

**University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 18, 2016
Room: Cohen 103**

Attendees: Brian Bogert (co-chair), Jon Ference, Justin Matus, Karim Medico-Letwinsky, Lyndsey Shay, Patricia Sweeney (co-chair), Christine Walsh, Terese Wignot, Yong Zhu

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

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

New Faculty Co-Chair

- Pat Sweeney had been elected (following the last meeting) by the committee as the UAC faculty co-chair for 2016-17.

Welcome of New Members

- New undergraduate student representatives, Christine Walsh and Lyndsey Shay, introduced themselves to the committee. Christine and Lyndsey were elected to be undergraduate student representatives to the committee by Student Government. Committee members went around the room to introduce themselves. This was also Jon Ference's first meeting. Jon replaced Harvey Jacobs as the faculty representative for the School of Pharmacy.

Review of Proposed changes to the Program Review form/process

- Brian projected the **academic full review form** used in 2015-16 and associated guidelines for the group, and passed out copies of the May 11, 2016 meeting minutes, which documented proposed changes to form and process. Changes verified for the next form include:
 - More explicit wording on 'Instructions'/Cover page indicating that data should reflect the last fully completed academic year (fall-spring-summer). Communications about the process should reference the assessment information in the same way.
 - Split the current #13 ("When was last measurement?") on full review forms A1 & A2 (Program Learning Outcomes Assessment) into 2 questions: "When were artifacts/assignments collected?" and "When were artifacts/assignments reviewed?". This will provide greater clarity for reviewers in ensuring that the individuals completing the forms are referencing assessment information from the appropriate academic year.
 - The count ("N") of artifacts/assignments reviewed for the assessment should be incorporated into the form (near "findings from most recent measurement", or "interpretation of findings...") to provide additional context for interpreting the generalizability of the assessment results.
 - More explicit call/request for rubrics or tools used for referenced assessments
 - Incorporation of a focused Narrative following FR A1 & A2 that allows the form-completer to provide greater context that will be helpful for reviewers. Prompts may include describing how the assessment evidence reflects on the program in terms of strengths, challenges.
- In discussing the **academic full review guidelines for UAC reviewers**, the following changes/updates were verified for inclusion in the next round of assessments:
 - Removal of "no data entry" fields in "Mixed/Uncertain" column. (This change had already been made prior to UAC reviews last spring). Any "(yes, no)" or similar text accompanying review guidelines will be removed for this next iteration, to ensure reviewers do not have contradictory prompts that would prevent them from responding with "Mixed/Uncertain" where appropriate.
 - Instead of the current review guideline prompt, "Is there a balance of direct and indirect evidence used to assess student learning?", there should be a split into 2 separate questions for reviewers to respond to. These include a question about whether "there is direct evidence....." and then whether there is "indirect evidence.....".
 - Wording on the reviewer guideline forms will be adjusted to ensure the current #4 & 4a are explicitly stated actions to be taken and associated resources related to the assessment of student learning documented in FR Form A1 or A2.
 - A similar guideline prompt should be added for resources needed to address any documented retention or graduation rate issues from FR Form B.

- The Annual Update review guidelines have a prompt to address whether individuals within the program/department were provided an opportunity to contribute to the activities described in the annual review. The full review form includes the same 'engagement' item as the annual review form, so the group felt it appropriate to add to the Full Review guidelines a prompt to address whether it was documented in the full review that individuals within the program/department were provided an opportunity to contribute.
- As the group ran out of time, Brian indicated that he would follow-up with the group via e-mail to address the **proposed changes to the full administrative unit review form and associated reviewer guidelines**. It was noted in the meeting that the proposed changes for the administrative review form and guidelines were also (already) addressed in the academic full review form (so the group would be unlikely to have an issue with the proposed changes).
- **Brian will distribute updated draft versions of the form prior to the November meeting, with changes incorporated into the forms.**
- It was also noted that Deans and VPs will need an additional opportunity to review the multi-year assessment schedule to make any necessary adjustments to the assessment plan for their programs prior to January.
- The group also indicated that dates for the next round of program review need to be determined and communicated soon. Brian indicated that at this point, he anticipates that dates used in the 2015-16 will be similar for those used in 2016-17. **He will check in with the Provost and get back to the committee with specifics.**
 - It was suggested that a communication go out to Deans, VPs, Chairs, and Directors to provide a "heads up" about the program review process deadlines, forms, and support shortly.
- A **"thank you" message to those who participated in the 2015-16 program review process** was also suggested. It was noted that there has been no official communication to date directly from the UAC to thank people for participating in the process. It was noted that it could be as simple (on the academic side) as someone taking a couple minutes in a full faculty meeting to thank people for their participation.
- Pat added that it would be good to gain clarity about where we are in "closing the loop" for the 2015-16 program review process, since the forms the UAC anticipated reviewing from Deans and VPs, following their post-UAC feedback meetings with Chairs and Directors, have not been received. **Terri indicated that several meetings between the Provost, Deans and Chairs for the full reviews are in the process of being set up to close the loop.**

A More Consultative Role

- The May proposal to better clarify address appropriate benchmarking segued into a discussion on how the UAC can better support assessment processes by *meeting people where they are*. One recommendation that Karim shared for how we could do this was to host brown bag lunches or something similar on assessment topics of need or interest, where there would be room for more informal and specific discussion.

A next meeting date (for November) will be set following the meeting, using a Doodle poll.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:05pm.