

**University Assessment Committee Minutes**  
**February 4, 2011**  
**1-2:30 PM/ A&S Deans Conference Room**

Attending: Carol Gittens, Bruce Lescher, Shelby McIntyre, Monica Parikh, Josef Hellebrandt, Cynthia Mertens, Chris Bachen, Steve Lee, Rob Covich, Ruth Davis

**Welcome and Introduction of new members**

Rob Covich, Program Associate for Academic Affairs, will be taking minutes.

**I. Summary of 2009-10 Activities and Accomplishments**

1. 2009-10 was the first year of the UAC. During that year the UAC met monthly and successfully developed a process for providing feedback to academic programs on the Annual Assessment Report. The current status of this feedback process is:

- In 2010 every academic program that was not currently engaged in Program Review received a personalized *Response Letter* prepared by the Office of Assessment.
- The Annual Assessment Report *Response Letters* are designed to show the strengths of the department's assessment efforts and give recommendations on how to improve areas that do not meet the objectives, with the intent of developing a climate of open communication.
- Thirty-seven academic programs from CAS, Business, Engineering, ECP and Law were sent Annual Assessment Report Response Letters (2 departments were engaged in Program Review in 2009-10);
- A spreadsheet was created to summarize the types of commendations and recommendations being made in 2009-10. This spreadsheet was made available to the WASC Visiting Team in February, 2011 and was distributed to the academic deans.

*Conclusions thus far regarding the Response Letter process:*

“Buy-in” is very important for the success of the Annual Assessment Report process. The group discussed the extent to which they thought faculty in each program had seen / read their program's Response Letter. It was suggested that Response Letters be distributed to the chair, but also forwarded to the faculty members so that they would be more likely to be read.

The group discussed ways in which to make the campus community aware of the many commendations that were made in 2009-10 in order to raise awareness of the successful practice of assessment on our campus. It was suggested that an email be sent that summarized the spreadsheet of commendations and recommendations. It was decided that the email should go out after the March 1<sup>st</sup> report deadline. Carol agreed to draft the email and ask if the Provost or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs would send out the email to the campus. Questions for further discussion in 2010-11: How should evaluate the feedback process – perhaps a survey of chairs / faculty?

2. The UAC dedicated one meeting each quarter to a joint meeting of the UAC and the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee (FSACC). Diane Jonte-Pace and Don Dodson also attended the three joint meetings in 2009-10. The purpose of these joint meetings was to increase the communication between the faculty and the administration around issues of assessment. The joint meetings permitted the opportunity to open lines of communication, to enable the FSAAC, as representatives of the Faculty Senate and faculty to become more aware of the WASC accreditation, Program Review, and annual assessment of student learning processes. Finally, the FSAAC contributed useful feedback on the [\*Guidelines for the Assessment of Student Learning\*](#)

[Outcomes](#) document which will be revised in 2010-11. The Faculty Senate voted in June 2010 to end the FSAAC, as it has been decided that there is not a sustained need for an advisory committee.

## **II. 2010-11 Goals**

The primary goal is to continue the conversation of revising the Annual Assessment guidelines, process, and report format. A second goal for this year is to take up the question of survey practices – there is not a common list of surveys being used at SCU. The Student Life Assessment Committee, chaired by Monica Parikh began to itemize campus surveys last year and so this committee’s work will be of interest to the UAC this year.

### **A. Discussion: Guidelines for assessment of student learning and Annual Assessment Report (AAR)**

The main discussion focused on proposing changes to the Annual Assessment of Student Learning Guidelines. Themes for revision that emerged at the end of last year were:

- AAR Due date - currently we have an arbitrary due date, March 1<sup>st</sup>
- Order of information included in the Guidelines document
- Order of information that is requested in the report itself
- Elements of the report and appendices

Carol shared with the group that the Program Review Guidelines are currently being revised by a sub-committee of the Academic Affairs Committee. All proposed revisions of the Annual Assessment Report process generated by the UAC this year will be submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval.

A discussion began on whether the Guidelines for the Assessment of Student Learning should include a recommended time table for how to integrated annual assessment practices within the Program Review Cycle (8 years). It was recommended that Year Three of the program review could be considered a “lighter” year to be used for rethinking mission goals and objectives. Sample timelines would need to be created for an 8-yr process as well as for 5-yr or 7-yr processes that may take place in programs with professional accreditation.

### **Announcements**

Carol is going on sabbatical in 2011-12. Chris Bachen will be the interim director of the Office of Assessment and will chair the University Assessment Committee during that academic year.

Next UAC meeting will be Friday, March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011. 1-2:30 PM