

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 21, 2017
Room: CSC 101**

Attendees: Brian Bogert (co-chair), Jon Ference, Christine Mellon, MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, Phil Ruthkosky, Pat Sweeney (co-chair), Yong Zhu

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

Minutes from the February 21, 2017 meeting were approved without revision.

Introduction of New Member

- Christine Mellon is the newly-elected faculty representative from the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (CAHSS). Christine introduced herself to the committee, and the existing committee members in attendance did likewise. This was Christine's first meeting as the CAHSS faculty representative.

Policy Discussion/Follow-Up

- This discussion was concerning the development of policy language to indicate when appropriate for new academic programs and administrative units to enter the program review process. Also included in the policy language is an expectation that new program and units will take steps early in their existence to sketch out components of an assessment plan. This discussion is a continuation from the February meeting.
- Jon Ference had made minor adjustments to the language for new academic programs, following the previous meeting, based on committee feedback.
- Brian Bogert had added language detailing an equivalent process for new administrative units.
- The committee members in attendance were supportive of all updates to the policy language.
- Christine indicated that this is an important policy and we should be cognizant of how it is communicated.
- Jon suggested that it could become a reference document for curriculum proposals for new academic programs. The foundation for an assessment plan could be submitted, using a standard set of prompts on an addendum to the regular curriculum proposal.
- The committee was in agreement that this sounded like a workable solution to ensure this is added into existing processes, rather than creating a new, standalone process which may not have the same traction.
- At minimum, program outcomes should be developed by this (curriculum) stage, as well as a general sense of an assessment plan.
- Brian indicated that he would draft a prompt to propose to Curriculum Committee as an addendum to their form/process, and circulate to UAC members prior to the next meeting. Once the UAC had an opportunity for feedback/adjustment, the UAC Co-Chairs can share the policy and proposed addendum to the curriculum form with the Chair of the Curriculum Committee.
- The committee considered how the policy could be integrated into a university process for the new administrative units. Phil Ruthkosky suggested that the UAC could check in with the Vice Presidents annually for an update on any new units.

Additional Discussion

- MaryBeth asked about whether the new WilkesEDGE program would be assessed as an administrative unit, since it is not an academic program. Brian indicated that it would likely be assessed differently, outside of the program review process (e.g. Institutional Research office will be tracking the academic performance of those receiving an offer to the program who accepted vs. those who denied their EDGE offer, but still attended Wilkes).
- Phil indicated that there are likely programs, such as Study Abroad (as one example) which are not currently covered by the University's program review process, which may require different methods or metrics to properly assess performance.
- The UAC will need to begin thinking of how to support the assessment processes of these different types of units that do not fit as easily into either an "academic program" or "administrative unit" category.

Discussion of a Next Meeting

- Pat Sweeney indicated that she will not be able to attend the next scheduled UAC meeting in April (18th) and so would like the group to consider an alternate meeting date, so she can attend. The UAC is likely to begin holding norming sessions for using UAC guidelines with submitted Annual Update program reviews at the next meeting.
- After discussing various options, the group decided not to reschedule the April 18th meeting until a viable alternative has been selected. The group also considered whether the May 16th meeting date should stay on the schedule, and whether any norming meetings should be over 1 hour in length, since norming sessions held last spring tended to be long meetings with much discussion.
- Brian will send a doodle poll following the meeting to determine UAC member availability during the week of April 24th through 28th for an alternate meeting date.

The next meeting is *currently* scheduled for April 18th at 11am.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:50am.