

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 5, 2014**

Meeting was called to order @ 3:35 pm.

In addition to UAC membership, Interim Provost/Sr. VP Dr. Terri Wignot, and incoming Provost/Sr. VP Dr. Anne Skleder attended (in person and by phone, respectively).

Minutes from the April 14, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

I. Overview of ETS Proficiency Profile Results -

- a. The committee reviewed the results of the ETS Proficiency Profile, closed on April 16th. A total of 70 students participated. Since the last meeting, a Chi Square goodness of fit statistical test was run, and did not identify any significant differences between the intended proportionality of the sample and the actual sample (so sample is representative).
- b. Brian led the committee through the following summaries of test results:
 - i. Overview of scores [overall and sub-scores by skill area (reading, critical thinking, mathematics and writing) and context area (humanities, social sciences and natural sciences); Included percentile rank vs. national group of seniors from 2008-2013, as well as past results for Wilkes freshmen and seniors (including P2 pharmacy students). Blake noted that the difference in test administration methodology at Wilkes over time may account for some of the variability within the scores, and so scores should be interpreted with caution.
 - ii. Overall, skill and context-based scores by college of primary major; Since several students (24) did not report their major at the time of the test using the provided major-to-college crosswalk, the College of Science & Engineering did not have enough cases (threshold = 10) for scores to be provided. Scores were provided for Pharmacy & Nursing (N = 16), Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences (N = 11) and Business & Leadership (N=10) although the distribution of other reported majors indicated that there were still other students with majors within those colleges who reported their major differently. The School of Education only yielded a sample of 3, although this was proportionate to their frequency within the target population. Some relatively minor variation was observed between the three colleges with data, but conversation focused mainly on the failure of the crosswalk to yield the intended data for each of the 5 colleges. Brian noted the caution that ETS indicated below the table to avoid generalizing results to any sub-population with a total number of less than 50 students.
 - iii. Summary of Proficiency status (% Proficient, Marginal, Not Proficient) by skill and level (Reading 1, Reading 2, Critical Thinking/Reading 3, Writing 1, Writing 2, Writing 3, Mathematics 1, Mathematics 2, Mathematics 3) for Wilkes across all administrations to freshmen and seniors/P2s, as well as a proficiency comparison to a national group of 252 institutions with participating seniors; Overall, Wilkes fared quite well – with a higher % proficient in nearly all areas (exception: Writing 3) than the spring 2010 sample. The Wilkes sample also had a higher % proficient in nearly all areas vs. the national sample of seniors. Only Writing 2 (equal % proficient) and Writing 3 (slightly lower for Wilkes) were not areas of strength for Wilkes vs. the national comps. Overall, this notable performance by Wilkes

students yielded an 80th percentile ranking. The committee noted this excellent accomplishment and suggested a today@wilkes announcement to celebrate this success.

- iv. Graphical Overview of Proficiencies by skill and level which also includes the defining outcomes for each, as well as the Wilkes General Education outcome language for the associated skill areas (Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, and Written Communication); Dr. Skleder noted that an important next step would be to review the alignment of the ETS Proficiency Profile outcome language by skill & level with those of the Wilkes General Education Curriculum. This alignment should best inform the usefulness of the results for reflection on the GE curriculum. Brian noted that KarenBeth Bohan (spring '12 chair of GEC) had taken a first stab in doing this for 2 of the skill areas (Critical Thinking and Quantitative Reasoning) in spring 2012 in preparation for the Monitoring Report on Assessment to Middle States.
- v. Motivation Related to Test Score; comparing the survey response patterns of students scoring above the ETS-PP mean (455.3) vs. those scoring below. The data, as well as the associated scatterplots with regression lines displayed a direct relationship between motivation (perceived importance of test, effort expended) and overall test score. Adam, Ed and others noted that it looked as though a few items were reverse-scored. Brian contacted committee members following the meeting with a revised handout, correcting the percentages displayed for the reverse-scored items.

- c. Brian indicated that results should be discussed with the General Education Committee.
- d. Dr. Wignot noted that going forward with subsequent administrations of the ETS-PP, the GEC should be more involved, if not leading the effort.
- e. Dr. Skleder asked whether benchmarks had been set in order to help in interpreting the proficiency results received. Brian noted that the methodology and sample of the last administration to seniors in 2010 had been problematic, and so no benchmarks had previously been set.
- f. Adam noted that the spring 2014 results should serve as a baseline for interpreting future ETS-PP testing for seniors and P2s. He suggested using a once-every-other-year assessment schedule for the test.
- g. Dr. Skleder also noted that it is good practice to periodically “assess the assessment”.
- h. Rhonda and others noted that to the extent possible, we should integrate the ETS-PP with curriculum or make it a graduation requirement. The perception of the test as low-stakes is likely to detract from the usefulness of the results (see ‘motivation related to test score’ above).

II. UAC Involvement in Program Review process/management –

- a. Brian shared with the committee a suggested role for the UAC in the upcoming program review process – as a facilitator of the process – including mostly managing timeline and expectations (who gets assessed when). The nearly updated (as per Dr. Wignot) disciplinary accreditation schedule should also inform the timing and scope of program review for externally-accredited programs.

III. Next Meeting Date/Plans –

- a. Due to the need for the UAC to manage components of the program review process, it was the decision of the committee that monthly meetings will continue over the summer. Brian will schedule a meeting for June shortly.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:45 pm.