

**University Assessment Committee  
Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2016  
Room: Cohen 103**

**Attendees:** Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher, John Hepp, Harvey Jacobs, Justin Matus (co-chair), Karim Medico Letwinsky, MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, and Phil Ruthkosky

**The meeting was called to order @ 2:35 pm.**

**Minutes from the January 27, 2016 meeting were approved without revision.**

**Final Review of UAC Assessment Process Guidelines/Forms For Providing Feedback:**

- Brian distributed forms that UAC members will eventually be completing for submitted Annual Updates. The guidelines embedded in the forms had been adjusted since the last UAC meeting based on feedback received since, from UAC members.
  - Adjustments to guidelines since January meeting:
    - A prompt was added to ask whether the program/unit reported progress related to any other learning outcomes/objectives for which performance documented in last full review was not problematic.
    - A prompt was added to ask whether this was the first Annual Update submitted since the full review.
    - Notations were added in red text where UAC members responsible for review will need to ensure (through UAC records or the Institutional Research Office) that they have access to all relevant forms – including the last completed full review and/or the last completed annual update (if what was submitted as an annual update followed an annual update from the previous reporting year).
  - Adjustments made to the form based on feedback at the January UAC meeting:
    - Yellow–shaded response areas were added for the VPs and Deans to briefly document notes from the “closing the loop” conversations they will be having with Directors and Chairs regarding assessment processes. They will do this after receiving the UAC review feedback (will simply add their notes to the form, and form will be submitted to Institutional Research to be shared with the UAC).
  - Brian added that the yellow-shaded response areas have also been added for Deans and VPs to record their notes from Full Review meetings that occur after receiving UAC feedback on assessment process.
  - Justin noted a clarification in language (typo) on the Administrative form that should be fixed. **Brian indicated that he would make the change to that form.**
  - The committee was in agreement that these changes were improvements to the forms and process.
  - **Brian will speak to the Provost and Associate Provost about getting the word out to Deans and VPs regarding their documented notes/meetings as part of this process.**

**Overview of Program Review Process Flow:**

- Brian distributed a 1-page document, containing a “process flow” chart for program review.
- Phil and John suggested clarification regarding the number of anticipated meetings with VPs and Deans, and when documentation/notes should be provided from VPs and Deans from their meetings.
- Committee members found it easier to discuss the flow chart by referencing the “box numbers”.
- **Brian indicated that as a follow-up to the meeting, he would number the boxes, make the clarifications discussed, and send back out to the group following the meeting for additional review and feedback prior to calling it a final/accurate representation of the process.**
- Underneath the chart were “lingering questions/follow-ups” including:
  - The UAC sharing Gen Ed assessment results with the GEC,
  - What happens to the WAC assessment information collected? (e.g. shared with GEC, Provost’s Office, etc.?)
  - Program and unit performance is aligned with strategic plan goals/themes in the full review. Is there value in sharing this information, in some form, with Strategic Planning leadership?

- As there was not sufficient time to discuss these questions fully, it was tabled for a future meeting.

### **Discussion of Information that the UAC Can Help to Better Coordinate & Communicate:**

- Justin suggested that the UAC take a more deliberate role in ensuring program faculty and unit staff align their outcomes/objectives in meaningful ways with the institutional outcomes (undergraduate or graduate) and/or strategic plan themes/goals.
  - UAC members agreed that this could be helpful, and fits the scope of the charge.
  - There had been some discussion about syllabi – whether appropriate for academics to align the ISLOs with the Program Outcomes with the course outcomes on every syllabus. While some areas do this currently (e.g. Education), others see it as creating an even longer syllabus, making students less likely to read through it.
  - First steps in raising awareness of the ISLOs will be to incorporate them into the UAC’s website.
  - Phil indicated that there is no shared set of co-curricular outcomes used by all administrative units that track progress in meeting those. However, he agreed with the suggestion that it may be worthwhile to include a link to the Council for Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education (the source for co-curricular outcomes used at Wilkes) on the UAC’s website.
  - **Brian will make sure that the changes are made to the UAC site (ISLOs incorporated, CAS site linked).**

### **Continuation/Update on Gen Ed Waivers Analysis:**

- Ed provided an update (and handout) to the group, following an analysis of waivers granted by Gen Ed area since 2009. He received this information from the Registrar (Sue Hritzak).
  - Over 60% of waivers granted over that period were for Visual & Performing Arts (Area IV) course requirements. No other Gen Ed areas had nearly that many waivers over the period analyzed.
  - It was suggested that Ed bring this discussion to either the GEC (perhaps via the Registrar’s Office, which is represented on the committee), or Academic Standards Committee (ASC).
    - Harvey noted that the ASC typically deals with waivers when they have been denied within the department (if student persists in seeking a waiver).

### **Discussions Tabled for Next Meeting:**

- Discussion of “Inner Workings” of the UAC Review Process
  - Determining appropriate teams for review
  - Justin suggested that the UAC consider including reviewers from beyond the committee membership.
- Discussion regarding collected Gen Ed, WAC, and Strategic Plan-relevant information.

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:40pm.**

**The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup> at 2:30 in the same room (Cohen 103).**