

**University Assessment Panel**  
**October 4, 2019**  
**10:00–12:00 p.m. Altgeld 203**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Arado, Ballantine, Barrett, Comber, Cripe, Gipson, Hathaway, Jaekel, Joung, Lagana, Osorio, Subramony, Zack

**Guests:** Steven Howell, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; Jim Ressler, Program Director, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education

**1. Announcements**

- a. Ritu Subramony opened the meeting.
  - i. Carolinda Douglass is in Springfield, IL and cannot make the meeting.
- b. Subramony welcomed the three guests from the College of Education (COE) in attendance today and thanked them for being there.
- c. It is important the guests understand the peer consultation at the University Assessment Panel (UAP).
  - i. The discussion is usually more focused on what else could be done.
  - ii. Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation (AAE) will put together all feedback in the rubric afterwards.
- d. Crystal Doyle passed out copies of the rubric.
- e. AAE will have a workshop Friday, October 11, 2019.
  - i. It will be held from 8:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m. with check-in starting at 8:00 a.m.
  - ii. Attendance goal is thirty to thirty-five attendees.
  - iii. Once the workshop is done, AAE will post the materials.
  - iv. The workshop focus is on curricular maps and other decision-making components.
- f. Carrie Zack directed committee members to the flowcharts of Bloom's Taxonomy.
  - i. She encouraged anyone to take a flowchart.
  - ii. The flowcharts have questions and suggested verbs for articulating Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and they serve as good reference guides.
- g. Everyone went around the room for introductions by stating their name and department.
- h. Subramony let the new members know that if they have any questions about the rubrics or how they should fill them out, please ask the group for guidance. This is the first working group of the meeting.

**2. Review of Assessment Plans and Status Reports**

- a. B.S.Ed. in Physical Education – Assessment Plan and Status Report
  - i. Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; Jim Ressler, Program Director, Department of

Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education, were in attendance to discuss the report.

- ii. Subramony opened the floor to comments before going into the rubric.
  1. Ballantine was impressed with the revised SLOs.
    - a. Using verbs that are measurable.
    - b. Why did they focus on six items? Is this part of an accreditation body's requirements? COE representatives answered yes.
- iii. There was a shift in some expectations in 2017. The initial comment reflects some of the changes made as a result.
- iv. Zack distributed a handout regarding the edTPA that included the task and the titles of the rubrics going under each task.
- v. Subramony asked if there was any feedback.
  1. Subramony commented it aligned well with the Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes.
  2. She also saw the program is trying to make sure they are going off Bloom's Taxonomy. The program is doing a great job with this.
- vi. There was a question regarding Bloom's Taxonomy. With SLO's 1, 2, and 4, how can these be measured?
  1. Subramony clarified the template has two parts.
    - a. There is the SLO plan with the SLOs and then the methods.
    - b. The UAP is asking for the status and result based off these assessments outcomes.
    - c. Commonly, the program is responding to the existing assessment plan.
      - i. In the process, they are also suggesting they had a problem with the word "understand."
      - ii. They suggested the new SLO's from Bloom's Taxonomy to refocus on what they want to focus in on SLOs.
    - d. Jim Ressler confirmed they changed their SLOs midcycle to reflect the changes in the sport and market space to prepare their candidates.
- vii. Zack said she found the new ones to be well written.
  1. Zack suggested that SLO 4 was a little awkward in the phrasing.
    - a. They can also include some of the things that are part of the assessment that are not included here. For example, creating the assessment, they could put "create" before "administer."
  2. The other suggestion involves the first one on "content knowledge."
    - a. She recommended using a different word to describe "how" they are going to apply and address this.
  3. Zack indicated she will provide all her recommendations in writing.
- viii. Subramony directed the conversation to the assessment methods.
  1. Under growth and development and technology, both of those do not have a direct assessment.
    - a. They could use alumni feedback here. For example, they can get graduate students' feedback.

