CAAC Meeting Minutes
May 22, 2018


Additional Representatives Present: Pam Coonan, Martin Marquez, Chrissy Lieberman, Gail Burd

Absent (without proxy): Laura Berry, Douglas Taren, Lucinda Rankin, Barbara Bryson, Ted Tong

Chair Kim Jones called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

I. Introduction of CAAC member: Francesca Lopez, Associate Dean of College of Education (eff. July 1)

II. Approval of Minutes from April 24, 2018 Meeting

III. Agenda Items
   a) Annual Update on APR Assessment Scores and Taskstream Accountability Management System (AMS) rollout- Elaine Marchello and Ingrid Novodvorsky
   
   Documents presented include the APR Assessment Scorecard for Cohort VII, average scores over the past seven cohorts, and information about Taskstream AMS rollout. Cohort VII is significant because it is the final cohort of the first cycle of embedding learning outcomes assessment in the APR process. The average scores gives a sense of the progress made to date. Expect to have extensive findings when cycle two begins. Taskstream AMS rollout summary document provides information regarding AMS provisioning, workshop information, and workshop attendance.

   Kim Jones asked about the number of programs being counted on the APR reports; possible discrepancy with College of Humanities numbers. Elaine explained that graduate programs will sometimes combine masters and PhD into one assessment while others have separate masters and PhD assessments, varies by college. Jim Baygents asked about assessing university-wide learning outcomes in APRs. Elaine explained that university wide learning outcomes are in Taskstream and program outcomes can be mapped to the institutional outcomes. Units will be able to generate a map and assessment report based on the mapping. Gail Burd expressed concern regarding the scoring system and asked to increase flexibility for criteria used to score programs. Elaine and Ingrid mentioned that the rubric has been re-vamped and nuanced feedback is given to departments, not seen on score report. Gail requested that associate deans and others relevant stakeholders convene to discuss the scoring system and assessments of learning. Pam Perry asked about the previous assessment website and accessing Taskstream. Ingrid and Elaine provided an update on the older website and future plans to have NetID login for Taskstream access. Maria Manriquez requested COM-Phoenix be included in the process.

   b) Career Destinations Dashboard- Abra McAndrew and Marla Franco
   
   Discussion on UA’s “Destination Survey” including historical processes, new design, response rates, reporting, insights, and next steps. The destination survey includes questions used to report to ABOR and college-specific questions used for accreditation. This survey is specific to undergrad students. An effort has been underway since 2015 to re-vamp questions and response options, survey processes and designs, survey logic, and easier reporting tools. Went over the impact of the updates/re-structure on response rate, survey administration, cleaning data, and development of college-specific analytics dashboards. Went over insights on student career-seeking behaviors based on 2016-2017 survey data. Entities that request survey data include NACE, US News and World Report, Arizona Auditor General, UAIR, college/program accreditors, grant, donors, UA Communications, and ABOR. Abra went over provisioning and requested suggestions about user experience and guidance.
CAAC members asked about gathering data further downstream. Discussed potential opportunities including Gallup survey and application tool that scrapes social media and job sites. Gail asked about ABOR data alignment. Marla explained that there are disparities in the collection period that would need to be considered when checking for alignment. CAAC members requested to see wording of survey questions and response options. Discussion on reconciling college data and survey data. Jim Hunt asked about linking to census codes to student-reported occupation titles. Student self-reported occupation titles are not linked to census titles. Kim requested that survey questions and presentation be sent in order to upload to CAAC’s box.

c) Student Complaint System- Pam Coonan and Cindy Williams
Received clarification from Higher Learning Commission (HLC) on expectations for collecting formal student complaints and the institution’s response to complaints. Developed a process that captures complaints and prevents double reporting. This student complaint system is an internal process capturing and tracking complaints that are unable to be resolved by an existing process. Complaints reported must be related to the violation of policy/procedure and/or interference of student learning and could be about academics, student affairs, and/or other interactions with offices. Discussed the complaint process and presented the online complaint form. Unwritten complaints informally resolved are not reported. Students must demonstrate that they have gone through informal resolution prior to submitting the complaint and login using WebAuth or submit complaint in writing with department. Complaints submitted on paper must capture the same information as the electronic form. Discussed possible process to eliminate double-reporting. Cindy Williams showed the electronic form login, text, and questions fields. Pam Coonan recommends creating committee with stakeholders to look at trends from complaint reports.

