

University Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 12, 2014

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

The meeting was called to order @ 3:03 pm.

Minutes from the October 8, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

Membership Language Update

- Adam updated the group that he had submitted paperwork to the FAC to alter language on elected faculty representation on the committee to read, “one from each college or school”. This was a follow-up action item from the October meeting.

Program Review Updates

- Adam and Brian shared that nearly 60 academic programs had turned in a program review and close to 30 administrative units had done the same.
- Brian and Adam presented proposed guidelines that would be used to facilitate ‘closing the loop’ for the academic program review. Guidelines focused primarily on the existence of program-level learning outcomes, their clarity, measurability, how and where measured (e.g. a specific course assignment, standardized exam, etc.), results vs. benchmark, and planned follow-up from the assessment. Additional items focused on program’s reflection on retention rates, graduation rates, and whether the program collects information on placement of graduates.
 - UAC-member feedback on the guidelines themselves focused largely on separating double-barreled items (e.g. are outcomes clear and measurable?) into separately-assessed items.
 - Karim suggested that it may be helpful to provide additional context for why certain items were included on the review and were important enough for the review guidelines. For instance, if there is no punitive implication for the program for the placement question to be asked, it will be important to communicate that clearly.
 - Brian confirmed that there was no punitive implication in asking that question on the review form. **Brian will revise the guidelines based on the committee’s feedback and provide the additional context sought – and share the result with the committee.**
- Brian and Adam shared a preliminary plan for the review of the academic program review forms received: the Provost and UAC co-chairs get together and review them, using the final set of guidelines that resulted from UAC feedback.
 - Patricia suggested that each review be reviewed by more than 1 individual.
- Brian indicated that assistance would be needed for reviewing the administrative unit program reviews.
- Several UAC members (Rhonda, Karim, Phil, and MaryBeth) indicated that they would help with the UAC review of the reviews received (using the guidelines) if needed.

Other Program-Review Related Conversation

- Justin shared concerns about the UAC grading programs or providing program-specific feedback they may not be qualified to give. Brian, Adam, Rhonda, Mike, Helen, and others spoke to the UAC’s role as “assessors of process” – ensuring that programs are using effective assessment processes for assessing student learning in their programs, rather than dictating program-specific follow-up. These were the tenants for the guidelines that were developed for reviewing the forms.
- Concerns were also shared about program review needing to be understood in a multi-year framework...that not all changes resulting from an assessment can always be addressed by the next cycle of review. It has been the intent that an outcome of this program review process is a larger, multi-year assessment plan across programs, where not all programs will be assessed in the same year, as they had been in 2014. ***This multi-year plan for assessing programs must be developed following the 2014 program review to ensure appropriate communication, planning and resourcing, for the assessments that will occur in subsequent years.***
- Additional feedback on the academic program review form itself was shared. This conversation was tabled until the program review process has been completed, to ensure an “assessment of the assessment tool”, but only once this round of the assessment process has come to a close.
- Justin suggested that the Middle States Standards be circulated to committee members. **Brian will share the Middle States Standards for accreditation (particular focus on *assessment*) with UAC members following the meeting.**

Website Update

- Brian referenced feedback received from UAC members on the proposed changes to the UAC website. Feedback was sparse, but positive and constructive.
- Elizabeth and Brian had met prior to the meeting to discuss the possibility of housing some UAC website content through the Library's new website. This may be particularly useful option for any training or reference materials available related to assessment.

Feedback and Gen Ed Assessment Reports

- Brian provided an overview of feedback received to date on the Gen Ed Assessment Reports (Area II/Scientific World) and ETS-Proficiency Profile (most notable: provide executive summary and/or table of contents for ease of navigation to relevant areas). UAC members agreed with feedback shared. No additional feedback was offered. **The Gen Ed Assessment Reports will be updated based on UAC feedback and shared with the GEC for discussion at their December 2nd meeting.**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00pm.

The Next UAC Meeting will be on Wednesday, December 3rd.