- i. Another committee member noted they had the same recommendation as well.
  - 2. Could you revise several of your assessments as well?
    - a. About half of the assessment methods they discontinued after 2014.
    - b. This is not reflected in your table of methods.
    - c. Does the edTPA allow for direct assessment of these?
      - i. One of the representatives said the edTPA is submitted during the external student teaching semester. We have integrated other formative assessments.
    - d. You presented edTPA data, so the question is would that be considered a direct assessment method?
      - i. Subramony clarified usually student assessment or something they perform is a direct form of assessment.
    - e. You revised your SLOs, but you did not revise your assessment methods table.
  - 3. Zack directed the conversation towards formative assessments with practicing for the edTPA to prepare it.
    - a. She thought when the new assessments are used and discussed, it might be helpful to include those in here.
    - b. She thinks, similarly to formative assessments, those would be great complimentary assessments to the edTPA since they are assessing the same thing earlier.
  - 4. Subramony said she thinks the methods are described well.
    - a. There is a nice wide variety. You are getting data from different sources and points in time. Use course-embedded assessments where these are available.
    - b. Where is it happening in the curriculum?
    - c. This will help to embellish the report a little.
- ix. Subramony directed the conversation to reporting results.
  - 1. This was a really interesting section.
  - 2. Focus on reporting of results by SLOs.
  - 3. Subramony opened the floor to making comments.
  - 4. There was a comment that the edTPA is now one of the primary tools they are using, and this came up on the data they are presenting.
    - a. There is a lot of edTPA results.
    - b. This really helps for understanding how the different courses relate to the outcomes.
    - c. Since it was not mentioned in your original table, it was difficult to figure out at first.
    - d. Without the in-course content evaluation, the edTPA is the only way you can assess the technical skills.
  - 5. Zack stated since COE also get data at the rubric level, it is also a good idea to include that in the table rather than just the task level.
    - a. In some parts of the discussion, it is mentioned the assessment is an area of concern.

- i. If we could see the data here, we could also see how the data contributes and the different aspects of assessment the way they are assessed there might be variations in performance in those different rubrics.
  - b. Subramony said the program is getting the feedback on where you need to make an improvement or where you are fine. Subramony said she likes the high-level layout used already.
- 6. There was a comment about aggregating the data.
  - a. The data reported year-to-year is great.
  - b. More disaggregation might be helpful though, especially with the focus on equity gaps.
  - c. Subramony agreed with this point.
    - i. The program is doing fairly well, but there is a slight dip in assessment and it would be helpful to figure out why this is occurring.
      - 1. Other possibilities causing the gap may be cohorts, gender, or online (if it was applicable for this major).
  - d. This is particularly important with the reliance on the edTPA.
    - i. The standards for the edTPA are creeping up.
- 7. A question regarding edTPA will come up later on when it is more in context.
- 8. Is there more than one assessment method for each SLO?
  - a. Subramony clarified if the question has concern that there is more than one reporting method for each outcome.
    - i. She said she sees several.
    - ii. Zack said it is organized by SLO. Page 13 for example, has SLO 1 and then the first table assessment for it. The next page has a table with another assessment method. Then there is table three.
      - 1. There are a few different ways they are getting to an assessment. At the end, they have a summary of the multiple assessment methods.
- 9. Subramony directed the conversation to the decision actions and user results. She encouraged the COE representatives to add in.
  - a. Comments include:
    - i. They are proud of the results, especially with the last few years in trends and shifts.
      - 1. It is often reflected at commencement, job placement, and alumni coming back.
    - ii. There is a lot of continuous improvement and reflection given to the program.
    - iii. They have been forced to change a lot since programs similar to this are fast moving. They are working hard to provide strong teaching, research, etc. to adapt to the ever changing climate.
- 10. Tawanda Gipson said the report was well done. When reading through it, you can hear the thought process. She is happy they

decided to still include the data even though there were some changes.

- a. Lagana agreed. It is easy to throw away the data, and it can be difficult to be creative to determine how else to use the data. He recommended maybe constructing a table and label methods by which ones are expected to change or not.

11. Zack said throughout the report, the discussion of the results assessment was an area that needs to be looked into. What are the plans moving forward?

