

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 13, 2016
Room: Cohen 103**

Attendees: Brian Bogert (co-chair), Kalen Churcher (attending on behalf of GEC), Justin Matus, Karim Medico-Letwinsky, MaryBeth Mullen, Judy Neri, Phil Ruthkosky, Patricia Sweeney, Yong Zhu

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

Minutes from the May 11, 2016 meeting were approved without revision.

Welcome of New Members

- Committee members (re-)introduce themselves and their representation area.
- Yong Zhu was introduced to the committee as a new faculty representative from the College of Science & Engineering (replacing Ed Bednarz).
- The new faculty representative from the School of Pharmacy, Jon Ference, was unable to attend, but was acknowledged as replacing Harvey Jacobs on the committee. Brian noted that Harvey had stepped down in his role as Assistant Dean of Pharmacy (in charge of organizing their assessments), and Jon had taken his place in that role. The Dean (Dr. Graham) had contacted FAC for their approval of the change in elected faculty representation, due to the circumstances (approved).
- Kalen indicated that she was attending as a representative from the General Education Committee (GEC), but the committee has not yet made an appointment for the "linking member". Kalen is co-chair of the GEC with Emily Havrilla, and will notify UAC leadership when an official appointment has been made.
- Brian noted that the committee does not yet have student representatives (1 undergraduate, 1 graduate) for this academic year. Phil indicated he would be in touch with Allie Grudeski (Student Government President) regarding the appointment of the undergraduate student representative.
- There was brief discussion that the graduate student representative could be selected by a committee member (as has been done in the past), or the Graduate Studies Committee could be consulted for a recommendation or appointment. Brian will follow-up on this matter.

Brief Review of Committee Charge

- The committee charge was briefly reviewed/read as a reminder of our primary functions and representation. Brian provided some brief examples of how we had addressed the functions within the past year or two.

Election of 2016-17 Faculty Co-Chair

- Justin Matus, who served as UAC Faculty Co-Chair in 2015-16, has decided not to continue in that role in 2016-17. Both Justin and Brian spoke a little about the responsibilities of the role.
- Faculty representatives were asked about their interest in serving in the role for 2016-17. To be consistent with past practice (also because not all UAC faculty representatives were present), Brian will send out a Survey Monkey ballot for UAC members to cast their vote. Brian will follow-up with the faculty member receiving the most votes to ensure he/she is willing to serve.

Sharing Recent/Current/Upcoming Assessment Activities

- The group engaged in sharing information about recent, current, or upcoming assessments, including:
 - Kalen indicated that the GEC will be looking into how to assess the GE learning outcomes related to Critical Thinking and Diversity at the course level.
 - Justin shared that the idea he had proposed to the UAC last spring – about participation in the ETS Proficiency Profile (longer version), despite looking promising last academic year, has not received the funding needed to move forward as a university initiative.
 - Yong and Brian shared information about an assessment conducted last spring into the summer, of general education skills in the following GE areas: Area II/Scientific World (distribution), Critical Thinking (skill), and Written Communication (skill). Holly Frederick had coordinated the assessment with a team of Science & Engineering faculty (Yong Zhu, Ernie Trujillo, Bill Biggers, and Ron Pryor), with assistance in setup and analysis from Institutional Research. The faculty team had selected a

new article/prompt, and assessed student performance based on the updated (2015) GE learning outcomes. Rubrics had been updated to align with the language of the new outcomes. Brian noted that this may be the first known assessment of some of the new GE outcomes. He indicated that the GEC should receive a report of the results soon.

- Phil shared information about several assessments, including assessments of Bystander Training, and a Campus Climate Survey (focused on harassment, etc....related to Title IX). The Campus Climate Survey is administered every other year. He also shared information about a Community-Based Learning (CBL) Survey that Megan Boone Valkenburg had recently distributed via the faculty and staff distribution lists. The purpose of the CBL is to collect information so the fuller impact of Wilkes (particularly faculty and students) on the community is better understood and documented.
 - Committee members shared that there is a lot that could be documented, including required service hours of undergraduate Nursing students (offered by Pat), and student involvement through the Personal & Professional Development (PPD) program through the Sidhu School (offered by Justin).
- MaryBeth let the committee know about the Transition to College Inventory (TCI), a survey that had recently been administered to incoming freshmen. Results of the survey provide an early indication of students who may be at risk of experiencing academic difficulty in their first year, based on non-cognitive factors (attitudes, expectations, etc.). Results inform University College's "watch list", prior to the availability of mid-term grades/early alert.
- Brian added that another survey that had recently been administered to incoming freshmen is the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey. The survey provides a baseline for other surveys the students may take [such as the Your First College Year (YFCY) or the College Senior Survey (CSS)] from which student change over time can be analyzed and compared to student change at benchmark groups of institutions participating nationally.

Updates on Program Review Process Outcomes and Status

- Brian shared some final 2015-16 program review participation statistics with the group:
 - Academic program Annual Updates: 76% (19/25)
 - Administrative Unit Annual Updates: 96% (23/24)
 - Academic program Full Reviews: 69% (24/35)
 - Administrative Unit Full Reviews: 75% (6/8)
- UAC reviews were completed for each of the program review reports received.
- Brian also shared that the final "closing the loop" part of the 2015-16 process has not yet been received from VPs and Deans. All UAC review information had been shared before the end of July with the Provost, Deans, and VPs. A meeting to discuss the UAC reviews had been offered at that time, and in a follow-up call, if there had been no response to the initial e-mail. Some meetings and/or conversations did occur. There may have been some confusion about what the UAC was asking VPs and Deans to do to complete the assessment loop for the 2015-16 program review cycle. Brian indicated that he would follow-up with the Provost about this.
- Judy shared that although the School of Education has not yet officially completed the "closing the loop" component, she is aware from conversations with the Dean (Rhonda Rabbitt) and from her own observations that the feedback received from the UAC varied quite a bit from review to review in its usefulness – although noted that since some of the programs indicated an overhaul in terms of the program's assessment methodology, there may not have been much about recent or current processes to respond to.

Next Steps for 2016-17 (Discussion)

- Karim suggested that the UAC could consider finding opportunities for assessment discussions with department chairpersons (and administrative directors) focused on richer conversations about their assessment processes. The thought is go move beyond the larger-scale workshops and informational videos that the UAC had provided last year to ensure greater opportunity for individualized discussion and answering specific questions. The group agreed that this was a good direction for committee focus.

- Justin added that it would be beneficial for more faculty (whether on the UAC or not) to attend Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) workshops, since it would heighten awareness of the importance of assessment processes, as they relate to our institutional accreditation.
- Brian added that MSCHE has progressed in their move to a new accreditation review timeline and format. As discussed previously, it will be 8 years between full self-studies, with annual updates provided by the institution each year in between. A mid-way review will occur by a group of external evaluators, but there will be no mid-way report (previously the Periodic Review Report (PRR), like Wilkes had submitted in 2015). Brian indicated he would share a MSCHE newsletter he received from the Provost, which contained an overview of the changes, as well as a presentation at upcoming town hall meetings.

A next meeting date (for October) will be set following the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:10pm.