

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 17, 2018
Room: CSC 103

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Kalen Churcher, Jennifer Edmonds, Christine Grieco Mellon, MaryBeth Mullen, Paul Reinert, Phil Ruthkosky, Brian Sacolic, Pat Sweeney, Yong Zhu

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

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

Membership Updates for Next Year

- Outgoing members Christine Grieco Mellon and Adam VanWert were thanked for their service on the committee. Pat and Brian noted that Rob Bruno will replace Christine as the faculty representative from the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, and Dominick Trombetta will replace Adam as the faculty representative from the Nesbitt School of Pharmacy.

Discussion of Curriculum Committee's Assessment Addendum at May 3rd FFM

- Brian noted that the Curriculum Committee will provide an update to the full faculty at the upcoming May 3rd Meeting. The Chair of Curriculum Committee (Karen Frantz Fry) had suggested that UAC members attend if possible, in case there are questions. A handout of what the new content looks like embedded into the Curriculum Committee's Proposal Form was distributed to re-familiarize UAC members. Pat and Brian noted that they will attend the meeting, but encouraged other members to attend also.

Norming Session: Academic Program Annual Update (AU)

- It was determined that due to the similarity of the Annual Update forms (between Administrative Units and Academic Programs) and reviewer guidelines, a separate norming session would not be held for the Academic Program Annual Update.

Norming Session: Academic Program Full Review (FR)

- Brian provided the group in attendance with a copy of one of the first Full Reviews received for an Academic Program. The review used for the norming session was for the BS in Mathematics. Also provided was a copy of the UAC guidelines for review.
- Committee members walked through the Full Review norming example together. There was some discussion about how critical the UAC should be about the clarity of the wording of programmatic learning outcomes. The ultimate agreement was that provided it is obviously measurable based on the measurements/evidence documented, there would not be a need to indicate concern regarding the clarity of the outcome language.
- Another discussion focused on where within the form to focus to determine whether the review identified strengths of the program. It was clarified that the first step for the reviewer should be to look at whether certain benchmarks were met, while others were not. If that is the case, there are certainly some areas where student learning is stronger (at least in terms of meeting benchmarks) than other areas. A second step, if needed, would be for the reviewer to focus on the open-ended section content, where the individual completing the form can provide additional context to clarify strengths and/or other content provided in the student learning outcome section of the full review.
- Changes suggested to the **review guidelines**, through the norming discussion:
 - For the final guideline/reviewer prompt, "Did the program identify other ways in which faculty were involved in the activities described in this Full Review?" – a prompt was added to the green-shaded open-ended feedback box aligned with the yes/no responses, asking for a brief summary of other strategies used. This was added to facilitate determining the frequency of additional common strategies used for engaging faculty in assessment, so they can be added to the form in the future, if warranted.
 - Brian noted that he would add cross-references to the actual form where possible (similar to what was done for the Annual Updates) to ensure reviewers are all reviewing the same content/sections when responding to guideline prompts.

Norming Session: Administrative Unit Full Review (FR)

- Brian provided the group a copy of a Full Review received for an Administrative Unit. The review used for the norming session was for the Finance Office. Also provided was a copy of the associated UAC guidelines for review.
- Committee members walked through the Full Review norming example together.
- The same changes (as for the Academic FR) were suggested to the **review guidelines**, through the norming discussion.

Additional Discussion/Items

- Brian will contact UAC membership shortly with information on how to access all materials needed to perform assigned reviews. He will also randomly assign reviewers to reviews.
- Brian indicated that he would also circulate a draft of a UAC End of Year Report shortly for member feedback/review.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:20pm.