

ACE Team Retreat

Meeting Notes

May 12, 2008

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wilderness Ridge

Morning Attendees (IACE): Kathy Ankerson, John Ballard, Scott Fuess, Frauke Hachtmann, Tiffany Heng-Moss, Jessica Jonson, Rita Kean, Peter Lefferts, Nancy Mitchell, Greg Snow, Larry Walklin, Linda Young

Afternoon Attendees: Kathy Ankerson, John Ballard, Lloyd Bell, Trudy Burge, Tony Bushard, Donna Dudney, Scott Fuess, Betsy Gabb, Frauke Hachtmann, Tiffany Heng-Moss, Jessica Jonson, Rita Kean, Peter Lefferts, Dan Leger, Nancy Mitchell, Ali Moeller, John Osterman, Michael Riley, Greg Snow, Ann Tschetter, Linda Young

Unable to attend: Larry Walklin

Guest Speaker: Dan Wheeler

Nancy Mitchell called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Review of Policy Recommendations for Transfer Students
 - Proposed policy revision #1 – suggested to use more clarifying text by changing “departmental transfer evaluators” to “appropriate unit transfer evaluators” as designated within the text. The rationale was that not all colleges use the term “department” to refer to the various units of the college. Motion was moved and seconded. The change was passed with all in favor.
 - Proposed policy revision #3 – motion to approve was moved and seconded. Discussion included how AP credit will be handled within this policy. AP credit will not have a syllabus and are not considered transfer courses, more of a placement issue. AP credit has equivalencies. R Kean suggested dealing with AP as a separate issue and consulting with Admissions and others. K Ankerson suggested putting “B-D” within the overall description of the transfer policy. Nancy Mitchell will rework the recommendations to the transfer policy according to the discussion and send out to IACE for review. The question was called for these minor changes to be made by N Mitchell. All were in favor, motion passed.
 - J Ballard asked if IACE has the authority to bind colleges to this policy. R Kean said that IACE does have the authority to make these changes for the general education program.
 - G Snow said that as a chief adviser, it is difficult to deal with transfer credit and wondered if this would add more work for transfer credit evaluators and advisers. Mitchell said that the idea is to keep as much power within the department and the transfer policy should alleviate most problems.

- Greg Snow asked about funding for the Unified Transfer Policy. R Kean said that the Enrollment Management Council (EMC) endorsed the Transfer Policy and it still needs to be approved by the Deans' Council. Then, funding for supporting the Transfer Policy will be analyzed.

2. Examples of Courses for ACE Review (morning session)

- Several courses were reviewed to practice analyzing for ACE credit using the guidelines. Some were examples that would most likely be approved and some were good candidates of ones that would not likely be approved without additional revision or materials.
- In review of a science course using SLO #4, the question was asked as to what kind of "data" should be included, what is making inferences from data, how much description should be included in the submission. A broad view of what making inferences mean, using raw data, and data can take on different meanings. IACE evaluators should not make judgments of the data themselves, but that analysis of the data occurs. Professors need to be aware in planning for courses for next year that courses submitted need to meet all of the requirements stated in the outcome.
- A syllabus should demonstrate how the course meets the outcome.
- Course facilitators could review courses prior to submission and discuss them with the submitters to head off any problems early.
- Tests will need to be permissible for assessment, as long as the submitter explains how the tests enable students to meet the outcome.
- It is important for all documents to be correctly attached to a submitted course.
- Submissions and syllabi need to be described so that evaluators outside the discipline understand.
- The use of "and" and "or" in the outcomes need to be emphasized and made clear so it is clear to faculty that all ("and") or at least one part ("or") needs to be addressed.
- A suggestion was made that courses needing revisions could be sent back to the appropriate course facilitator rather than directly to the submitter. The course facilitator could then assist the faculty member with revisions, make sure all parts are submitted, and that the course is submitted for the appropriate outcome. Also/or, facilitators could receive the proposals prior to the original submission to ensure all of above.
- In the Guidelines for Review of ACE Course Certification Requests, student learning outcome (SLO) #8, question 1 should be divided into three sub-questions in order to address ethical principles, civics, *and* stewardship.
- A workshop could be held for course facilitators on what and what not to do.
- Workshops could also be held for faculty on submitting course proposals. The timing of when the courses are being submitted could be an issue in receiving incomplete submissions (time of year and how much time faculty members have to give to the submissions).
- Somehow the faculty will need to be required to read the guidelines prior to submitting courses as some courses could be submitted that might include a part of the SLO but not be the main focus of the course. A course might include writing but not necessarily be a writing intensive

course that would satisfy SLO #1. SLOs #1-3 are intended to be foundational skills for later courses and the other SLOs.

