

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 19, 2015**

Attendees: Brian Bogert, Mike Garr, Karim Letwinsky, Justin Matus, MaryBeth Mullen, Amjad Nazzal, Phil Ruthkosky, Anne Skleder, Elizabeth Sullivan, Rhonda Waskiewicz, Adam Welch, and Janet Starner (invited guest)

The meeting was called to order @ 12:03 pm.

Minutes from the December 3, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

Janet Starner was introduced and welcomed to the committee meeting. Janet has been charged by the Provost with the task of coordinating documentation related to general education at Wilkes and its assessment.

Proposed Multi-year program review schedule – academic programs

- Brian Bogert projected an early draft of a multi-year program review schedule for the academic units, stressing that it would change with feedback (this draft was just to “get the ball rolling”).
- While a longer-term program review schedule had existed under the Associate Provost, there was no staggering of programs. This would be the first known plan that staggers full review of programs to prevent everything happening at once/increased competition for resources.
- Must determine what is meant by an annual update –
 - How much to update? How much work will it be? Anne is planning to incorporate this conversation into her meetings with programs when meeting to discuss program review.
- The Academic Deans will be contacted for their feedback and adjustments to the schedule

Assessment Mission Statement?

- There was some discussion about what’s actually motivating assessment at Wilkes – is it more than meeting the needs of accrediting agencies? Is it mostly about improving programs to support student learning? Do we need a mission statement to clarify? While this conversation did not result in a clear-cut answer, it brings home the need to clarify the “why is this important” when communicating about assessment.

Summary of Summaries

- Referenced, but not yet completed. Brian is planning to finalize the summary of summaries from academic program review shortly and will share with the committee. The summary of summaries from the administrative units will need to be completed soon too. The purpose of these summaries is to allow the UAC to see – across programs or units – what the common strengths and issues are - so the committee can best support and develop assessment processes based on prevailing needs.
- Adam Welch added that it will be important that we can demonstrate through the alignment of program outcomes with ISLOs – that our undergraduate curriculum is doing what we say it does.

Program Review Form(s)

- Both the form used for academic program review and the form used for administrative/non-academic program review should be reviewed and revised based on how well what was submitted could be assessed in terms of process and content. Did programs or units provide what we intended them to provide on the reviews? Were the reviews easy to follow and summarize?
 - It was noted that there isn’t as much consistency in the metrics/processes that would be used to assess the effectiveness of the administrative units as there would be for the academic units (which use program learning outcomes as core/primary focus of programmatic assessment).

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) alignment with ISLOs, Strategic Plan, etc.

- Brian projected the document representing the compilation of program outcomes shared via program review
 - Separate Excel tabs for undergraduate and graduate programs
 - Each outcome is aligned with ISLOs (by those completing the program reviews)
 - Each outcome is aligned with a Strategic Plan theme (by those completing the program reviews)
 - Achievement of each outcome is also documented
 - So can see if we are achieving the majority of outcomes aligned with (e.g.; “Strategic Theme 1” or “ISLO 1”, for example)
- We have not yet developed a graduate level set of ISLOs. The alignment done by those completing the program reviews may prove helpful when the conversation is brought to the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC). The focus/existing alignment may help in coordinating/drafting appropriate ISLOs for the graduate programs.
- These alignment tables will be included in the appendix of the Periodic Review Report (PRR).
- A suggestion offered at the meeting was to add a column to the alignment tables to indicate the action taken in response to the achievement status of the outcome.

Update on Periodic Review Report (PRR) due this summer

- Brian has been working as part of a group coordinating the PRR. So far, he has been coordinating the assessment section. He noted that Janet’s coordination of general education documentation will be useful to the process, and she may be called upon to help. The general plan for the assessment section of the report is to update information in a similar format to what had been provided in the 2012 Monitoring Report, which was also focused on assessment.

Other Business

- The WAC information provided in the program reviews will be summarized and provided shortly.
- It was suggested that we review how we are doing towards addressing the assessment recommendations from the 2010 Self Study.
- It was noted that the General Education Committee (GEC) has been very busy coordinating the update of outcomes that will soon be brought to the full faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:00pm.