University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 17, 2017
Room: CSC 102

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Kalen Churcher, Jennifer Edmonds, MaryBeth Mullen, Phil Ruthkosky, Adam VanWert, Yong Zhu

The meeting was called to order @ 11:10 am.

Minutes from the September 19, 2017 meeting were approved without revision.

Welcome of New Committee Member
- New member Adam VanWert (School of Pharmacy), joined the committee for his first meeting. Adam replaces Jon Ference as the Faculty representative from Pharmacy, due to Jon's role as Interim Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. Adam introduced himself and was welcomed by the committee members.

Update Regarding the Use of D2L to Support Learning Assessment
- Brian reported that he and Pat Sweeney met with Jason Wagner (Office of Technology for Teaching & Learning) since the last UAC meeting in September to learn about new capabilities within the University's learning management system, Desire to Learn (D2L). The new capabilities should facilitate assessment reporting for academic programs. Jason is working to develop concrete examples of the new capabilities, which he hopes to demo to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) in the spring. The UAC hopes to bring Jason in for a demo around the same time. A specific date for when the demo will be ready is not yet available.

Status Update: Assessment Addendum for Curriculum Committee
- Brian provided a brief status update – that the minor tweaks suggested at the UAC's September meeting had been incorporated into the Assessment Addendum form and Assessment Resources document intended (eventually) for the web – and sent to Karen Frantz Fry (Curriculum Chair) to share with Curriculum Committee. Unfortunately, neither Brian nor Pat had been able to attend either the September or October Curriculum Committee meetings, despite invitations, due to scheduling conflicts. The movement of the November and December UAC meetings to 2nd Thursdays (rather than 3rd Tuesdays) should enable either Brian or Pat (or both) to attend a Curriculum Committee meeting yet this semester, if requested.

2016-17 Program Review Participation Next Steps
- *Sharing WAC Assessment Information with Appropriate Parties*
  - Any information collected through the 2016-17 program review process concerning Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) will be shared shortly with the General Education Committee (GEC) and the appropriate academic dean(s).
- *Sharing Collected General Education Assessment Information with the General Education Committee (GEC)*
  - Any information collected through the 2016-17 program review process concerning General Education-related assessments of student learning will be shared with the GEC shortly to inform their discussions.
- *Analysis of Areas of Need, From UAC Review Feedback*
  - Brian indicated that since the UAC guidelines/feedback forms are in Excel, he could create a combined file of the feedback to look for patterns in the feedback that could inform UAC assessment support initiatives.
- *Meeting with Provost to Ensure Consistency of Program Review Framing with Institutional Accreditation Requirements*
  - Brian and Pat plan to meet with the Provost and Interim Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (Jon) soon to discuss adjustments that may be necessary to the program review form or process. This is to ensure we are asking for assessment-related information in such a way that it is well-aligned with the standards outlined by our regional accreditation agency, Middle States.

- *Following up on Planned Program Review Process/Form Adjustments from Last Year's Process*
  - o The majority of meeting discussion focused on this topic. Recommendations made by the committee towards the end of last year's process were included (extracted from the 2016-17 UAC End-of-Year Report) on the back of the meeting agenda for easy reference.
    - One change suggested last year had been to include something in all review forms to <u>ask about how the assessment process had been helpful/useful</u> (e.g. to find out what had been learned through the process). The committee generally agreed to the inclusion of this prompt.
    - <u>Separating the full review and annual update review forms;</u> – The committee strongly agreed that this should help to prevent confusion with the process.
    - <u>Recommendation to be more explicit in requesting rubrics (in Tabs "A1" and "A2")</u>
      - Jennifer suggested that instead of including the request for rubrics where it currently exists on the academic full review form, that "Please attach relevant rubrics" be indicated at the "What tool is being used to show achievement of outcomes" prompt. The committee agreed that this should make the call to provide rubrics more apparent.
    - <u>Tab "C" (Placement)</u> – Consideration of whether to continue including this section, due to patchy feedback, including many who indicate they do not have the means to track it.
      - Suggested in meeting to continue requesting this information, since it's good to keep it in awareness, and some/patchy information is better than no information.
      - It was also mentioned at the meeting that one prompt on the page indicates to report a percentage, and another prompt indicates to report a number. They should both indicate 'percentage' to prevent confusion.
      - Another suggestion was made in the meeting to ask whether the alum is employed in their field (if known). *This can be explored further to figure how best to integrate into the form.*
    - <u>Tab "B" (Retention)</u> – Adjust prompt to more specifically ask what can be done *by the program* to address retention or graduation rate-related issues experienced, rather than stating larger, university-level issues over which the programs have little to no control.
      - This suggestion prompted discussion, since often the larger university-level issues (e.g. accepting/enrolling under-prepared students) are a major contributor to the issues experienced and related back to the programs regarding retention & graduate rates. The committee generally agreed that with that in mind, it would still be good to ask for faculty to focus on solutions more directly within their control on the form.
      - The committee recommended including in the form a *specific example* (or examples) of what a program could do to address an issue related to retention or graduation rate-related issues, to prompt thinking.
    - <u>Tab "B" (Retention)</u> – Clarify prompt to ensure all are focusing on the same retention and graduation rate figures, based on what is most appropriate. The form currently indicates (for undergraduates) that the first-year retention goal of the strategic plan is 82%, and the 6-year graduation rate goal is 65%. For program faculty, "retention" experienced is focused more on retention within the academic program rather than retention at the University (may also be a more meaningful reflection on the program's impact). Whichever focus is most appropriate should be clarified in the instructions on the "Retention" tab, so all focus on the appropriate information provided in the Data Profile provided by Institutional Research. ***Due to time constraints, this discussion was not finished, but should be continued at the next (November) meeting.***

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:05pm.