Discussion on the location of the complaint form and questions regarding purpose of the form. Gail explained that UA needs a way to refer students to a tool to capture these types of complaints and record/report the data and resolution. Question over preventing submission of complaints that already have a process in place. Pam Coonan explained that complaints will be checked and reviewed prior to forwarding to departments/units. Suggestions for modifying the form include adding headings and prompts. Pam Coonan stated that the form structure will be evaluated for improvement once several complaints/data has been received and stakeholders have had time to work with the form. Discussion over paper version. Pam Coonan will check on this to see if paper version is required. Kim requested that additional questions/feedback be sent to Pam Coonan and/or discussed during future CAAC meeting.

d) Undergraduate Minor and Certificate Definition Proposal- Kim Jones
Kim reported that there were enough e-votes approving the definition with Mike Staten’s suggested wording and removing the 12-unit minimum text. Discussion on the minimum units for undergrad certificates will return eventually. CAAC members agreed.

e) Innovative Spaces for Learning and Engagement (ISLE) Project- Jane Hunter and Gail Burd
Competitive proposal process for funding transformation of department-owned classrooms. Rooms must be designed/transformed to promote engaged learning. Departments retain control and responsibility for the rooms. Will be done in two rounds, limit of one proposal per dept per round. Proposal solicitations went out 5/1. Appreciate early submissions to prepare estimates. Went over considerations and instructions to apply to the grant. Reviewed milestones for round one and two. Proposals due 8/1 for round one and 12/3 for round two. Selection criteria include innovative design concept, well-documented plans for effective use of proposed spaces, evidence of department commitment to improve student learning from department head and dean, and financial commitment from department and/or college. Went over online resources for design/transformation ideas. Jane’s team can help with suggestions and provide support.
Discussion on losing seats when transforming to collaborative learning space and potential new designs that may limit seat loss.

f) Class Scheduling Timeline and Follow-up from April Meeting – Beth Acree and Suhina Deol

Presented information on classroom inventory and constraints limiting scheduling options and availability including times/dates, standard and non-standard meeting patterns, class size, sessions, and priority requests. Additional impacts limiting availability include 35/35/30 rule (centrally scheduled rooms; 35% of classes on MWF peak times, 35% on TR peak times, and 30% other options before or after peak times), room capacity inefficiencies, and impact of cancelled sections/classes. Beth presented list showing past and proposed classroom scheduling principles. Proposed principles are meant to improve efficiencies, transparency, and fairness. Discussed previous scheduling timeline and processes. The proposed/modified spring 2019 timeline includes 13-week open scheduling, 2-week RCS schedule review, 6-week department review, and go live date. RCS plans to meet with colleges to present timeline and answer questions.

Discussed availability of data on classroom efficiencies, historical enrollment, and cancelled sections. Martina Shenal asked about historical enrollment and growth considerations when classes were held in department owned rooms. Suhina suggested using the 70% classroom fill benchmark and Beth stated that RCS will rely on department for information on projected growth. Discussion on presented principles, timeline structure, flexibility, and impact of online courses on room inventory. Suhina added that UA offering around the same number of in-person courses every year. Discussion on course schedule impact and TCE reports. CAAC member expressed concern regarding the proposed timeline. Suggestion to reduce 13 week period, increase RCS schedule review period, and providing departmental feedback early in the process. Beth explained that RCS will provide reports and information on 35/35/30 compliance, historical enrollment and potential options to address RCS-identified concerns. Discussion on priority scheduling agreements and cycle for reviewing said agreements. Discussion about optimization and machine learning and potential to consider nuances including department-owned rooms. Suggestion to bring together a group to discuss standard meeting patterns and policies. Kim requested saving presentation on optimization for a later meeting.

IV. Meeting Adjourned