

University Assessment Committee
March 20, 2015, 9:00-10:30
Raynor Library Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Patricia Bradford, Noreen Lephardt, Brittney Wyatt, Jodi Blahnik, John Su, Pol Vandevelde, Marilyn Bratt
Guests: Fr. Michael Class

I. Call to Order/Reflection

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. by Sharron Ronco.
No reflection was offered.

II. Approval of minutes from February 6, 2015 meeting

The minutes for the February 6, 2015 meeting were reviewed.
Motion to approve: Jodi Blahnik
Second: Noreen Lephardt
Motion passed by voice vote. Minutes approved without correction.

III. February Professional Development Workshops and Assessment Clinics

Sharron reported on the last workshop on curriculum mapping. Even though it was not highly attended, it appeared to be helpful and fruitful for participants. Discussion ensued around how if this process is carried out across academic units. John Su reported that English has a curriculum map. Pat Bradford reported law has “course streams” versus curriculum map. Marilyn Bratt stated that the CON is doing mapping in the undergraduate program and found that the workshop was helpful to engage in the process. Sharron has also done several informal Assessment Clinics with small numbers involved.

Further discussion raised comments around that we tend to not document the mapping process and raised the question as to whether we mandate/state that there is an expectation that there is a curriculum map for each program. ARMS enables uploading of curriculum maps, however it is listed as an optional upload. Should this be required instead of optional? HLC recommended that all programs have a curriculum map. Other questions arose regarding how the common core mapping would occur since it is embedded within existing academic requirements for each unit.

Information was shared the colleges of Communication and Arts and Science are moving toward a 120-credit graduation requirement and professional studies is proposing to follow suit.

IV. Innovation Fund Proposal for Assessment

Sharron shared the focus of her assessment proposal submitted for the Innovation Fund. She felt that the feedback received was not terribly helpful. Noreen Lephardt suggested that there be a rubric for scoring the proposals so as to get more direct feedback to know how to improve the proposal and make a decision regarding submission of a final

proposal. Budget workshops will be held on March 24 in the AMU; those seeking funding should plan on attending.

V. Changes in Assessment of the Core Curriculum

John Su has agreed to stay on as the Director of the University Core of Common Studies and lead the revision of the Common Core. The core comprises nine knowledge areas essential to a well-educated person and distinguishes Marquette University graduate from graduates of other institutions of higher learning. There are 3 learning outcomes for each of these 9 knowledge areas. At the end of this year all 9 areas will have been assessed. Since these are integrated outcomes across majors, they are harder to assess. They are in the process of establishing feedback loops around these integrated core outcomes and John is working with the rhetoric and mathematical knowledge areas to examine this. There are no set benchmarks for these outcomes and there needs to be better connections to co-curricular areas, which will be their future direction. They will be exploring indirect measures to demonstrate achievement of outcomes. From the beginning and throughout the revision process they need to be aware of the outcomes and how and where they can be measured. This revision tends to be a 2-year process with ground work beginning this semester. To begin the revision process they will develop 3 different proposals outlining various approaches to revise the core; these will then be voted upon to determine the final process. It is anticipated that the new core will be implemented in fall 2017.

VI. Next Steps for Revising Assessment of the Co-curricular Areas

Jodi Blaknik reported that committees have met twice. These committees have broad representation. Their work has involved dialogue around what makes their areas distinctive and what are the specific things that they do to make a difference. Currently they are exploring whether they can use existing measures and/or the University guiding values through a top down and bottom-up approach. They plan to meet twice more and keep evolving the discussion. It remains challenging to think about how to articulate and live out the co-curricular outcomes since they are not specific to any one department/college. There is still some perceived disconnect among academic units knowledge of what the co-curriculum does. It was concluded that Jodi and her committees will identify approximately 5 outcomes that the co-curriculum achieves and will bring this list of outcomes to UAC for input in Fall 2015. They will still need to submit an assessment report for this year.

VII. Status of Program Assessment Reports for AY 2014 Institutional Assessment Report

Sharron will be completing the 2014 Institutional Assessment Report that captures assessment for the 2013-2014 academic year. The report will cite any academic unit that did not seek approval to not file a report.

VIII. Meeting Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Bratt