. Gjellstad reported on the Faculty Senate proposal. She indicated that the second faculty forum had taken place, the sub-committee had met to discuss all feedback, and they are working to find ways to connect with more constituents. She encouraged Senators to provide feedback via the Senate website.
- f. Ms. Gjellstad indicated the need for developing a conduit for information for Senators and their constituents. She wants to learn how Senators would like to receive and provide information. She not only wants to hear from them, but also for them to gather feedback from constituents. There is a new feedback button on the University Senate website and she requested that Senators provide feedback via the website. She will also accept emails. Ms. Gjellstad then passed out notecards and asked each Senator or guest to list the three issues being talked about on campus and three issues that need to be talked about. Shortly after, she then introduced the second part of the exercise asking that Senators discuss the items with their neighbors. The notecards were gathered and Ms. Gjellstad will compile the information and report back at a future Senate meeting.

5.

Ms. Gjellstad called attention to the minutes of the September 4, 2014 meeting. There was a motion of approval by Mr. Munski. Mr. Jendrysik seconded and the minutes were approved as distributed.

6.

The question period was opened at 4:37 p.m.

Ms. Weaver-Hightower asked about the status of SOAR. Ms. Gjellstad reported that the taskforces have met and presented questions to the Coordinating Committee, which has met several times. There will be a forum to present more information to the taskforces. She indicated that decisions have not yet been

made on lists or questions. They are close to presenting a roadmap on getting the work done. As for a timeline, the intent is to have active work starting toward the end of the semester and, hopefully, completed by the end of the year; however, Mr. Zerr stated that doing it well is more important than rushing.

Ms. Gjellstad shared a noteworthy solution for communication during this process. A new position is being created and is currently called "the connector." Mr. Light will be that person. What this looks like has not yet been totally decided. There is more to come.

Mr. Sum asked about the flexible budgeting model. He understood we would be using that model next year and indicated that faculty and departments need information to plan. Because those that could answer this question were attending the State Board of Higher Education meeting, it will be addressed at the next meeting.

The question period closed at 4:45 p.m.

7.

Ms. Gjellstad called attention to the annual report from the Senate University Assessment Committee. A motion was made by Mr. Zerr to accept and file the report. There was a second by Ms. Christopherson and the motion was approved.

8.

Ms. Gjellstad called attention to the University Curriculum Committee report. She explained that the monthly Committee reports include curricular matters that need Senate approval and others that do not. In this report, there were no items that needed Senate approval. She requested a motion to file the report. Mr. Quinn moved approval. Mr. Poochigian seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

9.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Suzanne Anderson, Secretary
University Senate

**Senate University Assessment Committee
Annual Report for
Academic Year 2013-2014**

The Senate University Assessment Committee (UAC) provides faculty guidance and oversight to the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost in developing and implementing the University Assessment Plan. In addition, the committee analyzes and interprets assessment results, develops appropriate reports, and disseminates assessment results to the Office of Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost, the University Senate, and the community.

The University Assessment Committee was able to accomplish the tasks and responsibilities charged to it by the University Senate, in part due to the support provided by Joan Hawthorne, Director of Assessment & Regional Accreditation. The Committee is grateful for her continued support and expertise.

Much of the work of assessment has been, and is, conducted outside the University Assessment Committee. The UAC wishes to thank the Essential Studies Committee, the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), and the University community for their assessment efforts. Every contribution is vital to the assessment process at the University of North Dakota. Special thanks are also offered to Carmen Williams and Nancy Krom who willingly shared their research expertise and UAC experience with the University Assessment Committee on an ongoing basis.

