

**University Assessment Committee  
Meeting Minutes for May 11, 2016  
Room: Cohen 103**

**Attendees:** Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher, John Hepp, Harvey Jacobs, Judy Neri, Elizabeth Sullivan, and Patricia Sweeney

**The meeting was called to order @ 10:05 am.**

**Minutes from the April 13, 2016 meeting were approved without revision.**

**Update on Program Reviews Received:**

- Brian provided an update on program reviews received to date:
  1. **Annual Updates (Were due 4/15):**
    - Academic: 19/28 (68%)
    - Administrative: 19/26 (73%)
  2. **Full Reviews (Were due 5/06):**
    - Academic: 22/35 (63%)
    - Administrative: 6/9 (67%)

**Update on UAC Review of Annual Updates:**

- Brian indicated that the majority of Annual Update reviews assigned to UAC members have been completed and turned in.

**Deadline for completion of UAC reviews for Annual Updates and Full Reviews**

- The group agreed that end of May (5/31) was a reasonable due date for all assigned UAC reviews to be completed and turned in.

**Norming Session for evaluating Full Reviews using UAC-developed guidelines**

- The group held a norming session for the academic and administrative Full Reviews. The committee got through 1 academic and 1 administrative review in the time allotted.
- Brian indicated that following the meeting, he would be in touch with members to communicate assignment of “norming-trained” UAC members to Full Reviews to review with the guidelines.
- Several suggestions were made for revisions to either the full program review form or instructions or the UAC review guidelines. These suggestions are to ensure we are better communicating sufficient context for UAC reviewers to provide more useful feedback. Suggestions for changes are summarized in a separate section of the minutes, below.

**Suggestions for changes to Full Review Form for Academic Program Completers:**

- To reduce confusion about the time period that is the focus of the review (prior academic year), add that into the instructions, and wherever else reasonable, to heighten awareness and understanding.
- Instead of “When was last measurement?” prompt, need to request greater specificity, since it appears that some programs may indicate here when they did the analysis rather than when the artifacts were collected. Suggestion to split into 2 questions (perhaps “When were artifacts collected?” and “When were they reviewed?”) or at the very least ensure we can identify when the artifacts reviewed were originally collected.
- More clarification may need to be provided regarding appropriately setting benchmarks and reviewing performance against them.
- There was also a suggestion to add in a field to capture the count (“N”) of students in the sample reviewed/assessed. This will help to provide sufficient context for interpretation of assessment results.
- A suggestion was also made for the academic program review to be more explicit about requesting rubrics or tools that provide context for scoring and benchmarks.
- Add a section that allows for focused narrative “Executive Summary” that provides more context from the program about the assessment process, results, and use/intended use of results. Provided this new section is explicit enough in what it is requesting, it will provide UAC reviewers with greater context for completing

their reviews of each program's assessment process. This can include prompts asking form completers to identify strengths of the program based on the reported performance on student learning outcomes.

#### **Suggestions for changes to Academic Program Full Review UAC Guidelines:**

- Remove the blue "no data entry" fields in the 'Mixed/Uncertain' column for all guideline items to allow for reviewers to indicate 'Mixed/Uncertain' if a Yes or No response is not clearly appropriate.
- Split question, "Is there a balance of direct and indirect evidence used to assess student learning?" into 2 items/guidelines, "Is direct evidence used to assess student learning?" and perhaps a second item focused on whether there is indirect evidence used to assess student learning or whether there are multiple measures cited in the review for assessing performance on the outcome.
- The current item/guideline #4 & 4a ("What actions are there to be taken?" and "Are resources needed?") should be reworded to indicate that the focus of these questions is based on student performance on SLOs rather than proposed solutions to address retention and graduation rate issues.
- Provide additional prompts for UAC reviewers in the guidelines to identify whether resources will be needed, and what type (similar to #4a), for any solutions suggested to address retention and/or graduation rate issues.
- Add an item/guideline similar to what is included for the Annual Update, "Was it documented that individuals within the program/department were provided an opportunity to contribute to the activities described in this full review?"

#### **Suggestions for changes to Full Review Form for Administrative Unit Completers:**

- To reduce confusion about the time period that is the focus of the review (prior fiscal year), add that into the instructions, and wherever else reasonable, to heighten awareness and understanding.
- Add a section that allows for focused narrative "Executive Summary" that provides more context from the unit about the assessment process, results, and use/intended use of results. Provided this new section is explicit enough in what it is requesting, it will provide UAC reviewers with greater context for completing their reviews of each unit's assessment process. This can include prompts asking form completers to identify strengths of the unit based on the reported relationship between objectives and performance.

#### **Suggestions for changes to Administrative Unit Full Review UAC Guidelines:**

- Remove the blue "no data entry" fields in the 'Mixed/Uncertain' column for all guideline items to allow for reviewers to indicate 'Mixed/Uncertain' if a Yes or No response is not clearly appropriate.
- Add an item/guideline similar to what is included for the Annual Update, "Was it documented that individuals within the unit/division were provided an opportunity to contribute to the activities described in this full review?"

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