- a. The rubric level within the edTPA and then working backwards to use assignments or assessments that were reflective of the 2014 report.
- b. They adjusted their curriculum to reflect these changes.
- c. Undergraduate assessment specifically added a course earlier in the program.
- d. They wanted to drill down into the components of Task 3.
  - i. The dip in the trends for Task 3 for the edTPA, this is state and national trends.
  - ii. Many years, NIU has scored higher than the typical dip in Task 3, but it is worth mentioning that we saw this right away and decided we needed to do something about it.

b. M.S.Ed. in Kinesiology and Physical Education – Assessment Plan and Status Report

- i. Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; Steve Howell, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education, were in attendance to discuss the report.

- ii. Subramony opened the floor to comments before going into the rubric.

1. What students are you bringing into the program? Where do they go once they are done?

- a. McEvoy gave a quick overview of the M.S.Ed program.
  - i. It is a Master of Science in Kinesiology and Physical Education. There are four specialization areas:
    1. Adapted Physical Education
    2. Pedagogy and Curriculum Development
    3. Exercise Physiology and Fitness Leadership
    4. Sport and Exercise Psychology
  - ii. These are all subdisciplines under the KNPE umbrella.
  - iii. They are all very different which makes creating the SLOs challenging.

- iii. Subramony asked Howell if there was anything else he wanted to add about the program.

1. Howell said no but to McEvoy's point, the program does fall under the kinesiology umbrella. They do their best to compliment all the different areas within the program.

- iv. Subramony directed the conversation to the SLOs.
  - 1. With regards to the SLOs, there was difficulty figuring out what the content of the program was. This is taking into consideration that there are very distinct specializations all being taken into account for one masters. There was no insight into the type of program had.
    - a. For example with SLO 1 and 2, what knowledge are students communicating? How are you going to assess it if you are not specifying it? This needs to be incorporated a little more to the SLOs.
      - i. Are you assessing their ability to communicate only or are you also assessing their competency of knowledge on the subject matter as well?
      - ii. What expertise do they demonstrate?
  - 2. They developed this with different professionals. Do you recommend clarifying this?
    - a. A solution is list the programs by naming them. It would certainly help in understanding what the knowledge is about.
    - b. It is also not clear in the SLOs you are discussing their level of expertise.
    - c. For example, someone could be a great speaker, but they may know nothing about what they are talking about.
  - 3. Subramony brought the discussion back towards the rubric.
    - a. By looking at four, five, and six, the outcomes are so generic it could be to any master's degree. The context of your degree program would be helpful.
    - b. Can things be done at a higher level since it is a masters? This is where Bloom's Taxonomy becomes very helpful.
    - c. People were suggesting putting in that contextual knowledge based off your degree program.
- v. Subramony directed the conversation to the assessment methods.
  - 1. There may be redundant feedback.
  - 2. There was a question regarding what are the SLOs for technology under the assessment method that are used for measuring.
    - a. This was captured using technology, various communication, such as PowerPoint. A graduate level statistics class was also gathered as technology.
    - b. Another question stemmed from this. The course embedded methods for assessment in your appendix lists the term "project for KNPE 552." Are there any others or is this the primary one used?
      - i. This is the primary one used since this is what is common to all four of the specializations. This is one of the only courses that is common to specialization. This is the best, most holistic way.
    - c. When is KNPE 552 typically taken for students?
      - i. During their first semester. Some take it during their third semester.

- d. It will be more work for the faculty and those gathering data, but from a programmatic perspective, if they take KNPE 552 very early on in their program and the rest of the assessment methods are occurring at the end of the program, and there is nothing in between, how do you gauge the progress of your students?
  - i. There is progress measured during this, such as culminating experience. Throughout the program, graduate students will also participate in research and independent studies. This can be added to the second assessment method to show that students have this experiential learning component.
    - 1. Strongly encouraged to find areas where they can find these courses embedded things.
    - 2. It is difficult when students potentially are not meeting the benchmarks and there is only data from the beginning and end but not the middle.
    - 3. You need some data from the specific specialization areas as well. This would strengthen your assessment plan.
- 3. KNPE 552 is the commonality course.
  - a. Howell agreed and emphasized this course stems into how most students decide on their independent study.
  - b. Having a midpoint assessment will be helpful.
- 4. Subramony said the anchors are the SLOs. What do you want your students to be able to do? How should they perform? What should they know?
  - a. By embellishing these SLOs upfront, you would be able to find these sorts of things.
  - b. One example is the oral communication. Across the different specializations, if you have a presentation, this may be a common assessment.
- 5. Lagana commented on the exit interview and the alumni survey. This is great direct information from the students. Is this embedded anywhere else before the exit interview? Maybe at the end of the experiential learning.
  - a. The faculty are the academic advisors. Each student meets with the faculty members at least one time a semester, if not more. We could have the faculty gather some of this information as the student grows from semester to semester.
- 6. The rubric used for the evaluation of the project culminating experience, you are rating students as: exceeds standards, beats standards, and standards not met. It says each section in the rubric has been updated. What does this mean with the three ratings? Is there an expectation?
  - a. These are the standards. It may vary from area to area.
- 7. The faculty filling out the areas know what the standards are?

