

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 16, 2016
Room: Cohen 103**

Attendees: Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher, Harvey Jacobs, Allison Kristofco, Judy Neri, Phil Ruthkosky, Patricia Sweeney, and Terri Wignot

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

Minutes from the February 17, 2016 meeting were approved without revision.

Determining Appropriate UAC Program Review Teams/Strategies:

- The group in attendance at the meeting determined the following strategies for UAC review:
 1. The next UAC meeting (April 13th) will be extended to allow sufficient time at for holding a “norming session” to ensure agreement in evaluation based on assessment process guidelines.
 2. At that meeting (April 13th) the UAC will collaboratively review several of the Annual Updates received to date. The remainder of the Annual Updates received/that will be received, will be assigned to UAC members to complete who had attended the norming session.
 3. The UAC will ensure a norming opportunity as well for the Full Reviews received, prior to assigning responsibility for reviewing based on those guidelines. Since the Full Reviews are not due in to the Dean or VP until April 1st – and not due in to IR from the Deans or VPs until May 6th, it is unlikely that the UAC will be able to hold a norming session for the Full Reviews at the April 13th meeting. A next meeting will be scheduled to ensure this opportunity is provided.
 - The group anticipates that by the time the Full Reviews are anticipated in from the Deans and VPs (by the May 6th deadline), the UAC will have had an opportunity to review most, if not all, of the Annual Updates.
 4. The group decided that when Annual Updates and Full Reviews are reviewed by UAC members (post-norming session), they will be assigned (by UAC leadership) by review, rather than by individual guideline across reviews.
 5. When assignments are made, they will not be assigned to a representative from that program or unit (e.g. Pharmacy will not review Pharmacy, Institutional Research will not review Institutional Research, etc...).
 6. The group did not feel that there would be any incentive for external (non-UAC members) to share responsibility for reviewing submitted program reviews (Annual Updates or Full Reviews). The group decided to keep the potential pool of evaluators within the committee membership.
 7. The UAC reviewed the representativeness of the group – 2 students (1 graduate, 1 undergraduate), 5 staff (although at least 1 who works with assessment in an academic area), 7 faculty (1 from each college/school + 1 Gen Ed rep), and 1 representative from the Provost’s Office (Terri).
 - The group decided that students will not have direct responsibility for conducting any of the reviews (e.g. none will be assigned to the student representatives).
 8. UAC members will not be assigned to just 1 type of review. This will ensure that all UAC members have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with both sets of guidelines (Annual Update and Full Review), and that certain members do not receive the seemingly shorter task of reviewing just Annual Updates, while others receive the seemingly longer task of reviewing just Full Reviews.
 9. Harvey asked the group whether it fell within the purview of the UAC to ask a program, post-UAC review, to re-submit the program review if what was turned in was substantially insufficient (incomplete, insufficient context, etc.). After some discussion, the UAC generally agreed that provided the feedback came on behalf of the UAC’s review, rather than from any specific individual, that sort of feedback would be appropriate for ensuring what was documented and driving the assessment review and conversations was the most accurate reflection of the assessment processes in place for the program (and so, more useful).

Other Items:

- Gen Ed, WAC, and Strategic Plan-relevant information collected via program review:
 - Brian reviewed with the group that the Gen Ed assessment information collected (from Arts & Sciences undergraduate programs with courses that contribute to the Gen Ed curriculum) would be shared with the GEC, and that there may need to be some further discussion and/or collaboration regarding the assessment information collected.
 - The same was true for Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) information collected through the Full Reviews for undergraduate programs. Since the GEC has historically (post-WAC Coordinator) been the body at Wilkes with responsibility for assessing WAC, the information collected should be shared with the GEC for further discussion and planning purposes.
 - Since all academic programs and administrative units are responsible, through the Full Reviews, for aligning their learning outcomes (academic or co-curricular) or objectives (administrative units) with strategic plan goals/themes, Brian suggested that there may be an opportunity to share the information collected with the Strategic Planning Committee.
- Area II/Scientific World Assessment this Spring:
 - Brian also shared with the committee that a group of Science & Engineering faculty are coordinating an assessment across the (course number) “105” science sections, required for non-majors in meeting general education course requirements. The assignment is an update of what had been done in spring 2012 and 2014. Updates include selection of a new ‘prompt’/article for students to read and evaluate, as well as an update of the rubrics used for review, based on the spring 2015 changes to the Gen Ed skill (Critical Thinking, Written Communication) and distribution area (Scientific World) learning outcomes. Institutional Research will be assisting with the analysis in late spring/early summer.
- Brian also shared that the Institutional Research Office had recently updated the Survey Research Timeline accessible through the IR and UAC websites.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13th at 2:30 in the same room (Cohen 103).