University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 26, 2017
Room: CSC 102

Attendees: Brian Bogert (co-chair), MaryBeth Mullen, Phil Ruthkosky, Elizabeth Sullivan, Lindsey Shay, Pat Sweeney (co-chair), Terri Wignot

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

Minutes from the December 8, 2016 meeting were approved without revision.

Establishment of a Regular Monthly Meeting for Spring semester
- It was proposed that a regular monthly meeting be established for the spring semester, to avoid the need for a doodle poll to establish each meeting date, as was done in the fall. Third Tuesdays during the club period (just the 1st hour; 11am-12pm) was the proposal, since it ensured that most (if not all) faculty should be able to make meetings, and most, if not all, staff representatives.
- Elizabeth Sullivan noted that it would be a conflict with her work schedule in the Library, and so it may be necessary for a replacement representative from the Library to be selected.
- The proposed dates (2/21, 3/21, 4/18, and 5/16) however, worked for most in attendance, so Brian indicated he would schedule those meetings following the meeting.

Draft Policy for including new programs and units in the program review process
- Although an official draft policy was not yet ready to share, the group revisited the discussion.
- It was proposed that in the first year or two that a program is in operation, the UAC checks in with program leadership to ensure they're developing the building blocks of an assessment system/process.
- Also suggested was that a communication be sent to raise awareness about the program review process, and formative approach.
- The program review form should be shared to provide context for what program (or unit) leadership will be expected to complete when ready.
- An example or two of well-done program review (ideally similar in discipline/scope) should be shared.
- Appropriate windows of time pre-full review, and adequate opportunity for development of assessment "building blocks" proposed are yet to be set, but previous discussion suggested differentiation for undergraduate (after 4 years, or after sufficient number of graduates?) and graduate (after 2 years or after sufficient number of graduates?) programs, as well as for administrative units (after 2 full years of operation).

Program Review Communications/Support
- Communication from Committee to officially open program review process
  - Pat Sweeney had previously (beginning of December) drafted a "heads up" communication piece intended to be from the committee that had not been sent due to in delay in receiving feedback on communication strategy from the Provost.
  - The committee decided to move forward with an adjusted/updated communication piece to introduce and provide information on the program review process – to go out early in the week following this UAC meeting. Brian indicated he could send directly to VPs, Deans, Chairs, and Directors (those playing primary roles in the program review process).
  - Pat and Brian also updated the group that Brian had recently attended a Dean's Meeting (1/25) to talk about the program review process this spring.
- Scheduling Workshops/contributing to workshops
  - Brian reported on the results of the survey, sent to VPs, Deans, Chairs, and Directors. Feedback received was limited (7 responses to 'Academic' survey, and 10 to 'Administrative' survey), and did not point to a clear preference in terms of the best time to hold in-person webinars or how best to focus them to meet needs.
    - Among the most popular options (particularly on the 'Administrative' survey) was to provide an overview of how to complete the form and process (as had been the focus of the in-person workshops last year). A relatively popular response had also been to make support materials available online and forego an in-person workshop. The committee had also wondered

whether many would show up for an in-person workshop, since about 25 people showed up for each of the workshops (Academic and Administrative) offered last year.

- The group decided to forego in-person workshops, but to make support materials easily accessible online.
  - o Brian indicated that he would take care of making sure adjustments to materials were made – including splitting the 2 previous PowerPoint presentations used into 4, 1 for each type of program/unit & type of review pairing (e.g. Administrative unit full review, Administrative unit annual update, Academic program full review, Academic program annual update). This committee felt this adjustment would get people more quickly to content specifically relevant for their reporting responsibilities in the current year. It was also a suggestion provided on the survey.

Institutional Surveys planned for this spring

- Brian provided a 1-page handout to the group of an institutional survey schedule (also available on the web, via the following link: http://wilkes.edu/about-wilkes/offices-and-administration/institutional-research/_assets/Wilkes-Survey-Research-Timeline-2016.pdf
  - o The purpose of sharing was to raise awareness about surveys planned for the spring semester, including the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey, the College Senior Survey (CSS), and the HERI Faculty Survey.
    - The SSI is administered every other year in the spring to undergraduate and first-professional (Pharmacy) students.
    - The YFCY is now administered every third year in the spring to students who entered as new freshmen in the previous fall semester.
    - The CSS is administered every other year in the spring to soon-to-be Bachelor's and Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) graduates.
    - The HERI (Higher Education Research Institute) Faculty Survey is only offered every three years. If Wilkes participates this spring (likely) it will only be our second time participating (first was in spring 2014).

The next meeting is scheduled for February 21st at 11am.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.