- a. Yes, they establish this with students for the projects.
  - 8. Is this something done on an individual basis?
    - a. Yes.
  - 9. Subramony asked if it is right to say in the rubric with the categories and there are results with the bullets, are you treating this as criteria with line items?
    - a. It sometimes happens when you have a rubric and have the results somewhat quantified. For example, you can say what the average is for each track.
    - b. The whole idea is are you getting information from your methods that can tell you what is and is not going well or these tracks.
- vi. Subramony directed the conversation towards the curricular maps on page 5.
  - 1. She wondered why there were a lot of “D’s.”
    - a. It is possible the people in the cohort you have coming in do not need a beginner level. There was not a lot of proficient until they come to the final culminating 699.
    - b. The way you are looking at it, coming into a graduate level there should be more “P’s” coming in.
  - 2. There are some proficiencies in certain classes. The application of that is happening even more in 699. This may or may not be true with your program, but verifying it may be helpful.
  - 3. Detailing what the SLOs are covering and differentiating will be helpful. It will help to disaggregate this.
  - 4. There was a comment regarding communication. If students cannot communicate well, the program would be challenging to complete.
    - a. A communication requirement could be a prerequisite to the program. If not, this communication must be developed in the program.
  - 5. The faculty will be consulted to reconstruct the SLOs.
    - a. There has been a turnover in the faculty as well, so it would make sense to sit down with the new faculty.
  - 6. There was no employer feedback even though there are internship opportunities. This is another comment to look into.
    - a. The last two semester have had an increase in internship opportunities compared to previous semesters. We are starting to get more data now on this.
  - 7. The program level targets are 85%. It is common to get the question, how did you reach this target number?
    - a. Historically, it has always been 80%. It was raised to 85%.
      - i. Also, these are not accredited programs.
      - ii. The group of initial licensures are accredited, but not a full track is accredited.
  - 8. SLOs are so high at the degree level. There are two options moving forward:
    - a. Develop a few specific SLOs to each track
    - b. Keep the current, high level SLOs and collect data from each track.



9. In the end, the purpose is about what is this degree program providing for the students as a whole.
  - a. By the time they graduate, what are skills and outcomes you expect them to have?
    - i. It could be a holistic level. They do not need individual ones, but you need to collect data.
  - b. In the past, some programs have taken it too far in the other direction where they have many SLOs for each individual track and lose sight of the commonalities. It is a delicate balance. You can write high level SLOs that fit with each program, but the methods do not have to be the same across the tracks, but they just need to reach the same outcome.
    - i. Faculty need to collect what the degree program is trying to accomplish at the core and how they plan to do this.
10. Gipson said by incorporating these recommendations, the report will become more useful. Right now looking at the methods table, each method address all the SLOs, so the table is not needed then. Once you add the more detail, it will be useful.
11. For undergraduate, we have many different emphases for the degree programs. Would it be advantageous to have a clear cut program or have a degree but divergent specializations. How would we think about collecting data for both of these cases, especially when they do not have both undergraduate and graduate?
  - a. The start point would be the SLOs of the various programs across NIU. In the assessment plans, there are places where there are multiple emphases or specializations.
  - b. Different programs have done this differently. A great example is Nutrition and Dietetics.
- vii. Subramony directed the conversation towards the reporting results.
  1. There are some incompleteness in results. Somethings may not have been mentioned in the report that are happening, such as the internship opportunities.
    - a. Please take this as consultative feedback.
  2. The data tables presented for the course embedded assessment presents the aggregated results. How are those results determined? What do those number mean? I am assuming the eight things outlined are somehow incorporated.
    - a. The project compromise roughly 60%. By taking grades from the past four years, an “A” or “B” was considered successful. “C” and below is considered unsuccessful.
      - i. An aggregate grade does not necessarily provide insight into where the areas that the program needs to improve. Evaluation of the project’s rubric might provide more insight as an assessment method. The aggregate score is less helpful.
  3. Subramony made a similar comment for the exit interviews. It is not clear about what you are reporting on.