The Senate University Assessment Committee for the 2013-2014 academic year consisted of the following individuals:

Mary Askim-Lovseth (BPA)
Kevin Buettner (Nursing & Professional Disciplines)
Paul Drechsel (JDO)
Devon Hanson (A&S)
Joan Hawthorne (Director of Assessment & Regional Accreditation)
Sukhvarsh Jerath (CEM)
Brett Johnson (Undergraduate Student Representative)
Nancy Krom (Recorder; Institutional Research)
Bradley Myers (Law)
Shari Nelson (VPSA Designee)
C. Casey Ozaki (Graduate Studies Designee)
Kenneth Ruit (MED)
Tom Steen (Director, Essential Studies)
Kyle Thorson (Graduate Student Representative)
Carmen Williams (VPAA Designee; Institutional Research)
Deborah Worley, Chair (EHD)

Functions and Responsibilities of the University Assessment Committee

The University Senate has identified six areas of responsibility for the University Assessment Committee. The responsibilities of the Committee and its accomplishments during the 2013-2014 academic year are addressed as follows:

I. Address all issues regarding assessment of student achievement and development.

The University Assessment Plan recognizes the role of the Academic Curriculum (implicit and explicit) in student learning and development. Through a review process of departmental annual reports, assessment plans, previous assessment reviews, and departmental documents, the assessment activities of departments and programs within the College of Arts & Sciences were reviewed in 2013-2014. The results were communicated to the department chairs through the Assessment Director.

The University Assessment Committee also conducted reviews of eight non-academic units including: Career Services, Chester Fritz Library, Continuing Education, International Center, Memorial Union,

Student Health Services, University Children's Center, and the Wellness Center. The Committee recognizes their contributions in the achievement of Institutional, Essential Studies, and Program goals relative to student learning and development.

Finally, the committee reviewed six OIR (Office of Institutional Research) tools regularly used by various University stakeholders. These tools include: the Advising survey, the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), the College Senior Survey (CSS), the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshmen survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the EduCause Center for Applied Research (ECAR) Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology.

Finally, members of the Assessment Committee volunteered to assist with Essential Studies assessment initiatives. Further details of this activity are available on the Essential Studies web site:

<http://und.edu/academics/essential-studies/>

- II. Develop, review, and evaluate the University Assessment Plan in conjunction with the Assessment Director.

This document is to be reviewed every other year. The University Assessment Plan was reviewed in fall 2013. Minimal revisions were made to the document at that time. The plan should be reviewed again in fall 2015. To access the University Assessment Plan, please visit:

http://und.edu/university-senate/committees/assessment/_files/docs/univ-asmt-plan.pdf

- III. Oversee and evaluate the implementation of the University Assessment Plan, evaluate assessment activities and the interpretation of assessment results, and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Plan.

Assessment of Student Learning and Development: Program Level

As previously indicated, the UAC reviewed the assessment documents for the departments and programs within the College of Arts & Sciences in Spring 2014. The committee reviewed assessment plans for 47 programs within the College, including certificate, undergraduate, and graduate degree programs. Findings were documented and forwarded to departments through the Assessment Director.

The Assessment Director and the UAC continue to provide guidance to departments as they develop, implement, and make use of their assessment plans. Taken collectively, the reviews help determine the state of assessment for the University as a whole. In general, departments and programs have specific plans for assessment in place, and there are many programs where student learning goals are well-articulated in those assessment plans. Moreover, appropriate methods of assessment are implemented. However, the committee reviewed several programs where assessment methods need further description. A small number of programs did not include any assessment results in their annual reports or the results that were included were not clearly linked to the student learning goals for the program.

Assessment of Student Learning and Development: Institutional Level

The University has many assessment tools at its disposal. As noted in section I, six tools were reviewed in the 2013-2014 academic year.

Some of the tools that are administered by the Office of Institutional Research are mandated by the North Dakota University System (NDUS), such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Others have been developed by UND for internal purposes, such as the Advising Survey. Many of the surveys do not directly measure student learning; they do address the infrastructures, conditions, and environmental components that promote and enhance student learning. Thus, even though survey findings are of special importance to administration, academic departments may also find results noteworthy in further understanding student learning.

