

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 25, 2017
Room: CSC 103**

Attendees: Brian Bogert (co-chair), Jon Ference, Christine Mellon, MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, Phil Ruthkosky, Elizabeth Sullivan, Patricia Sweeney (co-chair)

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

Minutes from the April 18, 2017 meeting were approved without revision.

Update on status of Assessment Addendum for Curriculum Proposals

- Brian Bogert updated the group on the discussion from the Curriculum Committee Meeting.
 - Curriculum had no objections to the proposed addition to their process (Assessment Addendum), although they provided related concerns or suggestions they would like to be addressed:
 - The Curriculum Committee suggested that the **UAC provide additional guidance to those completing the Assessment Addendum through a link to best practices/program assessment guidelines posted through the web**. That way (with it being a link to online content) as supporting information changes, the Curriculum Committee's forms will not need to be adjusted.
 - Brian indicated that he would pull together guiding information this summer and post it through the UAC website & provide the link to the Curriculum Committee.
 - **Include an additional prompt titled something like "Accreditation Requirements/Comments"**, with the understanding that a program may be required to frame things in a specific way due to program accreditation needs (and so clarification related to accreditation-required framing can be provided).

Norming Session for Full Review

- The majority of the meeting time was spent as a norming session for the Academic Full Review. Handouts were provided for 1 academic program. Brian facilitated the group's review.
- **Discussion during the group norming session brought up several suggestions for adjustments to the academic full review form for 2017-18, including:**
 - **B. Retention – 1.)** In "Action" section, adjust prompt to more specifically ask what can be done to address the problem by those reporting it, rather than allowing respondents to focus only on larger/university-level issues over which they have little or no control.
 - **B. Retention – 2.)** Clarify which retention and graduation rates should be referenced to ensure all are focusing on the same ones. Essentially – should the focus be retention or graduation in the original major?.....or at the University (regardless of the major/degree they end up with?).
 - **C. Placement** – Consider whether worthwhile to keep this section as part of form, since most do not collect and/or feel that it is not their job to track it.
 - **D. Involvement in Process Question** – Clarify prompt (check/update language on **each form & in the guidelines**) to make sure language is clear that intention is to find out about involvement in *SLO assessment process* documented in review.

A Doodle poll will be sent to committee members to schedule a last meeting for the semester.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00pm.