- a. The exit interview is usually seen as a fairly strong method since it comes directly from the students.
    - b. You can collect qualitative data in addition to this.
  - viii. Subramony made a comment about the appendix.
    - 1. Course embedded measure with the research.
    - 2. These are the criteria you could potentially use.
    - 3. Zack added that while you are using your rubric here, keep in mind how they connect to the SLO and if this rubric gets to one SLO that is fine. Usually the assessment as a whole gets to more than one thing. Just be careful to piece these out.
  - ix. Subramony directed the conversation to decision, users, and action results.
    - 1. Is there anything that was not already covered?
      - a. Someone confirmed that it would be similar commentary already mentioned.
    - 2. Are there any questions from the program representatives for the committee?
      - a. They confirmed the feedback was very helpful, especially in terms of the specializations.
    - 3. Gipson said the comments in the report already says the program should add additional rigor. Once all the changes are made, you probably will not see this.
      - a. Additional comment about this. Adding the purpose for the additional rigor will add to this.
    - 4. There are improvements also being taken. If you can leverage that, it is recommended as you make these changes to send you updated plan to AAE. Typically, the plans do not need to come back to UAP.
- c. Proposed Ph.D. in Kinesiology and Physical Education – Assessment Plan
  - i. Chad McEvoy, Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; Steve Howell, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, College of Education; David Walker, Associate Dean, College of Education, were in attendance to discuss the report.
  - ii. Subramony opened the floor to overall comments.
  - iii. She asked if Chad McEvoy had anything.
  - iv. McEvoy said it is a new proposed program, so most of this is working through flowcharts.
    - 1. It has been about a three year process.
    - 2. Discussing the need and desire for a doctoral program.
    - 3. Built a model that is flexible to accommodate student needs but also has a strong research and training component within it.
  - v. Subramony directed the conversation towards SLOs.
    - 1. A comment regarding SLOs. You are selling yourself short with several SLOs saying “develop.” You can use words that are beyond “develop.”
      - a. Someone said “exhibiting.”
    - 2. Move up the scaffold of the words to really sell yourselves.
    - 3. SLOs 3 and 4 were hard to distinguish the difference between.

- a. Have you considered combining them?
    - i. Yes, this was something discussed at the beginning that they could be combined.
    - ii. One problem they have found is that a lot of Ph.D. programs are silent when it comes to how they are training their faculty.
      - 1. Training and teaching a pedagogy.
      - 2. Action learning with an independent study with working with their mentor.
  - b. If there is a distinct difference, just explicitly state this and you can keep these separated then.
    - i. SLO 3 is about the teaching.
    - ii. SLO 4 is about the application.
  - c. It can also be considered how the first one is done. It is a matter of how it is being done and communicated.
4. The idea of SLO 5 and 6 is concerning.
- a. The idea is great, but is that for a Ph.D. student? Is that what you want to do?
    - i. We talk exhaustively about the teaching research and this is a lot of how we got our first jobs.
    - ii. We took this to heart as we were putting together this program.
    - iii. We want to benefit students for their futures, and we do not want to lose this.
    - iv. Our Ph.D. program would actually have the most research and statistics requirements out of any of the programs offered. We want research to be a strength, but we do not want it to be an inconvenience piece.
5. Comment from the committee that they want them to be cautious about this decision.
- a. How would you assess this?
6. From the assessment standpoint, can we say developing the competency of understanding expectations around assessment? This could be course embedded.
7. Zack said it reminds her of the dispositions for the teachers. Did this influence this in anyway? Would it be helpful to think about how they assess some of these kinds of things?
- a. It did not come up in their discussions. The disposition model used is not common throughout their department.
  - b. You really have to think about what these look like in practice. What do you want to see? They are attitudes that could be manifested into behavior.
8. A committee member said they like the specific mention of service. From personal experience, there are many faculty candidates who are not communicated this expectation. In the long run, it can hurt us if we hire someone if they do not have this expectation in front of them.

