

University Assessment Committee  
September 18, 2015  
Raynor Library Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Susan Bay, Jodi Blahnik, Marilyn Bratt, Karen Evans, Noreen Lephardt, Maureen McAvoy, Andrew Oswald, Pol Vandeveld, Guy Simoneau, John Su, Fred Sutkiewicz, Baolin Wan, Jean Zaroni

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 by Sharron Ronco who shared the reflection sent by Brittany Wyatt.

Updates on the Core Curriculum revision (John Su):

3 main points:

1. The core revision website is an important resource
2. Where the CCRC is in the review process:
  - 3 steps for Fall:
    1. Initial survey that was just sent. Response rate of 35% is consistent with climate survey
    2. Take survey results to each College for conversation with aim to move toward learning outcomes; encouraged members of UAC to be at those meetings
    3. After college conversations completed will have another campus-wide survey with suggested learning outcomes
  3. Where are UAC's key places for input:
    - Be at college meeting to inform conversation regarding how to assess learning outcomes.
    - Feedback on the survey itself: Discussion centered primarily on Question 2 (Degree to which you believe outcome can be assessed). Issues raised were: campus-wide survey might not be best place to ask Question 2 because all outcomes can be assessed; don't want people to focus only on those outcomes that are easily assessed; want to get buy in from faculty and worried may not if they are not aware that LO's will be assessed; perhaps rephrase question to ask *how* LO's could be assessed rather than *whether* LO can be assessed; suggest to narrow down LO's before ask faculty how to assess. John said will have concept papers to help inform faculty of LO's, suggestions for frameworks and assessments, and where is accountability for assessments.
    - Look for ways to talk to CCRC

Approval of minutes:

The minutes of the Sept. 4, 2015 meeting were approved.

### Updates from the Chair:

- New PAL orientation/refresher workshop today and another one scheduled for next Thursday. Deadline for program assessment reports is Oct. 23<sup>rd</sup>. The annual peer review session is scheduled for Nov. 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Dean Holz was invited to attend a UAC meeting and accepted. He will be here at the next meeting and requested questions/topics for discussion. Discussed what should be the focus of our conversation with him: how we can support him in assessment in A&S; does he view that we are supporting him; suggest need for assessment “expert” in college that could support programs and PALs across the college; how could assessment structure in A&S be more efficient (i.e., is PALs structure working, need for more training); provide assessment metrics and programs who are/are not meeting metrics; recognize unique challenges present in A&S and how to best address those challenges. Issue of resources was raised and need to integrate assessment into existing structure rather than adding an external person to address assessment. Revisions to Core will impact A&S so provides another reason to think about how assessment might be better addressed. Requested Sharron send us the draft of what is sent to Dean Holz.

### Updates on revising assessment of the Co-curricular programs (Jodi Blahnik):

Individual program LO's and assessment reports were not working because so much of what they do is interdisciplinary. Assessment committee met to determine 5 main interdisciplinary domains and then LO's for each domain. Next steps will be approval of LO's and then curriculum mapping. Discussed whether LO's were specific to Co-curricular or if there is overlap with institutional outcomes, strategic plan, and other program outcomes. Recommended a hiatus for 2015-16 assessment report since assessment plan will be under development during this academic year. Recommend sending program a note of commendation and appreciation of all the work they have done.

### 5. Review of new assessment plan for the Interdisciplinary Applied Math Economics Major:

Agreement that assessment plan was acceptable. Discussed 3 year review cycle and how LO's might change at end of cycle to reflect more challenging outcomes, and whether measures (2 exams in 2 courses) were sufficient.

### 6. Review the charter/functionality of UAC:

Out of time for this meeting so suggest putting it at beginning of agenda for next meeting. Suggest having meeting with Provost for input as think about revising the charge for our committee. Send ideas to Sharron before next meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:29.

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen Evans