

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2017
Room: CSC 103

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Jennifer Edmonds, Jon Ference, Hunter Hughes, Christine Mellon, MaryBeth Mullen, Paul Reinert, Patricia Sweeney, Yong Zhu

The meeting was called to order @ 11:05 am.

Minutes from the May 5, 2017 meeting were approved without revision.

Introductions/Welcoming New Members

- Each committee member introduced him/herself, including name and what body they were elected or appointed to represent.
- New members Hunter Hughes (undergraduate student rep), Jennifer Edmonds (Sidhu School Faculty rep), and Paul Reinert (School of Education Faculty rep) were welcomed to the committee.

2016-17 Program Review Participation, status update

- Brian shared that participation in the program review process in 2016-17 was higher than it had been in 2015-16. The committee agreed that this is good progress.
- Pat shared that due to many of the program reviews coming in after review assignments to UAC members had been made, those submitted later had been reviewed by Brian. That number was roughly ½ of the total submitted.
 - The group discussed and decided that assignment of reviews should be done differently starting this year, so that committee members (in general) will each have more to review, but no one individual will have to review so many.
- The program review process flow chart referenced last year was provided to committee members for reference. Pat and Brian referenced step 8 as where we are currently in the 2016-17 program review process. At this stage, program review feedback is shared with the Deans and Vice Presidents, who are in turn encouraged to meet with department chairpersons or directors to discuss the Assessment Committee's feedback on their documented assessment process. The planned outcome of those meetings had been for the Deans or Vice Presidents to them electronically update the feedback forms (where UAC feedback had been provided) with any relevant outcomes from their follow-up discussions, and return the forms so they get back to the UAC.
 - It was noted that this is the part of the process where things have fallen apart, since few if any forms with documentation from follow-up conversations had been turned in last year, and little to none is (realistically) anticipated this year.
 - Committee discussion focused on pulling back from being as compliance-oriented (requiring the Deans and Vice Presidents to submit documentation from each meeting). The group generally agreed that the proof of ongoing assessment processes and conversations should be evident in the next submitted review (especially in the case of an Annual Update the year after a Full Review had been completed).
 - Jon suggested, consistent with the group's recommendation, that the yellow-shaded areas of the feedback form (for the Dean or VP's documentation from meetings) be eliminated. However, Deans and VPs will still be sent the UAC's feedback on relevant programs or units, and encouraged to have follow-up meetings/discussions.
 - Brian indicated that he intends to distribute the UAC's feedback to the individual(s) who completed the program review as well. This ensures that regardless of whether the meeting occurs with the Dean or VP, the program or unit receives feedback on their documented assessment process.
 - Brian shared that Anne Skleder (Provost), Jon (Interim Associate Provost), and he had met late in the summer to make a list of academic programs given priority for follow-up conversations related to assessment, based on either process issues identified by the UAC, or performance issues (performance falling below benchmark(s)). This prioritized list had been segmented by College/School and shared with the appropriate Dean prior to this meeting.
 - He indicated an intent to follow up with Vice Presidents regarding the administrative units.

Assessment Addendum/Curriculum Committee status/feedback

- Brian shared materials prior to the meeting for this discussion point. He indicated that these same materials had been shared with the Curriculum Committee for their input. The materials include:
 - An updated 'Assessment Addendum' document, incorporating recommendations from the Curriculum Committee (since intent is to add the Addendum to Curriculum proposal requirements)
 - Proposed website content (guidance & best practices for individuals completing the Assessment Addendum); This had been another recommendation from Curriculum Committee.
- The committee thought the recommendations made by the Curriculum Committee were improvements.
- A further recommended change for item #2 on the Assessment Addendum (*"Please briefly describe current plans for how student performance on each program-level SLO will be assessed. Be sure to answer where? (which course(s)), when? (frequency), and how? (assessment method) for each SLO"*) was:
 - Segment the response space on the form to ensure those completing it are responding to each of the 3 prompts (Where? When? How?).
 - Jennifer noted that it is important that the word "current" remains in this prompt, since not all assessment plans are well-developed by this stage. The Addendum provides a starting point for program assessment, but it is not anticipated that the assessment plan will be finalized at this stage in the program's development.
- Regarding the proposed web content (for use as guidance in developing an assessment plan), Christine suggested moving the UAC's contact information from the end of the content to the beginning, to ensure it is seen and understood that the UAC supports the process of developing assessment plans, and can be contacted with questions.

Faculty Co-Chair Election

- Each year, a new faculty co-chair is elected by the committee (to chair alongside Brian as Director of Institutional Research). Pat Sweeney had been faculty co-chair in 2016-17.
- Brian indicated he would send out a poll after the meeting for committee members to elect the faculty co-chair, consistent with the process followed in previous years.

D2L Capabilities that Support Assessment Processes

- Pat and Brian indicated that they have an upcoming meeting with Jason Wagner from the Office of Technology for Teaching and Learning (formerly eLearning) to discuss how new capabilities in Desire 2 Learn (D2L) can be leveraged to support assessment of student learning. They indicated that Jason may be invited to a future UAC meeting to demonstrate.

Future Meeting Dates

- Brian indicated that some committee members are not able to make it to 3rd Tuesday meetings at 11am. He suggested 2nd Thursdays at 11am as an alternative. Jennifer noted 2nd Thursday would not be possible for the October meeting, as it is during fall break. Brian indicated he would follow-up with the committee to schedule meetings for the rest of the semester.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:05pm.