

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 13, 2018
Room: Karambelas 122

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Rob Bruno, Eddie Clem, Alana Guerrero, MaryBeth Mullen, Paul Reinert, Phil Ruthkosky, Pat Sweeney, Dominick Trombetta

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

Minutes from the October 9, 2018 meeting were reviewed and approved.

Discussion of Recommended Adjustments to Review Process, Forms, and Reviewer Guidelines

- The committee navigated through several suggested changes to the program/unit review process, forms, or UAC reviewer guidelines that Brian had compiled and shared with the group prior to the meeting. References were reworked since the last meeting to be easier to address during the hour.
 - **Adjustment to Process:**
 - The suggested change was to adjust the timing of when UAC feedback will be available (in process flow chart, presentations, etc.) to later in the month of September. This was because September 1st (previous date referenced) is a busy time at the start of the semester and the emailed feedback may be missed. A date later in the month will also increase the likelihood that the UAC can meet the communicated turnaround time/expectation. The committee approved using “**by/before September 30th**” as the new turnaround time expectation for UAC feedback.
 - **Adjustments to Forms:**
 - **Annual Update (AU)**
 - **ACTIONS/CHANGES IMPLEMENTED OR PLANNED BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS:**
 - There was a question of whether to keep the current items 1C, 1D, and 1G on the Academic AU form as well as items 2A & B, since all address implemented or planned actions/changes. It was noted in the discussion that items 2A & B are specifically framed as curricular changes/adjustments. Brian mentioned that sometimes content provided in the 2017-18 AUs was the same across item 1 categories and item 2 categories, and sometimes it differed. For instance, sometimes the changes referenced in 1C, D, or G relate to staffing or other issues that are not curricular.
 - Phil suggested adding space to report (as part of item 2, perhaps C & D) co-curricular (or at least non-curricular) changes that have come about as a result of assessment findings. The committee agreed with this addition to the form. Individuals completing the form can cross-reference if they’ve already addressed an implemented or planned change already (e.g. See 1G).
 - **RESOURCES TO SUPPORT PLANNED ACTIONS:**
 - **Resources Requested in the previous review:** Instead of “What resources were requested in the last review submitted” (3A), the item was adjusted to “Were resources requested in the last review submitted?” The group felt it was not necessary to revisit which specific resources were requested last review or (old 3C) what they were requested to address [so 3C was removed/replaced]. 3C was replaced with a modified version of the old 3D.
 - The group felt it was important to get a sense of the type of resources needed to address the issue from the last review (if requested resources not received), but the specifics of those resources were not necessary. Paul suggested including a dropdown menu of popular types of resources. Asking the question in this way should also help the UAC to

more easily tabulate the types of resources needed to address assessment-related issues.

- **Resources Requested in the current review:** It was noted that although the AU form asks follow-up questions on the status of resources requested to address improvement needs, any new resource needs discovered through more recent assessment results are not collected. To support plans for improvement resulting through the AU, additional 'Resource Request' items were added to the AU form. They include:
 - *Are resources requested to address any new issues related to the scope of this review? (new 3D)*
 - *If "yes", what type of resources are needed to address this new issue? (3E)*
 - *Please use this space to briefly provide any additional context/clarification regarding the resources referenced in 3E & F. (3G)*
 - This last item was included because the committee agreed that the first time resources are requested to address a specific issue, opportunity should be provided to not only categorize the type of resources but also to provide context.
- **Both Annual Update (AU) and Full Review (FR)**
 - **ENGAGEMENT IN THE PROCESS:** The suggested change here was to protect the 'Sharing Results, Plans' and 'Sharing Responsibility' prompts to prevent form-completers from adjusting those based on different content. Brian indicated that several form-completers had done that in the 2017-18 cycle. The committee approved protecting those fields. Customization is still possible in the space designated as 'Additional context/ways...[to engage other in the process]'.
- **Full Review (FR)**
 - **Academic Full Review**
 - **GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT:** A decision was made to "stay the course" with current General Education Assessment expectations for courses taken to address skill requirements. Specifically this means that the disciplines that offer courses such as English 101, Communications 101, and Computer Science 115 (commonly taken to address Written Communication, Oral Communication, and Computer Literacy skill areas) will still be expected to complete the General Education section of the full review form for those courses. At the last meeting, there had been discussion as to whether participation will continue to be necessary since additional –non-course-specific assessment strategies should soon be in place for the skill areas.
 - **MIXED RESULTS:** A suggestion was made to include a response option of 'outcome partially achieved/mixed results' for individuals completing the review forms to select when they used multiple measures and results that met the benchmark were mixed. The committee approved this adjustment. Brian noted that in the AU forms then, there would need to be an adjustment of language to reference whether the benchmarks were fully met in the previous and current review cycles.

- **Administrative Unit Full Review**
 - **UNIT PERFORMANCE ON OBJECTIVES:** It was suggested that the prompts on the administrative unit FR form could be reframed to be better able to directly evaluate unit performance related to goals.
 - The prompt about follow-up actions was expanded to collect follow-up plans for continued review & improvement regardless of whether the goal was met in the most recent assessment.
 - More specificity was added to the form to address resource needs that may stem from assessment results. As with the AU and Academic FR, common options for resources requested in the past were added to a dropdown list for form-completers to select.

The table below illustrates proposed updates to language for 2018-19 admin. unit FR cycle.

Question on Form Used in 2017-18	Proposed Adjustment(s) for 2018-19		
How did your unit perform vs. any goals your unit may have established for performance?	Please identify below the benchmark(s) or goal(s) used to determine whether the objective was met for the referenced period.	Please indicate below whether the referenced benchmark(s)/goal(s) were met for the referenced period.	
Please describe below any actions planned to improve results (if needed) moving forward.	Please briefly describe planned actions for either improving results (if needed), or continuing to achieve results that meet or exceed the benchmark(s)/goal(s) going forward.		
Will Resources be Needed for this action? Please Explain (what kind?)	Will Resources be Needed to support these actions?	If Yes (to previous), what type of resources are needed?	Please briefly describe the resources referenced

- **Adjustments to UAC Reviewer Guidelines:**
 - **Annual Update (AU)**
 - Due to adjustments to the AU form which took effect last year, there is no longer a need to ask whether outcomes that met or did not meet the benchmark in that last FR were reported. The expectation in completing the AU form is that a status update is provided for all outcomes or objectives. As such, a decision was made to remove the associated UAC reviewer guidelines (formerly 1b & 1c).
 - Language was slightly clarified for guideline 1a to be *“Was the benchmark not met for any of the program’s outcomes (or unit’s objectives) reported in the last Full Review?”*
 - The UAC reviewer guideline asking about whether a status was provided for initiatives undertaken within the past year was removed.
 - **Full Review (FR)**
 - **Administrative Units:** The UAC reviewer guidelines that ask about completion of the staff accomplishments section were removed, since it is an elective component (since 2017-18) of the review.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.