UAP Meeting  
Friday, November 20, 2020  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
TEAMS

**Present:** Hasan Ferdowsi, Ursula Sullivan, Andrew Setterstrom, Alecia Santuzzi, Dennis Brown, Hyun-Mee Joung, Nicholas Grahovec, Dennis Brain, Therese Arado, Elizabeth Moxley, Jenn-Terng Gau, Carolinda Douglass, Carrie Zack, Ritu Subramony, Tawanda Gipson, Jeanie Sparacino

1. **Announcements**
   - Tawanda gave information for finding updated UAP materials in Teams or One Drive. Notebook has been updated.
   - Carrie announced that IUPUI had recordings from their conference available on their website. Talk of putting it on Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation (AAE) website and emailing the information out to the UAP members.

2. **Higher Learning Commission – Quality Initiative (QI)**
   - Carolinda gave an overview of the process with UAP members
     - 10 year cycle with HLC – UAP is in year six
     - Overview of HLC cycle requirements
     - QI will be carried out over a three year period.
   - QI Plan to Focus on Success In Gateway Courses for All Students
     - QI proposal is requirement for Higher Learning Commission, Open Pathway Quality Initiative Proposal
     - NIU demonstrates evidence of commitment and capacity
     - Addresses equity, diversity, and inclusion in gateway courses
     - Includes timeline and budget
     - Carolinda went through the proposal and asked for Feedback by November 30, 2020.

3. **Program Review Findings Report**
   - Carolinda takes to the UAP every year
     - Written for the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE)
     - Review cycle for programs is approximately 8 years
     - Summary reports based on program review components

4. **UAP Input in Review of Assessment Processes – Update from APC 11/16/2020**
   - Ritu gave a summary of the APC meeting - 11/16/2020
   - Carolinda, Ritu, Alecia, Brandon, and Therese attended the APC meeting
   - Alecia spoke about APC collaborating with UAP to make revisions to the current process, summarizing her take-aways from the APC meeting
     - Provost was for revision as long as the revision is in line with what that process is supposed to be, so we continue to meet our goals, and make more efficient
- UAP wants to meet needs for compliance, including external agencies, but to put more emphasis on value of assessment for programs.
- Asked whether the UAP believes it would be helpful to conduct a needs assessment to get who has had a negative reaction to the current process and what their concerns are in order to use that information to guide what UAP proposals for a new assessment model.

- Therese stated that commitment to students is the purpose of assessment—to ensure that we give students what we say we will give them— that we are living up to NIU mission.
- Ursula suggested that program/department consultations with the UAP to begin at the beginning of the assessment process instead of the end with Carolinda added that UAP and AAE have offered consultations earlier in the process but thinks this opportunity is not translating into significant number of programs taking advantage of the opportunity and having an impact on the quality of mid-cycle reports. She suggested that UAP needs to go back to emphasizing these opportunities and think of new ways to engage programs on a larger, more meaningful scale. Focus on providing support to programs to ensure students are learning what the faculty believe they should learn.
- Alecia suggested that representatives of UAP could serve as consultants to colleges and departments/programs in their respective area in earlier in the process to help their peers with understand the mid-status report and what it entails.
- Nicholas pointed out directors of new programs as well as new directors of existing programs.
- Ursula suggested highlighting what the department does on the Institutional Effectiveness website in order to raise awareness of the consultation function.
- Ritu offered that the function of consultations is to support and facilitate the continuous improvement purpose of assessment.
- The possibility of hosting virtual focus group in the future in order to inform efforts in this area was discussed.

5. Assessment Review Simulation- continued from 10-16-20
- Ritu talked members through the Assessment Framework with slides on the following topics: Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Develop SLO’s, Identify Methods, Collect Data and Information, Data Informed Decisions.
- Break out groups
  - Breakout groups met and discussed examples
  - One member from each group presented summary of group discussion to whole UAP.

6. Approach to UAP Discussion
- Ritu gave an overview of a new approach UAP and AAE are trying this year to produce feedback and discussion that feels more useful and less overwhelming for program report writers. Each time AAE receives a report for the UAP from a program, Ritu asks them what they want to highlight, what they would like suggestions on, and what their overall experience was like when writing the report. This information can then be used to focus discussion and feedback at UAP in order
to help the program accomplish their goals and make the process more useful to them. Alecia added an observation that UAP members should keep in mind that learning outcomes are different from program outcomes. They do overlap but what we are focusing on with academic programs is learning. The program may have other goals that relate more broadly to program evaluation. When we get to talking about service units (academic support programs), the difference between learning outcomes versus program outcomes is also important but a little bit different for them.

7. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.
Next meeting Friday, December 4, 2020