ATTENDANCE
Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Rebecca Bardwell, Jodi Blahnik, Patricia Bradford, Marilyn Bratt, Mark Federle, Kim Halula, Tom Kaczmarek, Noreen Lephardt, Laura MacBride, Michelle Nemer, Fred Sutkiewicz, Jean Zanoni

I.   **Reflection/Prayer**
       The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Sharron Ronco. The Reflection was offered by Rebecca Bardwell.

II.   **Approval of the March 7, 2014 Minutes**
       The 3/7/2014 minutes were approved Motion by Kim Halula, Second by Jean Zanoni, Rebecca, Mark and Noreen abstained.

       Note that the minutes back to 2004-05 will be on the Provost's website, once they are taken off the website, Jean confirmed the materials will be archived, but only for those that are posted on the website.

       Jean suggested the annual reports be placed on the UAC website.

III.   **New Business**

       Discussion of NILOA publication (January 2014).
       Sharron reviewed charts from the NILOA study. We are ahead with the "Assessment management system or software" Behind on "Funds targeted for outcomes assessment". Overall Sharron's feeling is that we are ahead of the schools who participating in the survey.

       The survey results aggregate all data, the question was asked if we could see data more related to Marquette.

       Figure 22: Priority Needs
       Tough to understand how the priority needs are defined.

       Major Findings –
       http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/documents/2013%20Abridged%20Survey%20Report%20Final.pdf
       1. Stated learning outcomes are now the norm.

       2. The prime driver of assessment remains the same: expectations of regional and program or specialized accrediting agencies.

       3. Substantially more student learning outcomes assessment is underway now than a few years ago and the range of tools and measures to assess student learning has expanded.

4. Meeting accreditation expectations heads the list for how assessment evidence is used, but internal use by campuses is growing and is considered far more important than external use.

5. Provosts perceive substantial support on their campuses for assessment.

6. Institutions more frequently report assessment results internally than to external audiences.

7. In general, institutional selectivity is negatively related to assessment activity.

8. Faculty are the key to moving assessment forward.

Implications are also provided and were reviewed by the group.

IV. Continuing Business

A. <u>Components of a Maturity Model at the Program Level– two page handout sent with Agenda:</u>
Sharron asked for suggestions on how to go forward with this document?

A partial listing of the comments include:

We should review the items from the NILOA study to consider in our maturity model – for example – Student Involvement.

Build the maturity model based on the combined wisdom of this group and Sharron's knowledge.

Need to decide where we are immature and what we will do about it.

Could use this to evaluate how much the faculty know about assessment and their level of understanding of the assessment policies in their program. Top question should filter out those faculty who aren't familiar with assessment. Filter could be "Learning outcomes on syllabi"

Start with an informational approach and share the model with the chairs and deans. This can serve as a guideline for the administrators.

We should decide what our focus of asking these questions – if we are in developmental mode, then we should educate first before conducting the evaluation.

Could this be part of the workshop in the fall with new PALs? We are trying to grow into this – will include this as part of the September workshop.

Treat this as advisory information / informing.

May want to focus on the common core.

Use the PALs to respond to a survey? Fear that folks will be judged.

Should ask the PALS, Chairs and Dean for their level on each of the components in the maturity model. Noreen suggested using QualTrexx.

What are the consequences of being at the high level of maturity? Can a range of program maturity be developed and have those more fully mature mentor those seeking improvement?

Formative and summative assessment (both) are coming to those programs re-accredited. Knowledge, Skills and Values are a focus of assessment in dentistry.

Conduct a survey of what resources you need or grow into.

Sharron wants to resurrect the idea of surveying PALs in the next academic year.

How do we determine where we are at in our assessment cycle and how does that fit with where we want to go in the next 10 years?

This can be a guide, but has to be explained to PALs and others.

Should we have more representatives from Arts and Sciences?

Should there be different reporting levels for accredited versus non-accredited programs – use the maturity model to determine reporting requirements. Is it a requirement versus a suggestion?

Sharron's request: Take another look at the Maturity Model make suggestions for additions, changes, deletions and these will be discussed at the next two meetings. Determine if this should be a guidance document and determine how the committee wants to roll this out. Need to clean up the difference between program versus department.

Need to plan a semester out for surveying faculty.

Should there be a second assessment committee that represents those programs without an external accreditation process?

A suggestion is that this be rolled out over a set timeframe (2 to 3 years)? All complete it by 2017?

The meeting was adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Federle