- a. McEvoy said this was exactly what they discussed during their meeting.
  - b. Someone asked if this was an NIU value? They came from another institution that did not care about collegiality.
  - c. Think about the current job market. How many jobs are at schools like NIU?
  - d. The ones that can incorporate collegiality are more likely in the long run to progress professionally.
  - e. Maybe, but it also matters about the institution's mission and vision. It also matters about whether or not they are just researchers or teachers as well.
  - f. Committee member made a comment regarding a scenario. If you have two students come out:
    - i. One focused on research solely and the other has an expectation of research and something else.
    - ii. The student that will excel at research is the first one and the one that will become department chair is the second student with these different expectations instilled into them.
9. It sounds like the program is being very deliberate in what they want delivered. These comments give you the perspectives of your peers. The rewording itself may be helpful.
10. Gipson asked if students do not meet these SLOs, are they still eligible to graduate?
- a. Subramony said they do not stop people from graduating.
  - b. McEvoy agreed and said they are not actually measuring the extent of their collegiality.
  - c. It is delivered in the curriculum and they are very deliberate about it.
11. Do you want to add anything about the interdisciplinary aspects?
12. Zack said SLO 1 said it related to what discipline it was but the rest of them do not. It could be applicable to a number of programs, so maybe try to make them more specific for this Ph.D. program.
- vi. Subramony directed the conversation to the assessment methods.
1. Someone had a question about the teaching portfolio. When would students take this course?
    - a. Within the first two years. They are offering their courses on a four semester rotation.
  2. You have a front-end assessment and then end, and there is nothing in the middle. It is very heavily end loaded with the assessment methods, such as the dissertation. Can you consider in-between formative assessments?
    - a. A possibility- mentors can also observe them in the classroom. We think they are going to be teaching courses, such as KNPE 100.
  3. Committee member is unsure this is a proper assessment tool for a Ph.D.

- a. Representative said this was commonly seen in other Ph.D. programs at the university.
  - b. Subramony confirmed this.
- 4. When they have met student level expectations, they have met the criteria established by the committee. Should they be universal so that there is a consistency?
  - a. McEvoy said it is a work in progress.
- 5. As long as you have the idea on how you want to measure it, you have colleagues here that are happy to help you.
  - a. What is it really measuring is the process. Was this dissertation defense performed in a fair method?
    - i. Was the presentation understandable?
  - b. How useful is it in terms of assessment for SLOs.
- 6. Gipson asked about page 5 for the methods description for the dissertation description? Is this a typo since it was talking about the portfolio?
  - a. Yes, this was a typo.
- 7. Subramony mentioned that for several of these methods, we do have the candidate's dissertation chair and the committee as the main people responsible for evaluation. Is there some issues in terms of bias? If that is the case, could you consider some of the more course embedded experiences in addition to this summative evaluation?
  - a. If that could happen here, just consider looking into it.
  - b. The bias is for the student, not the program.
  - c. At this point, all Ph.D. programs at this point are going into external review.
- 8. Zack referenced page 7. The table that discusses whether things are indirect or direct and formative or summative, she had a question about exit interview listed as a formative assessment. Is that a formative assessment and how so?
  - a. This might be another typo.
  - b. Generally, we would call this a summative.
- 9. Are there any other areas that would be able to assess that? Are there other places that are potentially going to hire the Ph.D.'s of this program that can give feedback about institutional cultures? Or, you could have alumni give feedback about whether or not they were prepared for the culture at where they went to work.
- 10. Committee member said overall the proposed program looks really great. You can end up with great cohorts.
- vii. Subramony asked the committee members if the Proposed Ph.D. in Kinesiology and Physical Education was accepted?
  - 1. Unanimous yes from the committee members.

### 3. Other Business

- a. Subramony encouraged the programs to reach out to AAE if they have any questions or concerns.

### 4. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Next meeting Friday, October 18, 2019, 10:00 a.m. in Altgeld 225