I. Call to Order/Reflection

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 A.M. by Sharron Ronco. Joyce Wolburg offered the reflection.

II. Approval of October 24, 2014 minutes

The minutes for the October 24, 2014 meeting were reviewed.
Motion to approve: Noreen Lephardt.
Second: Joyce Wolburg.
Motion passed by voice vote. Minutes approved without correction.

III. Peer Review Seminar Debrief and Discussion

Sharron Ronco thanked Brittney and all who participation in the Peer Review Seminar. She noted that table minutes would be used as the record of the Review Process.

Sharron reported that about 65% of the Program Assessment Leaders participated. The response to the new format for Peer Review was generally positive. Creating grouping were difficult, and the success of a table interactions was dependent on the composition of the group. Changing tables and the composition of the members was a good idea, and was positively noted in the feedback.

The committee reviewed the feedback and data from the Peer Review participants (N=62). For the three activities (Maturity Model discussion, The Examen, and The Marquette Experience) more than 91% of the participants found the sessions “somewhat” or “very useful”. The Maturity Model discussion was rated most positively. The written positive feedback (N=39) had several themes. Many noted the richness and meaningfulness of reflective discussion (several specifically noted this was an improvement over just discussing the reports); positive comments on the new format and changing tables; sharing using the reflective process and the energy level. The unfavorable comments (N=10) tended to be more general complaints about assessment. Three related to the new format. Sharron commented that some of the complaining may be that people do not understand assessment. The three topics most noted for future workshops were: Curriculum mapping (N=26); Assessment of critical thinking (N=22); and Problem based assessment (N=20)
The committee discussed their reactions/insights concerning the Peer Review, issues around assessment and the perception that assessment is not valued. Marilynn Bratt and Patricia Bradford both noted that there is a lack of connection between assessment and the strategic plan. It was felt that there is a need for a better connection between assessment and curriculum design, and institutional outcomes. Noted was the lack of resources for the assessment process, the missing integration of data to outcomes (closing the loop), and the weighing of evidence. Fred Sutkiewicz noted the integrated assessment process in Dentistry where data is tied to outcomes. He suggested that the university assessment process has to move to the next level of integration; weighing evidence and systematic reviews. The UAC will need to decide where it wants to go in the long run. Members of the UAC acknowledged that programs with external accreditation requirements are at a different stages than those who do not. Joyce Wolburg suggested a mandatory meeting for PALS to clarify expectations. Brittney Wyatt noted that there is a general theme of resentment and resistance to assessment for some.

Committee members suggested possible responses to address some of the issues discussed:

- A one page information memo on basic assessment concepts to provide a common understanding for PALS
  - Sharron noted that there is a lot of material on the Assessment website.
- A mandatory meeting for all PALS that outlines expectations, ties expectations with accountability and consequences,
- Sharron could attend faculty meetings at the different colleges
  - There would be different needs targeted for each college
  - Clarify expectation, accountability
- Sharron could attend the Dean’s Council Meetings to get buy-in from leadership
  - Create Information brochure
- Have a faculty assessment retreat

There was a strong sentiment that assessment needs support and by-in from leadership.

IV. Maturity Model Program Data and Discussion

Sharron provided a list of the programs that had not completed the Maturity Model Evaluation. Completed Maturity Models are needed for the evaluation of the data. It was noted that A&S had significant core curriculum changes which may explain the number of missing models. Committee member volunteered to contact PALS in their colleges that needed to complete the model.

Discussion followed concerning how to hold PALS accountable for completing their reports. Recognizing there are few consequences if they are not completed. John Su noted that we are functionally limited (no institutional benefit or cost) and we need to be persuasive and involve people. He suggested that we invite PALs to a UAC meeting to review their Maturity Model.

Pol Vandevelde suggested the most effective method was to involve the Deans. Sharron with follow-up with Gary Meyer about providing information to the Deans.
V. 2014 First Time-Time Freshman Executive Summary

Laura MacBride presented a summary of the 2014 Survey of First-Time Freshman that was collected during Freshman Orientation. (The Executive Summary is available at: http://www.marquette.edu/oira/intdocs/sv_ftf_2014.pdf). There was a 98% response rate and N= 1,954. The survey results have been relatively consistent over the last three years (the survey was redesigned in 2012 and most comparison data was reported for 2012-13-14). Laura noted that the student responses are aspirational goals/expectations. Many of the questions correspond to the senior survey and can be used for comparison. The UAC discussed the results. Several notable trends were discussed including: a.) the rising number of students expecting a 3.5 GPA or better (68% in 2007 compared to 80% in 2014); b.) the increased use of technology (in particular smartphone ownership 2010-39%; 2014-96%); and c.) two new questions added in 2014 showing that 89% of the freshman expected to communicate with their parents or guardians at least once a week, and 59% of the students had received sexual assault prevention education in high school. Laura noted that the reports were shared across campus. Discussion followed about how the data from the reports could be helpful. She indicated that OIS would run reports specific to programs or college needs if requested.

VI. Meeting Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn: Karen Evans
Second: Pol Vandevelde
Motioned passed by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:32 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Noreen Lephardt