University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 27, 2016
Room: Cohen 103

Attendees: Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher, John Hepp, Harvey Jacobs, Allison Kristofco, Justin Matus (co-chair), MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, Phil Ruthkosky, Elizabeth Sullivan, Patricia Sweeney, Terri Wignot, and Jeremy Yeoman

The meeting was called to order @ 2:33 pm.

Minutes from the December 9, 2015 meeting were approved without revision.

Recap of Recent UAC Support of Program Review Process:
- Brian provided an overview of program-review related happenings since the committee's last official meeting in early December.
    - This included:
        - Program Review Workshops held….
            - for Administrative Units (January 13th)
            - for Academic Programs (January 14th)
        - Program Review Webinars developed….
            - for Administrative Units (by Elizabeth Sullivan), and
            - for Academic Programs (by Kalen Churcher)
- It was noted that the webinars are completed, and should be posted to the web/available for viewing by the end of the week. Brian had set up a meeting with Marketing to get them posted.
- An e-mail will be sent shortly - to committee members and those involved in the program review process to provide links for viewing the appropriate webinar for their review process
- Brian thanked Elizabeth and Kalen for creating the webinars, and all UAC members who assisted in preparation for, and presentation of – the workshops (includes Phil, Harvey, Kalen, Karim, Terri, and Judy).

Review of UAC Guidelines for Assessment Process Review:
- **Full Review vs. Annual Update**
    - The committee determined that the guidelines used for review of the previous program review process (separate sets for academic programs and administrative units) should again be used this year for the programs undergoing a Full Review.
    - It was discussed that the guidelines exist for the UAC to provide feedback to facilitate assessment-related discussions that may occur as a result of the program review process.
        - Justin noted that the committee should not get too caught up in wordsmithing, since guidelines will never be perfect, but must be useful (for UAC review, looking at aggregates and trends). The committee agreed that the guidelines established for the 2014 program review should be useful for the 2015-16 Full Review.
    - The committee agreed that there should be some sort of review as well for the Annual Updates submitted. It was noted that nothing is more frustrating for those completing the program/unit reviews, than not receiving any feedback about what they have taken the time to provide.
        - Judy noted that guidelines would likely follow the 3 questions/prompts on the annual update form closely.
        - As a follow-up to the meeting, Brian will draft suggested guidelines for the UAC to use for evaluating the assessment process documented through the Annual Updates. These will be distributed to the committee for review & feedback prior to the next meeting.
    - To strengthen the committee's support of 'closing the assessment loop', Terri suggested adding a column to the guideline templates (for Full Review and Annual Updates) for VPs and Deans/Provost to provide notes from the conversations they have with Unit Directors and Program Chairpersons (respectively) regarding assessment processes.
        - The committee agreed this would be useful – both to support the process, and for documentation of it. These 'notes' columns will be added to the guideline forms.

- o Justin noted that one of the next things we will need to do is determine the most appropriate way for UAC members to go about using the guidelines for review (e.g. Who reviews the academic full reviews?....the academic annual updates?...the admin unit full reviews?....the admin unit annual updates?....assign individuals to specific questions across reviews?, etc…)

<u>Additional Discussion</u>:
- **Assessment Time Frame:** Judy brought up an 'assessment time frame' issue – an inconsistency in what has been done in the School of Education between undergraduate and graduate programs. The inconsistency is regarding which summer to include in reporting assessment activity by academic year. Undergraduate programs consider summer to be the last term of their academic year. For graduate programs (at least at the Master's level - GTE), it is the first term of their academic year.
    - o The committee expressed that unless absolutely necessary to maintain the two different systems, it made sense for all to use the same 'academic year' reporting time frame. Since the typical chronological framework for an academic year is fall-spring-summer, it was recommended that GTE programs use that framework also.
- **Gen Ed Waivers/Exemptions:** Ed Bednarz shared a potential research project that he had been pondering, related to the diversity of paths that students use to progress through the General Education (GE) Curriculum at Wilkes. The inquiry stemmed from issues that have come up in his advising of students. Specifically, he wondered how common it was for students to receive a waiver or exemption, excusing them from completing specific GE required courses (for fulfilling distribution or skill area requirements).
    - o Perceptions of UAC members varied, with some believing – from their experience that it was common, while others believed it was not.
    - o John indicated that the individual circumstances involved in each case vary considerably.
    - o Harvey indicated that this type of inquiry may be most related to the work of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC).
    - o There was some conversation about whether the inquiry was "Cognos-able" (whether a query could be developed to pull coded information from Banner). If anyone can answer this, it would most likely be someone in the Registar's Office, or IT.
    - o It was suggested that Ed contact the Registrar's Office and/or the current chair of the ASC, Chris Henkels if deciding to pursue this inquiry further.
- **Next UAC Meeting(s):** The committee indicated that this same meeting time on Wednesday afternoons should work for everyone going forward. Brian will send out calendar meeting invitations following the meeting for the next several meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:40pm.

The next meeting will be at the same time of day on a Wednesday in mid-late February, and will be scheduled following the meeting.