- The exercise in reviewing courses was a practice trial to see what could arise. These issues could be corrected early, alleviating problems for later.
 - Have examples of what to do and what not to do in stylized versions to help with reinforcement of the importance of reviewing the guidelines. A certified model could be created, with an example of a course that would not be certified (remove some information to show what is missing).
 - F Hachtmann shared a question from her college regarding the logistics of the sample to be collected for assessment and how it is organized into the high, middle, and low ranges. Sometimes it will be hard for faculty to have samples available, especially if most of the student work is returned to the students. Should the sample include feedback from faculty or should pre-graded copies be kept for future assessment? J Jonson said that faculty cannot be required to keep copies with feedback so a representative sample is a good idea.
 - Faculty should not copy and paste text from their syllabi into ACE course material submissions. The submission text needs to address the ACE committee not the students. Jonson said that faculty could be more specific in their submissions and even provide examples on multiple choice exams (for large courses that use such tests).
 - It is important to include an explanation for each reinforcement.
 - Examples of submissions will be posted on the web.
 - Concerns were raised with SLOs #8 and 9 regarding the global and diversity aspects, and with the use of “or” in #9.
3. Rules of Engagement for IACE Voting – Dan Wheeler (morning session with IACE)
 - Wheeler lead a group discussion about challenges facing the ACE Team, and made recommendations to the team for identifying solutions
 4. Keeping the Momentum – Dan Wheeler (afternoon session with course facilitators and IACE)
 - The discussion focused on establishing and maintaining momentum especially into the fall.
 5. Meetings
 - Initial IACE meeting for fall – decided to meet the week of August 18.
 - The course facilitators handed in times they could meet for meetings.
 6. Recap of Morning Session – Nancy Mitchell
 - Mitchell shared transfer changes that were made in the morning session. Will put up on web.
 - The question was asked if transfer equivalencies will be reexamined for ACE. They will be at least reviewed regularly to make sure they follow the ACE requirements. Faculty could be upset if UNL courses are scrutinized for ACE approval but transfer courses can proceed through without the careful consideration. Courses reviewed for ACE should be thought of as “courses

to outcome equivalencies” instead of “course to course equivalencies.” Think of outcomes instead of content.

- The number of courses being transferred in for ACE credit would need to go back to the faculty for a vote if it was changed.
- There will be a transition period. UNL staff will be meeting with community colleges and will expect other schools to conform to outcomes. A concern was raised for the possible extensive time commitment that could arise for advisers. Outcomes will be fulfilled by other courses at UNL, not just transfer courses.

7. Examples of Courses for ACE Review (afternoon session)

- The group practiced course approvals using good and bad examples.
- For SLO#4, the data should be the result of measurement or observation. Need to clarify that all parts are needed, depending on the identifier of “and” or “or.” Most of the faculty preparing documents for course review will not have insider information to help with their preparation, so their documentation will most likely not be as proficient as the examples given during the session.
- Examples could be posted on the web, but prior permission will need to be obtained.
- Faculty need to look at the guidelines before submissions.
- Feedback needed for assessment had some questions – whether feedback is needed or to just give examples with grades. What is needed for recertification?
- The course facilitator could check courses online and go back to faculty to make revisions prior to submissions. Jessica Jonson reiterated making the SLO the actual learning goal of the course, not just a component of the course. Mitchell reminded the group to be on the lookout for courses that do not have the appropriate outcome.
- A sample syllabus/representative sample could be used for courses that have sections taught by several faculty members.
- Remember to include the information where it’s needed. Do not put too much information into the reinforcement area that should go elsewhere. Uploading documents takes time with the online system. Mitchell suggested creating the text in a word document and then cutting and pasting the text into the course approval online form or emailing any documents directly to the ACE office. Information Services (IS) is reworking the online system, which may take until the end of May.

8. Action Plan

- Mitchell asked the group to take the action plan worksheet back to their colleges and work on it. Return it back to Mitchell. Things that are going well can be highlighted in the fall. Ask the ACE office what they can do to help.

9. Updates from the Colleges on ACE Progress

- Architecture – Provided review sheets and will be targeting faculty individually to have information back by June 2.

- Arts & Sciences – Osterman had a meeting with the sciences vice chairs. Much misinformation was shared so there was some major resistance. Osterman tried to explain the process and hopes the tension is relieved. Faculty think of courses in terms of ownership and this culture needs to be changed. Deans will need to get involved to provide some strong help. On the social science side, there was trepidation of the assessment part, which has now relaxed. Faculty members do not appear to be worried about fall deadlines if not assessing for a few years. It might not be until next year that more courses will appear.
- CEHS – Will be developing a CEHS 200 course which everyone in CEHS takes. They will meet with faculty that teach the course as a model and help to report in the fall. They want faculty to pinpoint ACE courses. CEHS would like to have a system where Moeller and Young will review the courses before they are submitted, which will require communication. They can return any courses that need revisions and provide assistance.
- FPA – Lefferts said that Music has been handled intensively and will have courses by June 2. Art wanted more non-majors in their classes. Theatre was not as proactive, but would like THEA 112 to be a part, need to look at what might and might not work. FPA would like to offer more courses but have to be aware of what is possible in terms of spots and availability of professors.
- CBA – The APC has submitted 8-10 courses, with a total of 12-15 possible. Samples and the guidelines were sent to faculty. They would like to be able to approve courses without full faculty approval (a subgroup).
- Journalism – Hachtmann and Burge generated discussion. A faculty vote resulted in 20 courses being submitted.
- Engineering – They will not have any courses for June 2. All majors will have capstones which will be submitted. Most of their courses fall under SLO #3 and 4. They will be repackaging and submitting material. Global awareness has been a problem but with ACE will have to pinpoint courses to take.
- CASNR – They will be having a session this Friday, with 78% of faculty being represented. They are having problems with information coming from other sources and faculty not knowing what to do with it.
- Mitchell suggested it might not be possible to do very much during the summer. Could proceed slowly to adjust and not make as many mistakes.
- Some colleges are realigning their college requirements. CBA is working on drafts. Arts and Sciences is working on this. FPA, Music specifically, will need to clean up capstone courses and have a curricular change in majors. Same with CBA. Engineering will need to complete some changes in their curriculum as math and science will need to fulfill ACE. ACE will allow Architecture to free up some of their credit hours.

Announcement: IACE will meet on June 12, from 11:30-1:30 in 206 Seaton Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Notes submitted by
Jennifer Lantz

Office of Undergraduate Studies
May 15, 2008