University Assessment Committee
May 6, 2016

Raynor Conference Room A

Present: Karen Andeen, Jodi Blahnik, Karen Evans, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Maureen McAvoy, Sharron Ronco (Chair), Guy Simoneau, John Su, Pol Vandevelde, Baolin Wan, Joyce Wolburg, Brittney Wyatt, and Jean Zanoni

I. The meeting was brought to order at 9.03 AM. Karen Evens provided the reflection


III. University Program Review – The Procedure for Assessment - Sharron Ronco

The procedure of how the UAC’s will evaluate a programs assessment process for University Program Review was the central focus of the discussion.

The UAC will have a greater role in giving feedback to programs on their assessment process as they engaged in their self-study in preparation for external reviewers.

- In spring 2017 four departments will prepare their self-study for program review: 1. Education (three graduate programs); 2. Graduate School of Management; 3. English (3 programs) and 4. Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science (multiple programs).
- There was a discussion of the process and structure the UAC will establish and follow for University Program Review; who would be involved in the rating process and how the assignments would be made.

- The Recommendations are:
  1. Programs will be reviewed by pairs consisting of 2 UAC members – Sharron will assign UAC members
  2. UAC members will review three years of assessment data using the Assessment Process Rating Guide – The data will be accessed from ARMS and the team will review.
  3. UAC reviewers will write an Executive Summary which includes summative statements of the program’s assessment process and key recommendations. The summary will be in the Appendix of the Program Review material that will be read by the External Reviewers.

IV. Assessment Process Rating Guide – Beta test for History

Sharron used the History major to illustrate how the Assessment Rating Guide would be completed. The History department is up for program review in Fall, 2016.
Sharron noted that the ARMS reporting system may not reflect all of the assessment work the program is doing. We should invite the departments to share additional assessment information in their self-study.

The UAC discussed the meaningfulness of the UAC’s assessment review for Program Review by external professionals and concluded that the Rating Guide will be helpful for the review process.

Jodi Blahnik and Laura MacBride volunteered to complete the Guide for the three history programs this summer.


The focus of the Institutional Assessment Report was a narrative on the evolution of assessment at Marquette and reflective comments on the continued building of a culture of assessment at Marquette. This will be a public document. It will be shared with Administration, Deans before it is made public.

The narrative focused on moving the culture of assessment at Marquette towards a broader understanding of best practices; focus on student and program growth; rigor and precision in assessment design and flexible approaches to assessment reporting to meet diverse program needs.

The document includes a number of appendices. These will be made available internally but not shared on the public website.

Sharron asked for comments and feedback from the UAC.

The general reaction of the UAC was positive and the content good.

John Su will send assessment results from the ICLOs (Core).

The question about the structure and role of the UAC was brought up and Sharron indicated she would wait for guidance from administration.

VI. Concluding Remarks - Sharron

Celebrate a good year for the UAC
Joyce Wolburg will rotate off the UAC. Karen Slattery will replace her.
Next year we will not be meeting in this room. We will move to Raynor C.
First meeting will be in Zilber Hall 470

VII. Motion to Adjourn : Karen Evans; Second Jodi
Meeting adjourned at 10:29 AM
Respectfully Submitted,
Noreen Lephardt, Ph.D.