

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 8, 2014**

Attendees: Ed Bednarz, Brian Bogert, Karim Letwinsky, Justin Matus, MaryBeth Mullen, Amjad Nazzal, Kathryn Roshong, Anne Skleder, Elizabeth Sullivan, Patricia Sweeney, Rhonda Waskiewicz, Adam Welch, and Helen Davis (GEC Chair, invited guest)

The meeting was called to order @ 3:00 pm.

Minutes from the September 3, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

Welcome of New Members

- New members were welcomed. Committee members briefly introduced themselves.

Needed Update to Committee Composition Language

- The integration of 3 new faculty (instead of 2), bringing the current total of elected faculty representatives to 6, was a suggestion made by the current FAC Chair, Jon Ference, and supported by UAC leadership. This change was contingent upon a revision of the UAC composition language in the Faculty Handbook.
 - “Five elected faculty members (one from each college or school whenever possible)” will be changed to “A faculty member from each college or school” or similar language, to allow for representation to change as the University changes, without needing to update the composition language each time.
 - **Adam Welch will submit the appropriate documentation for the change to be approved.**

Program Review Status Update

- Brian Bogert noted that the 10/15 deadline is around the corner, and that several department chairpersons or unit heads had been in touch regarding completion of their program review reports.
- Going forward, the UAC will coordinate a rotation schedule for understanding when each program or unit will be involved in a cycle of assessment, and at what level (full review, annual update, etc.).
 - Justin Matus noted that the UAC must be sensitive to accreditation schedules and associated workload for externally-accredited programs in determining the schedule.
 - Rhonda Waskiewicz shared that the review that the UAC will be doing will be different in scope than a disciplinary review by a program accreditor. Any feedback provided will be more about good process than discipline-specific information. The UAC will also find out about issues that cut across programs or units, which will help the UAC in supporting assessment needs.
 - Anne Skleder indicated that a full review every 3 years is best practice. 2014 should be considered a “reset” year.
- Anne Skleder noted that external reviewers will be brought in for future cycles of review for an external review of non-accredited programs.
- **Next Steps**
 - Rhonda Waskiewicz noted that it will be important for the UAC to determine appropriate next steps once program review reports have been collected.
 - Suggestions offered by the committee included the development of guidelines that articulate criteria for review. The guidelines would help in framing major findings, and provide information useful for facilitating the conversations (e.g. Provost-Deans-Chairs, etc.) that result.
 - Justin Matus noted that the UAC must be careful not to be overly prescriptive in the review.
 - Anne Skleder noted that actions to be taken indicated on the submitted forms will be important for guiding the UAC review and the subsequent conversations and planning that result. She indicated that these conversations will be the most important part of the program review process.
 - Karim Letwinsky asked whether program review ‘actions to be taken’ may change following those conversations. Anne indicated that may be likely. Brian asked that those program review documents be updated following the conversations and re-submitted, so that the UAC has the most recent records, and will know what was been decided. This will impact the ‘Actions to be Taken’ pre-filled into the next round of program review.
 - **Anne, Adam and Brian will meet before the next UAC meeting to draft guidelines for review.**

Drexel Assessment Conference Feedback

- Ed Bednarz, Rhonda Waskiewicz, and Brian Bogert each briefly contributed something about what they learned at the recent conference. All felt attendance was worthwhile.

Update on Proposal of Changes to UAC Website

- There was not sufficient time to discuss proposed changes to the website. They will be shared at a later date.

GEC/UAC to Work More Collaboratively

- Helen Davis spoke briefly about the importance for the committees to work collaboratively. She referenced the recent general education assessments that took place (ETS Proficiency Profile and Area II/Scientific World), which the GEC will soon be reviewing.
- Helen and Brian provided an overview of recent GEC discussion on the following two 2010 Self Study recommendations relevant to General Education Assessment:
 - "The University must develop, implement, and communicate the process through which undergraduate students are able to test out of one or more of the skill areas within the General Education requirements"
 - GEC members indicated that the language in the bulletin should be changed to reflect current practice. Undergraduate students do not test out of a skill area, but the department chairperson may exercise discretion in assigning the student credit based on his/her situation.
 - "The University Assessment Committee must clarify the assessment methodology and reporting process for courses within the distribution and skill areas of the General Education core."
 - This is part of the reason why the committees should be working together closely – to ensure the UAC is involved in the conversations about appropriate methodology and process for assessing the general education curriculum.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00pm.

The Next UAC Meeting will be on Wednesday, November 12th.