

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 9, 2018
Room: Karambelas 122**

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Rob Bruno, Kalen Churcher, Eddie Clem, Alana Guerrero, Phil Ruthkosky, Pat Sweeney, Dominick Trombetta, Yong Zhu

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

Minutes from the September 11, 2018 meeting were approved pending a minor revision.

Welcoming New Members

- The committee members in attendance went around the room to introduce themselves to the group. This was done primarily for the new members who had not been at the September meeting (Eddie Clem – Farley Library representative, and Dominick Trombetta – faculty representative from Pharmacy)

UAC Minutes – Post on Web?

- At the September meeting, there was a discussion regarding how well the UAC “communicates relevant information about assessment activity to all constituencies of Wilkes University” (1 of 3 committee functions from the charge). At that time, one of the members had noted that our posted meeting minutes were one strategy for sharing what we are doing with the University Community. UAC minutes, at least over the past several years, had not been made available to the larger University Community through the web. They had only been shared with the UAC members, and the end-of-year report was shared with FAC.
 - To address this, the UAC decided to begin posting UAC minutes to the web. There is already a page directly linked through the UAC information on the portal where this information can be uploaded. Old minutes from years ago are posted here. Brian will contact Marketing Communications to get UAC minutes posted so they are more widely accessible.

Review & Discussion of 2017-18 Program/Unit Review Results

- Brian shared with the group data for each type of review (Administrative Unit Annual Update, Academic Program Annual Update, Academic Program Full Review, Administrative Unit Full Review) resulting from the 2017-18 review cycle. Data from the 2016-17 review cycle was included for context. The intent of sharing this information was for the UAC to review and see if we can learn something useful from looking at these summaries of the reviews that the UAC had done at the end of last academic year.
 - For instance: Does the summary speak to whether there are any relevant changes/improvements on the metrics we are using? Are there areas that consistently have poor ratings?
 - As the group had not had much time to review prior to the meeting, it was suggested that the group extend the opportunity to review this information between meetings. Brian will share this information again, via email, asking UAC members to review prior to the next meeting.

Discussion of Recommended Adjustments to Review Forms/Process

Discussion of Recommended Adjustments to Reviewer Guidelines

General Education Assessment Update(s)

- These items from the meeting agenda are listed together because they were addressed together in a handout provided just prior to, and at the meeting. The handout included several suggestions compiled – based either on feedback received from the 2017-18 review process, or recommendations for changes noted when pulling together the overall 2017-18 results discussed in the section above.
- To familiarize (if new) – or re-familiarize (if not new) UAC members with the review forms, Brian began by providing an overview of the academic full review form. The academic full review form was reviewed first because the first recommendation addressed on the handout references it. Specifically, the issue was whether current general education assessment methods – collecting course-level assessment information on a specific tab within the full review form – continues to be an appropriate way to assess both the distribution and skill areas of the general education curriculum.

- Specific suggestion (from handout): ...”limit General Education information collected via program review to be only for the Distribution Areas (I, II, III, or IV) where there is not another method employed to assess those Gen Ed Outcomes (e.g. Area II regularly conducts a separate assessment).
 - Reason(s) for suggested change:
 - The Distribution requirement areas exist to expose students to new information that broadens their horizons. Courses such as Philosophy 101, Anthropology 101, or Dance 100, can be taken to meet distribution requirements. If these courses are the gen ed. path for students to expand their horizons, assessment of associated distribution area outcomes should continue to occur at the course level and can continue to be reported via the General Education section of the Academic Full Review Form.
 - However, courses taken to fulfill gen ed. skill area requirements may not need to be assessed via academic full review. **This is the recommended change.** It is not anticipated that underclassmen taking 100-level general education skill requirement courses (e.g. Computer Science 115 or Communications 101) will have sufficiently developed the associated general education skill (e.g. Computer Literacy or Oral Communication) at the time they take the course. Skill development occurs across the undergraduate experience, rather than through a single course. For that reason, it is recommended as more appropriate that assessment of the gen ed. skill areas occurs, at minimum, at the time of the senior capstone, or at least prior to graduation. **The assessment strategies needed to determine sufficient mastery of the gen ed. skill areas will need to occur outside of the academic full review, and should be determined and supported by both the General Education Committee (GEC) and the UAC.**
 - This does not mean that it is inappropriate for general education courses taken to fulfill a skill area requirement to report course level assessment on the full review form. It just means that if the University is to reference one assessment for each general education skill area, the reference point should be prior to graduation, rather than when a student is taking COM 101, ENG 101, etc.
 - Since several UAC members were not particularly familiar with the general education curriculum requirements – and because this recommendation was introduced late in the meeting, there was not much discussion.
 - However, discussion that did occur was regarding whether it was appropriate for the UAC to be involved in supporting plans for the assessment of general education skill areas; specifically – whether this was overstepping into the GEC’s charge. Brian reminded the group that the GEC’s charge indicates that the GEC will “*Work with the University Assessment Committee (UAC) to develop assessment processes for the General Education curriculum*”.
 - No definitive decisions were made regarding this recommendation at the meeting. Kalen (GEC Co-Chair and UAC linking member) indicated she would bring this discussion back to the GEC at their next meeting.
- Pat made one additional recommendation for a change to the review forms (all 4). Specifically, she asked that a date be added to the footer of the forms to make it easier to distinguish between review years.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:55am.