# University Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes for September 3, 2014

Attendees:

Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert, Mike Garr, Phil Ruthkosky, Scott Skammer, Anne Skleder, Elizabeth Sullivan, Rhonda Waskiewicz, Adam Welch, Grace Cadigan (stand-in undergraduate student representative), and Helen Davis (GEC Chair, invited guest)

The meeting was called to order @ 3:35 pm.

Minutes from the July 31, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

### **Program Review Workshop Feedback**

- Brian shared feedback received on the academic program review workshops hosted by the UAC. Feedback was collected via a brief online survey. Although only 7 individuals responded, feedback was positive. However, a couple comments focused on having experienced some difficulty working within the form itself.
- Another comment focused on a want for more discipline-specific feedback through the program review process. It was noted in the meeting discussion that program review itself is typically more about ensuring good practice (e.g. how is the program using the information collected for program improvement?) than about discipline-specific parameters. Anne noted that in the future however, program review could bring in discipline-specific peers for reviews.

## **New Middle States Standards**

- Brian provided an overview of the new Middle States Standards that have been proposed, endorsed, and are in the
  process of being voted on by Middle States region college/university presidents. Anne noted that these standards, or
  something very much like them, will be approved. It was noted that for the Periodic Review Report (PRR) due to Middle
  States on June 1, 2015, Wilkes will be held to the 'old' standards (#1-14). There are just 7 of the new standards, but all in
  some way rely on assessment processes and information relevant to each standard.
- The new standards (see: <a href="http://www.msche.org/documents/RevisedStandardsFINAL.pdf">http://www.msche.org/documents/RevisedStandardsFINAL.pdf</a> ) will be what Wilkes must use as a guide for the next Self Study, due in 2020.

## **Proposed Changes to the UAC website**

- Brian had reviewed the website and come up with several suggestions for improvement. He talked through the suggested changes, page by page, while Adam navigated the site so committee members would have a reference point. Committee members contributed several suggestions.
  - There was a lot of energy around holding another assessment day in the future. The event would need to be planned well in advance to allow enough time for coordinating it with the academic calendar, securing funding, and determining which assessments would be taking place at the event.
  - o A FAQ page for Wilkes' program review process was another suggestion.
- Elizabeth volunteered to help make changes to the site, since she has experience updating the library site. Anne suggested the committee have an opportunity to review proposed changes once in a format easier for review. Rhonda volunteered to meet with Brian to put together a proposed revision of the website, to bring back to the committee.

#### **Drexel Assessment Conference**

• Rhonda, Ed, and Brian from the UAC and Judy Neri (Assessment & Regulatory Management, School of Education) will be attending Drexel University's first assessment conference September 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Discussion of Assessment Plan**

- Brian indicated the need to develop an assessment plan for the University that lays out which programs will be assessed
  when. Anne contributed that an assessment plan is really just a compendium of the assessment we (University) are doing,
  coordinated in one place, indicating what we found and how we'll follow-up.
- Discussion turned to an assessment-related recommendation from the 2010 Self Study (to be addressed in the PRR):
  - "The University Assessment Committee, along with appropriate administrative and academic leadership, needs to refine the current Program Review Process to: (a) Foster inclusion and promote active participation of all individuals in the unit creating the review; (b) articulate and monitor adherence to a program review timeline that provides timely and useful feedback; tracks the progress of units under review through prescribed channels; and assures that improvements in support of strategic planning can take place in a timely manner; and (c) Create a mechanism to recognize and reward excellence in support of strategic initiatives."

o Some discussion ensued regarding the link between the UAC and strategic planning, and whether it was ever intended that it would be within the purview of the UAC to participate in the assessment of the strategic plan.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15pm.

The Next UAC Meeting will be on Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>.