

**University Assessment Committee  
Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2017  
Room: UCOM 228**

**Attendees:** Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher, Jon Ference, Justin Matus, Karim Medico-Letwinsky, MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, Pat Sweeney (co-chair), Yong Zhu

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

**Minutes from the January 26, 2017 meeting were approved without revision.**

**Membership Updates**

- It was called to attention that John Hepp has stepped down from the committee. As John had been an elected faculty representative from the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, Andy Miller (FAC Chair) had been contacted by UAC leadership, indicating that a replacement representative would need to be elected to serve on the committee. At the time of this (February 21<sup>st</sup>) meeting, no replacement faculty representative had yet been elected/ notified. *[Note – the day after the UAC meeting, the Co-Chairs were notified that Christine Mellon (Communication Studies) had been elected to replace John as the faculty representative from the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences].*
- It was also brought to attention that a replacement member may be needed for Elizabeth Sullivan (Library). Due to scheduling conflicts, Elizabeth had indicated at the previous meeting that it may be necessary to find a replacement for her. *[Note – a few days after the UAC meeting, the Co-Chairs were notified – from John Stachacz (Dean of Library) and Elizabeth Sullivan, that Elizabeth’s availability has changed so she will now be able to attend the remaining UAC meetings this spring, eliminating the need to seek a replacement.]*

**Updates on the Program Review Process**

- Brian Bogert provided an update on where things stood for the program review process this spring.
  - Supporting materials (PowerPoint overviews for each process and instructional videos for completing each form) have been posted/updated on the web. A link to the information had been emailed out to everyone responsible for completing a review this cycle.
  - Individualized emails were sent from staff in the Institutional Research Office (Brian) to each appropriate department chairperson, program coordinator or director, containing relevant program review forms, a process timeline, and other supporting documentation.
  - He will send reminders out to individuals completing reviews in a few weeks.

**Policy for including new programs and units in the program review process**

- Jon Ference provided copies of drafted language for a new UAC policy for delineating when new academic programs and administrative units will undergo a first full review, and the role that the UAC will play in preparing them for that first review.
  - A few tweaks to the policy were recommended through discussion at the meeting, such as switching the order of “sufficient number of graduates” and “four years after curriculum proposal” in the determination of when new programs should undergo their first full review, and ensuring that any references to student learning outcomes were understood to be at the program or course level. Jon will adjust the language based on committee feedback and submit revised version to the chairs.
- Due to the role that the Curriculum Committee plays in reviewing and approving the curriculum for new programs (including syllabi), it was suggested that the UAC Co-Chairs contact the Chair(s) of the Curriculum Committee to discuss UAC concerns that information provided in curriculum proposals be clarified to ensure there is a foundation for assessment planning available at that stage of the process for new programs. That information could then be shared with the Assessment Committee, contingent upon approval.

### **Other items of concern/additional discussion**

- Kalen Churcher, as the General Education Committee (GEC) linking member took an opportunity to discuss an assessment-related issue that is currently under discussion in that committee. The GEC had, within the past year, extended a call to instructors of undergraduate courses that contribute to the general education core to provide updated course syllabi that align course outcomes to appropriate (spring 2015 faculty-approved) new General Education Outcomes. Results have been mixed in what has been received. Since the GEC and UAC share responsibility for assessment of general education, Kalen had suggested within the GEC that in any follow-up, they ask for not only the alignment of course to general education outcomes for the courses, but also the method of assessment used (e.g. Com101 course outcome aligned with a general education outcome that falls under Oral Communication, and is assessed using a common rubric enabling measurement of performance related to the outcomes). The academic full review form completed for undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences does collect this information, but is it only available for roughly 1/3 of programs in any given year, due to the staggered review schedule. She wanted to know, from the UAC, whether there were any recommendations for how to proceed, or whether committee members would share any particular perspectives related to her suggestion in the GEC.
  - Despite some discussion occurring, no clear direction for next steps was offered through the conversation. The discussion did bring up, though, questions about consistency in what is required content in course syllabi. It seemed that there was not as much consistency across disciplines and levels as previously thought. It was suggested that the Faculty Handbook be referenced as outlining the minimum requirements for any course syllabus.
- Justin Matus suggested that the UAC start looking more carefully at how information documented through program review is actually being used for improvement. He suggested that in the next round of program review, we could include an item that asks specifically about whether the process of the review has been useful for program improvement, and to ask what has been learned through the process.

**The next meeting is scheduled for March 21<sup>st</sup> at 11am.**

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.**