HeadsUp Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
8:30-10:00 am Monday, September 19, 2016
Patrick Lyons host
Arizona State Museum, North Building, Room 309
(Map: http://uanow.org/NYsu)

Summary

- Visit from Gail Burd, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (8:30-9:00 am)
  Accreditation (see two documents attached).
  Biannual course review. Fernando Chavez will join us as well.
  Questions
    Are there ideas that you want input on from the steering committee? The
    steering committee could be used as a focus group to get formative feedback
    and not an end around the decision making process that involves the Deans.
    Are there items that you would like to pass along to the heads and
directors?

Gail reviewed the accreditation process and preparations for the site visit in 2020. She focused
on issues of special interest to heads. She proposed a lunch meeting on the theme of
accreditation. She will also visit each College via department heads meetings to discuss.

See notes attached.

Tricia Serio provided an update on president search and plans for an RCM oversight committee.

Heads Up events that are planned
Development Workshop for Department Heads and their College/Unit’s Development Officer.
Friday, October 14, 2016
Vine Annex, Room 102-104
12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Lunch Provided
This workshop, organized by the HeadsUp Steering Committee and Sponsored by the UA
Foundation, will build upon the February 2016 Development Workshop for Department Heads.
Topics include engaging and (when appropriate) soliciting donors.

Presenter/Facilitator:
Doug Stewart
Senior Consultant and Principal, Marts & Lundy
Former Associate Vice President for Medical Development and Alumni Affairs, Stanford
University
Former Vice President, UCSF Foundation and Campaign Director, University of
California, San Francisco
RSVP for this event to Jeana at jeana.horacek@uafoundation.org by Friday, September 30th.

Town Hall-style luncheon meeting focused on RCM. Recent Surveys of the Heads and Directors indicate a lot of interest in a discussion of RCM "taxes," specifically, how they are determined, what the funds are used for, and future plans. Invite Andrew Comrie and Jim Florian.
Date TBD

Next meetings on October 17 (David Cuillier host) and November 14 (Michael Brewer host).

All meeting agendas and minutes are posted at http://headsup.arizona.edu/steering-meetings.
Gail Burd, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
November 2016

**Higher Learning Commission (HLC) - Preparation for 2020 Accreditation Review**
1. Serving as HLC Peer Reviewer to gather information about the review process and criteria.
2. Verify credit hours are correct.
3. Collect electronic syllabi for all courses that include student learning outcomes; syllabi requested by students and required by HLC; will use and distribute an electronic syllabus template for this purpose.
4. Confirm co-convened syllabi for undergrad/grad 400/500 courses show different learning outcomes for grad and UG and show more demanding work from grad students.
5. Enhance program level assessment of student learning outcomes to demonstrate full cycle of assessment with learning outcomes, assessment activities, assessment findings, and program improvements in response to findings; will purchase TaskStream software to assist this process.
6. Remove courses in course catalog that are not current; students need to know which courses are available to take in their program and HLC requires that courses be current; biannual course review in progress.
7. Assure that faculty are “qualified” to teach their courses; have MS or PhD in the discipline of their teaching; process underway with associate deans and department heads to establish policies and procedures in this area.
8. Establish general education and co-curricular assessment of student learning outcomes; University-Wide General Education Committee and Student Affairs are working on these issues.

**Improving our processes and facilitating development of tools for student degree mapping**
1. This requires a decrease in the number of exceptions done for course substitutions by building rules to accept courses commonly used as exceptions in the degree requirements.
2. Dr. Meredith Aronson, program manager for advising analytics, is working with advisors and program directors on this project.

**Information**

a. **HLC Quality Initiative - UA Learning Initiative**
   - Faculty are participating in Faculty Learning Communities and reading Small Teaching by James Lang and students, and providing formative peer review if each other’s teaching.
   - Undergraduates - Student Advocates for Improved Learning (SAIL) Fellows are taking a one-credit course on learning and meeting with groups of peers to discuss approaches for improved learning
b. **Advisor Task Force**
   - Based on input from the Advising Academic Program Review last year, the task force is reviewing advisor work, career ladder, and salary steps
c. **Collaborative Learning Spaces**
   - 9 classrooms - 24-260 seats; fall 2016 – 110 faculty and 40 departments teaching in these spaces.
   - Designed for active learning teaching approaches.
   - Professional development for faculty, TAs, and preceptors provided by Dr. Jane Hunter, Director of Academic Resources and Special Projects, and the Office of Instruction and Assessment
d. **New Courses and New Academic Programs**
   - New course requests sent to all Associated Deans by email for review (10-day turnaround) and full proposals for new academic program are reviewed by CAAC before submission to ABOR. This provides committee review for quality and RCM purposes.
Questions

a. Is the level of your foundation math requirement appropriate and helpful for the careers and post-graduation work of your undergraduates? Would a quantitative reasoning/quantitative literacy course with information about scale, probabilities, some statistics, etc. or a statistics course be a better Foundation Math requirement for the Moderate Strand Math requirement (now that is mostly satisfied with College Algebra)?

b. Would your undergraduate programs benefit if you could count on all students having access in and out-of-class access to a notebook computer? Would this improve the teaching you could/would do? If yes, what specific software or capabilities would be needed on this notebook computer? We could explore with the library and bookstore ways to rent or loan computers to students with financial need.

c. Are you satisfied with the communication skills of the students in your programs? Does the writing emphasis course in your program need to be reviewed to develop specific skills? Employers ask for improved "soft" skills in writing, oral communication, and critical thinking in their employees. Are we doing enough to prepare our graduates for the workplace?

Figure 1: A Faculty-Driven Process for Program Level Assessment of Student Outcomes
Core Component 3.A
The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.
1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Core Component 3.B
The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.
1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Core Component 3.C
The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.
1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Core Component 3.D
The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.
1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Core Component 4.A
The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.
1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Core Component 4.B
The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.
1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

**Core Component 4.C**
The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.
1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)
New/Transformed Collaborative Learning Spaces Planned for Fall, 2016

Fall, 2015
- Harvill Rm 404 (Cap 70)
- Chavez Rm 307 (Cap 30)
- Soc Sci Rm 222 (Cap 60)
- BSW Rm 301 (Cap 112)

Fall, 2016
- Educ Rm 353 (Cap 90)
- ILC Rm 137 (Cap 60)
- SEL Rm 2005 (Cap 260)