UAP Meeting  
Friday, February 18, 2022  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
ZOOM  

Members  
Guests: Nicholas Karonis, Kirk Duffin, Daniel Rogness  

1. Announcements - Nothing at this time  

2. Review of Assessment Plans and Status Reports – Introductions were made and Nicholas Karonis gave an overview of the programs.  
   a. B.S. in Computer Science  
      i. SLO’s - Suggestions included making SLOs more specific regarding the knowledge/skills to be demonstrated.  
      ii. Curriculum Map - Suggestions included distinguishing between required and elective courses when demonstrating coverage of all SLOS in required courses.  
      iii. Methods - Suggestions included adding formative assessments that students can demonstrate some progress across the curriculum on SLOs rather than just at the end of the program.  
      iv. Results/Use of Results - Suggestions included including items that clearly reflect language of the SLOs (as was done in the internship survey) in all surveys and providing a description regarding how assessment results are being used to identify opportunities to improve the program.  

   b. M.S. in Computer Science  
      i. SLO’s - Suggestions included making SLOs more specific in order to differentiate M.S. SLO’s from B.S. SLO’s.  
      ii. Curriculum Map - Suggestions included adding clarification to SLO mapping to make it clear why some courses have more than one level of student proficiency expected.  
      iii. Methods - Suggestions included developing rubric/scoring form for the Master’s Thesis that would document student performance on each SLO and adding formative assessments prior to the end of the program.  
      iv. Results/Use of Results - Data has yet to be collected/reported.  

   c. Ph.D. in Computer Science  
      i. SLO’s - Suggestions included developing a rubric or scoring form that addresses each SLO for the thesis or dissertation and setting targets for performance ratings on SLOs.  
      ii. Curriculum Map - Suggestions included distinguishing between required and elective courses in the curriculum map.  
      iii. Methods - Suggestions included linking components of the candidacy exam to SLOs.  
      iv. Results/Use of Results - Suggestions included focusing on attainment of learning outcomes throughout the program to determine whether gaps in
learning along the course of the program prevent students from progressing in the program or defending their theses/dissertations successfully.

3. Continuing the Conversation on Equity in Assessment
   a. Equity and Assessment Task Force – discussion of draft plan for initiative
      i. Alecia Santuzzi gave an overview of the draft plan explaining a two part study would take place. A qualitative study involving some key stake holders, such as department chairs and program directors, would establish some barriers and facilitators to addressing equity in assessment. The results would be used to develop a survey of faculty to gauge faculty readiness and needs to be addressed to facilitate equity minded approaches to assessment.
   b. Equity-minded assessment practice – discussion of an example case
      i. Carrie Zack plans for future UAP meeting include sharing some example cases to continue the conversation on Equity-minded assessment practices.
      ii. Ritu Subramony asked the UAP members if they have any questions about equity-minded assessment, especially as this relates to assessment practice; these would help the task force prepare some basic responses for colleagues beyond this group.
      iii. Linda Matuszewski asked about disaggregating data, we probably have equity gap information on grades, but how often do we it with learning objectives? What do we do with the information after we have it?
      iv. Beth Moxley asked about the measurement of it, what tool are we using to measure it? What kinds are equity are we measuring?
      v. Subramony posed a question, how are other people looking at equity and assessment? What areas are they looking at when they are looking at equity and assessment? Are there concrete examples that can be shared?

4. Continuing the Conversation on Academic Support Program Reporting – nothing to report

5. Other Business

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:51am.
Next meeting Friday, April 1, 2022