Full reports of the OIR tools were directed to the Office of Institutional Research. UAC reviews were also forwarded to the respective administrative or academic departments via the Assessment Director and/or the Office of Institutional Research. Departmental chairs and individual faculty are encouraged to access survey results at <http://und.edu/research/institutional-research/survey-timelines.cfm> or by contacting the Assessment Director or the Office of Institutional Research.

In addition, information specifically for students about the findings of the surveys is available online: <http://und.edu/university-senate/committees/assessment/for-students.cfm>

Assessment of Non-Academic Units

It is recognized that many non-academic units have a direct involvement in student learning and development. As noted in section I, eight non-academic units were reviewed during the 2013-2014 academic year. UAC committee members noted that non-academic programs do have assessment plans in place, and some programs include student learning goals in their plans. There is, however, room for improvement. For many programs, a single type of assessment method predominates and there is no evidence that results included in annual reports are not directly tied to decision-making within the unit. UAC reviews were forwarded to the respective units via the Assessment Director.

- IV. Make recommendations regarding how to address any deficiencies that are revealed by assessment activities.

A process for providing feedback from the Committee to administrators and departments continues to be provided by the institution's Assessment Director. Changes in the process continue as appropriate.

Additionally, a luncheon for Chairs and the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences was held in May 2014. Many members of the Assessment Committee attended and provided general comments about the assessment plans that were reviewed. The Assessment Director moderated a series of brief presentations by departments who have developed and maintained successful assessment systems.

- V. Review University Accreditation Report when issued and advise the Senate regarding the Report and its implications.

With guidance from the Assessment Director, members of the Assessment Committee reviewed the self-study report in preparation for the HLC visit that occurred in fall 2013. Committee members specifically reviewed Chapter 5, Criterion 4: Teaching & Learning: Evaluation and Improvement as this part of the self-study specifically discussed the committee's work. A special meeting time was set aside during the HLC visit for reviewers to meet with the Assessment Committee. The meeting was cancelled by the reviewers, however, just prior to the actual meeting day.

- VI. Work with Institutional Research to keep the Assessment Committee's website current.

The Office of Institutional Research continues to maintain the Assessment Committee's website. Several key features of the site include: a section on the basic steps of writing an assessment plan, a section for students that describes key findings from OIR tools, resources for campus constituents about assessment, and resources for committee members who conduct reviews of assessment plans, including posting of the most up to date assessment review templates (revised in fall 2013). In addition, the assessment plans of academic departments and non-academic units that attend to student learning and development are available to the campus and to the public on the Assessment Committee website. For more information, please visit: <http://und.edu/university-senate/committees/assessment/>

Summary: During 2013-2014, the University Assessment Committee fulfilled its purpose, function and responsibilities including annual reviews of academic and non-academic assessment activities, and OIR (Office of Instruction Research) tools, and a review of templates for assessment reviews.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deborah Worley
Chair, University Assessment Committee

September 2014

**University Senate Curriculum Committee Report
October 2, 2014**

Senate approval is not required for the following report items

I Program Changes

- BA-BS in Honors
 - Change in program name from “BA-BA in Honors” to “BA/BS in Honors”

II Course Changes: Undergraduate

- ME 101: Introduction to Mechanical Engineering
 - Revise course description
- ACCT 302: Intermediate Accounting II
 - Change in Prerequisites
 - Add grade of C or better to Acct 301
 - Add permission of department and Junior standing
- ACCT 315: Business in the Legal Environment
 - Title change to: Business Law I
- ACCT 316: Business Law
 - Title change to: Business Law II
- ACCT 320: Accounting for Production
 - Title change to: Cost Accounting
- CHEM 441: Instrumental Analysis I – Spectroscopy
 - Terms typically offered: from Spring odd years to Spring even years
- CHEM 442: Instrumental Analysis II – Electrochemistry
 - Terms typically offered: Spring odd years