

**University Assessment Committee**  
April 17, 2015, 9:00-10:30  
Raynor Library Conference Room A

**Present:** Sharron Ronco (Chair), Jodi Blahnik, Patricia Bradford, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Maureen McAvoy, John Su, Fred Sutkiewicz, Pol Vandavelde, Baolin Wan, Brittney Wyatt, Jean Zanoni

**I. Call to Order/Reflection**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00AM. by Sharron Ronco.  
Fred Sutkiewicz offered a reflection.

**II. Approval of the minutes of the March 20, 2015 meeting**

The minutes of the March 20, 2015 meeting were reviewed. A minor correction was made.  
Motion to approve: Noreen Lephardt  
Second: Maureen McAvoy  
Motion passed by voice vote.

**III. UAC's Annual Report to University Academic Senate**

The committee discussed a draft prepared by Sharron Ronco presenting the responsibilities of the committee, the membership, the number of meetings, the highlights of the work the UAC has done during the year, the continuing business for next year, and some recommendations.

As part of the continuing business the committee suggested the following:

1. To invite representatives from the College of Arts & Sciences to join the UAC. Sharron Ronco had discussed this with Dean Holz last year.
2. To invite Dr. Gary Meyer to share with the committee the University's views on assessment: its place and significance.
3. To continue evaluating extra-curricular programs.
4. To continue inviting representatives of other programs on a regular basis. This practice was an innovative component this year and was deemed very successful.
5. To find the means to have a greater involvement on the part of some programs.
  - 5.1 One suggestion was to invite those programs on hiatus to discuss their assessment with the committee.
  - 5.2 Another suggestion was to identify programs who had done a part of assessment very successfully and to invite them to share it with other programs.
  - 5.3 Another suggestion was to make these invitations part of a normal process so that programs would not feel targeted. Sharron Ronco has already invited the department of foreign languages and literatures and the department of physics for next year.

As part of the recommendations the committee suggested the following:

1. To discuss and have more information about resources. Sharron Ronco mentioned that the proposal submitted to the Innovation Fund would allow the committee to audit the means that programs use for doing assessment.
2. To have clarity from the administration about the effects the changes in the Core will have on the assessment committee and the role of the committee during the development of those changes. John Su suggested some ways this could be done (representative of the UAC on the CCRC, liaison, etc.).
3. For those programs that have external accreditation on a regular basis, to find the means to integrate the work done for regular assessment into the work done for accreditation so that there is no redundancy and the work done for assessment is relevant to accreditation (for example, as yearly components of the process).
4. To review the functionality of the UAC: what should be happening in the committee? How is the work of the committee integrated into the strategic plan of the university? Does the committee want to do more than overseeing programs? How efficient is the committee?
5. To have the perspectives of students on assessment. Are they interested in the process of assessment? Do they have feedback to provide? It was noted that graduate students are probably more interested than undergraduate students.

Sharron Ronco will integrate those suggestions in a revised draft and distribute it to committee members.

#### **IV. Program assessment report for AY 2014 Institutional Assessment Report**

Sharron Ronco discussed the institutional assessment report she is preparing. It summarizes the different assessments that programs have been doing, identifying those programs that have the best practices, those on hiatus, etc. It was noted that programs would benefit from receiving feedback about their assessment. The goal would be to give feedback while continuing to encourage collaboration and thus without imposing criteria.

#### **V. Meeting Adjournment**

Motion to Adjourn: Jodi Blahnik  
Second: Fred Sutkiewicz

Motion passed by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10AM

Respectfully submitted,

Pol Vandavelde