

University Assessment Committee
October 28, 2016, 9:00-10:30
Raynor Library Raynor Study Room D

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Susan Bay, Jodi Blahnik, Marilyn Bratt, Sarah Feldner, Stephen Guastello, Courtney Guc, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Marta Magiera, Karen Slattery, Pol Vandavelde, Baolin Wan

I. Call to Order/Reflection

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 A.M. by Sharron Ronco. Sharron Ronco offered the reflection on behavior of Karen Evans.

II. Approval of minutes from October 7, 2016 meeting

The minutes for the October 7, 2016 meeting were reviewed.

Motion to approve: Noreen Lephardt.

Second: Marilyn Bratt.

Motion passed by voice vote. Minutes approved with one abstain (Karen Slattery because of absence of October 7 meeting).

III. Updates on co-curricular

Jodi Blahnik offered updates on assessment of co-curricular. Assessment of co-curricular is moving from subject matter to focusing on large domains. The major challenge is that there are more than 300 different programs and it is difficult to develop a measurement to be consistent across different domains. Three or four consistent items will be developed for all programs to input data for assessment. The question of how student employees represent the whole student population was raised by Noreen and it was discussed.

IV. Completing the Rating guide for Spring 2017 program reviews- questions or concerns?

- Sharron Ronco updated the current status of rating and reminded the deadline to submit the ratings is December 2, 2016.
- Susan Bay and Marilyn Bratt shared their experience on rating. The data was collected from ARM. Each numerically rated the items individually and then shared each other. Most of the ratings were match and the differences on a few items were solved by discussion. The overall process was straightforward and easy. Some minor difficulties include: understanding the curriculum map, not the expertise of that area, and name change of the program.
- The comments written by Susan and Marilyn were displayed on screen and discussed by the committee. Sharron indicated that the purpose of rating was to provide feedback to the program under review, not to be used for comparison or any other way.

- The committee indicated that the program under review should pay attention to and improve the items with rating of 0 and 1.
- Sharron agreed that the reviewers can discuss with the person in charge of the assessment of the program under review if they think it is necessary.

V. Status of AY2016 assessment reports

- Sharron Ronco updated the current status of assessment reports for AY2016. Most of programs had submitted the reports, but a few were still missing. Email was sent to the associate dean of the college of art and science to remind her some programs in that college had not submitted the reports yet.
- If the student number is few than five in a program, the program does not need to report the individual results. However, the program should still collect data and report in later time when the student number is more than five.
- Sharron discussed with the representatives from each college to ask for input of possible reasons why some programs of that college had not submitted the assessment reports.

VI. Peer Review procedures for November 11th and possible follow-up discussion in February, 2017

- Sharron Ronco indicated that the Peer Review on November 11 will focus on the actual peer review and reports. Each participant will talk about and share their assess report to get feedback from peers. It is possible to pick a day in February to get interest people together to talk about other issues of the assessment.
- Marta raised the question of how to handle the assessment of small program and it was discussed by the committee.
- Sharron asked and confirmed which committee members could be facilitator for the Peer Review.
- The committee discussed the possible guiding questions for the participants to discuss in the Peer Review day. Following are the possible questions provided by the committee members:
 - What is the assessment report telling you about your program?
 - What aspects have not been included in the assessment report?
 - How do you take challenges and put in future report?
 - How is your assessment process helping improve your program?
- It was concluded that maximum four reports will be discussed at each table in the 90 minutes program.
- Recorders are needed for the discussions in Peer Review. Graduate students with education major will be recruited. Certificates of Appreciation will be issued to the graduate student recorders.
- Committee discussed how to share the reports during the peer review. The options are sending out PDF files for the participants at same table and asking the participants to bring their own reports.
- Discussion questions will be sent to the participants in advance for them to prepare.

- Facilitators should keep the discussion focusing on fundamental issues and avoid distraction of complaining (e.g. ARM).
- Participants from same college or similar disciplines will be placed at same table.

VII. Curriculum mapping webinar on November 1st, 3 – 4 p.m

Sharron announced that there will be a webinar on webpage development and curriculum mapping from 3 to 4 pm on November 1st. The webinar is provided by Samuel Merritt University. Committee members having interest are welcome to join Sharron to watch the seminar. The link of the webinar will also be sent to the committee members who want to watch.

VIII. Meeting Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn: Jodi Blahnik.

Second: Noreen Lephardt.

Motioned passed by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:31 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Baolin Wan