The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its October 11, 2010 Meeting

refereeingjoumBls, service on UAF committees or science fair judging. The following examples illustrate what is wanted:
i. Civil Engineering faculty wqrked with the local school district to
implement a pre-engineering curriculum track.
ii. A Fisheries faculty member served on the North Pacific Fisheries
Management Council
iii. An Anthropology faculty member serves as editor of a major journal in the field

iv. Music faculty participate in the Fairbanks Symphony, a collaboration
between UAF and the local community
c. A narrative addressing whether similar programs exist elsewhere in the UA

• Average number of declared majors in program over 4 years /average number of degrees (certificates) over 4 years (no

. .

Appendix A. Evaluating a Programmatic Outcomes Assessment Report

Program will submit the following outcomes assessment infonnation:

• An assessment plan for each program; programs are encouraged, but not required, to
include employment placement and/or graduate school enrollment infonnation as part of
their assessment process.
• Assessment inronnation collected and summarized during the previous three years
• A summary of programmatic revisions (improvements) resulting from the assessment
infonnation

The Program Review Committee will assess 'he quality of the programmatic assessment process. Quality shall be assessed based on at least the following characteristics:

I) Assessment Plan
8. Each program has its own outcomes assessment appropriate to the certificate or
degree (the same plan for cannot be used programs of different levels, e.g.,
associate and baccalaureate because the outcomes should differ)
b. Multiple measures of student outcomes are utilized
c. Assessment includes direct evidence of student learning (student survey results
are considered indirect evidence)

2) Assessment information is collected and summarized on a regular basis.

3) The assessment SUI1U118O' is based on aggregate student information not a statement about individual student outcomcs. The intent of the process is to assess the etTectiveness of
the curriculum not individual performance. In addition, it is important to be able to share assessment information with

impo5 T8erndual valuatorlts

The assessment studlhe