Members

1. Meeting was called to order by Carrie Zack at 10:02 a.m.

2. Minutes approved from last meeting on October 7th (motion made by Beth Moxley and seconded by Therese Arado).

3. Discussion of Bylaw Changes – Carrie reviewed the revisions made based on the UAP discussion from October 7th. Bylaw updates were approved (motion made by Ursula Sullivan and seconded by Therese Arado). AAE will forward the updated bylaws to Faculty Senate to complete the process.

4. AAU process feedback –
   • Carrie reminded UAP about AAU process updates made for the past data collection cycle based on Assessment Taskforce report. AAE made changes to the submission forms and the feedback rubric provided.
   • Carrie presented report on AAU process feedback. UAP members asked about the response rate and suggested to follow up again in the future since it may be too soon to make decisions about the process based on feedback from only a few departments. AAE will solicit feedback again in the future to give programs more time to reflect on the feedback and become acclimated to the changes.

5. Work for the panel this year – Carrie presented a proposal made by AAE based on guidance from the Provost to help move the UAP away from extensive detailed review of program reports so it has more time to focus on its other duties. The proposal was for AAE to review the reports, meet with the programs, and to provide aggregated summaries to the UAP of the feedback made to the programs. In response to the proposal, UAP members asked what projects the panel would dedicate its time to in the absence of reviewing the reports. Members asked if faculty peer feedback would be needed or if administration would be solely giving the feedback on reports produced by faculty. Carrie reminded the group about the other duties, which are included in the bylaws. UAP members made changes to the proposal to include reviewing AAE’s draft of individual program feedback prior to AAE meeting with each program. In addition, AAE will make the submitted mid-status reports available for optional review by UAP members. UAP members also requested a summary of each meeting to learn the program’s response to the feedback. The proposal was amended accordingly and will be considered a pilot. The process will be reviewed at the beginning of the next academic year (2023-24) after all of the feedback has been provided. UAP members voted on this updated process. The amended version of the pilot review process was approved (motion made by Ursula Sullivan and seconded by Beth Moxley).

6. Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m. (Motion made by Ursula Sullivan and seconded by Therese Arado).

Meeting adjourned at 10:55am
Next meeting Friday, November 4, 2022