

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 20, 2018
Room: CSC 102**

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Kalen Churcher, Jennifer Edmonds, MaryBeth Mullen, Paul Reinert, Brian Sacolic, Pat Sweeney, Adam VanWert, Yong Zhu

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

Minutes from the February 20, 2018 meeting were approved without revision.

Membership Update

- Pat shared with the group that nobody is currently on the ballot to replace the elected faculty positions from the College of Arts, Humanities, & Social Sciences, and Pharmacy that Christine and Adam (respectively) will be vacating at the end of this academic year.
- Pat indicated she will contact Andy Miller (FAC Chair) to find out the protocol for filling the missing slots.

Ensuring Alignment of the UAC Review Guidelines with Form Updates

- Alignment of UAC Review Guidelines for the Annual Update forms were addressed through the first norming session.

Norming Session: Administrative Unit Annual Update

- Brian provided the group in attendance with a copy of the first Annual Update Review received for an Administrative Unit. The review used for the norming session was for the Center for Global Education & Diversity. Also provided was a copy of the UAC guidelines for review.
- Committee members were given a few minutes to review the Annual Update norming example.
- Brian used the UAC guidelines to prompt the group for the agreed-upon answers to the questions posed.
- Changes suggested to the *review guidelines*, through the norming discussion:
 - For the items that began with “If yes or *mixed* to 1b and/or 1c (above)” (*essentially – if the unit reported on objectives for which the goal either was or wasn’t reached in the last full review*) that introductory framing should be eliminated, since the updated Annual Update form asks respondents to address all objectives (or program outcomes, for academic programs) regardless of whether the goal (or benchmark for academic programs) was reached at the time of the last full review.
 - Certain items should be re-ordered to flow more naturally. For instance, any “If “Yes” to [a previous question]” items were re-ordered to immediately follow the referenced question.
 - In the new “Resources” section of the review guidelines, a new prompt was suggested to ask about resources identified/requested to address the issue going forward.
 - For the “Initiatives Undertaken in the past year” section, it was suggested that the second prompt be adjusted to ask for whether the status of the initiative was indicated (to fit the reviewer’s response options).
 - Brian indicated that he would provide a direct reference point where possible, directing the reviewer what to check on the Annual Update form (e.g. 3A, 1G) to aid in evaluating reviews.
 - Other than that, just some typos/misspellings were identified so they could be fixed.
 - Brian indicated that since the format and prompts of the Annual Update are consistent (except for differing focus on *objectives* for Administrative Units vs. *outcomes* for Academic Programs) across programs and units, the agreed-upon adjustments resulting from this norming session would inform adjustments to the review guidelines for Academic Annual Update reviews.

Norming Sessions: Additional Meeting Time(s) Needed?

- Pat suggested that the group hold off on scheduling additional meetings until we know how much is left to cover. A suggestion was also floated to have a norming session *via email*, if needed instead of calling an additional face-to-face meeting to address norming.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:10pm.