University Assessment Committee
October 30, 2015
Raynor Library Conference Room A

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Susan Bay, Jodi Blahnik, Marilyn Bratt, Karen Evans, Noreen
            Lephardt, Marta Magiera, Maureen McAvoy, Andrew Oswald, , John Su, Pol Vandevelde,
            Joyce Wolburg, Brittney Wyatt
Absent: Laura McBride, Guy Simoneau, Fred Sutkiewicz, Baolin Wan, Jean Zanoni

I.   Meeting was called to order by Sharron Ronco at 9:00 AM

II.   Reflection offered by Maureen McAvoy

III.   **Call to approve October 2nd, 2015 UAC Minutes**
            **Motion to approve (with friendly amendments): Maureen McAvoy, Second: Karen
            Evans**
            Voice vote: Unanimous.

IV.   Noreen recommended that Sharron send a follow up email to Rick Holz, Dean of the
            College of Arts and Sciences, thanking him for sending additional representatives from
            the College of Letters and Sciences to the UAC and providing him with the minutes from
            the 10/2 UAC meeting to remind him of UAC needs for the future.

V.   **AY 2015 Assessment Reports not yet completed (attached)**
            Sharron needs to follow up with those who have not yet completed to be sure that they
            know the correct process of submitting reports (e.g., the need to click "completed").

            Discussion about programs with too few students:
            •   PALs should at least make a statement on the reflection page that they're
                collecting assessment data and will aggregate it with future years' data to assess
                the program's delivery of its learning outcomes.
            •   Discussion about potential FERPA violations at issue when programs with very
                few students are assessed. Sharron noted that because assessment information
                is not publicly available, there may not be a FERPA issue. Noreen suggested that
                we consult with counsel just to be sure because in the past counsel advised that
                there would be a FERPA violation in this kind of situation. Karen also expressed
                concern.
            •   Committee advised that Sharron contact Laura Bautista, Associate General
                Counsel at Marquette, to determine if assessment of smaller programs would
                violate FERPA, and if so, how we might avoid those violations.
            •   The concern is that programs with few students will avoid their obligation to
                report. Thus, perhaps there is a way to make some information in ARMS
                inaccessible to anyone but the PAL, so that reporting is still maintained, but
                there would be no FERPA violation.
            •   In the meantime, we could develop a policy that requires programs with fewer
                than X students to indicate in the reflection component of ARMS that they are
                gathering data and will aggregate it and report on it every three years.
            •   Whatever solution is determined, it must then be communicated to the PALS,
                along with all new assessment processes.

Joyce Wolburg will follow up with Communications Dept. people who have not finished.

Sharron hopes that the Committee can help get other reports completed. Sharron will contact Deans to inform them of late report status. Even if programs did not do assessment last year, PALs should submit a report stating that they're working on it for next year.

Discussion about holding departments accountable for submitting assessment reports:
- Suggestion to contact Marya Leatherwood or Dan Myers to ask for suggestions regarding how to incentivize departments to complete reports. We could invite one or both of them to a UAC Committee meeting to discuss this problem.
- General discussion about communicating the importance of assessment as more than a faculty service requirement, but as an obligation to the university and students.
- John suggested that we inform programs in the year before reports are due of the importance of assessment. Tell them that there is an immediate and relevant benefit to their program in completing the reports, and that therefore we're expecting compliance with the assessment process in the coming year. Joyce agreed, indicating that departments are not seeing the reward to their program that can come from doing assessment. Therefore, we need to communicate that to departments. Noreen suggested that departments who have taken an active approach to meeting assessment requirements and who have gained knowledge and expertise from that experience tell their stories to the departments who don't see this.
- **Motion by Maureen, seconded by Joyce that we invite Dan Myers to a future UAC meeting to discuss the importance of assessment and gain university-wide support. Approved unanimously.**

VI.   **Hiatus Requests**
Sharron received a number of hiatus requests from student affairs and co-curricular areas (Career Services, Student Development, Counseling Center, and Recreational Sports) because the Division of Student Affairs is finalizing the shared learning outcomes for all departments within the division. All of these programs will submit reports next year.

Noreen asked whether we communicate end-of-hiatus output expectations to programs that receive hiatus. Sharron has invited affected programs to attend a UAC Committee meeting to report about status of new assessment plans when they are ready. Committee determined that this should be required. If programs on hiatus do not respond/comply, Sharron should report to their deans that they have a hiatus and are noncompliant. Programs who have promised to meet with the UAC in the spring must commit to a meeting date to prevent Sharron reporting to their dean.

Motion to approve four hiatus requests from student services with expectation that they share the status of a new assessment plan development by fall 2016.

(All programs should be required to do this: report in semester after hiatus request as described in previous paragraph.)

Motion to approve Jodi, seconded by Maureen. Approved unanimously.

VII. **Preparing for Peer Review Seminar**
Sharron asked that Committee members attend as facilitators and obtained commitments from those who can attend.

Sharron is working on obtaining recorders. She needs about a dozen people to fulfill this valuable task. Brittney will ask graduate students. Noreen suggested that Sharron ask for volunteers from the writing lab (Rebecca Nowacek). Other committee members agreed to try to find volunteers. A fallback plan will be to ask someone at each table to perform the task (but this hasn't worked well in the past).

There will be three different topics covered in Peer Review:
1. Best practices:
   - Sharon has received confirmation from volunteers from various programs who have done various assessment-related tasks well (e.g., created effective student learning outcomes, curriculum maps, data analysis, or reflections) to present on their best practices. She needs a few more.
   - Tables will then discuss best practices, following suggested discussion questions. Committee commented upon suggested discussion questions.
   - Goal will be to learn how participants will translate best practices learned from presentations into their programs.
2. Knowing the components of a good assessment process (assessing the assessment process):
   - Assessment Process Rating Guide will be distributed to participants with an explanation that this report will be used in the future by the UAC (or a subcommittee or another body). Participants will be asked to react to new rubric.
     a. Committee offered suggestions to improve Assessment Processing Rating Guide.
     b. This guide will still be in draft form as it goes to peer review to get more reaction.
3. Discussion regarding the new co-curricular learning outcomes:
   - Jodi will present new co-curricular learning outcomes and their background, including the goal of integrating co-curricular learning outcomes and common core as university-level goals to participants.
   - We want to know where academic program experiences already intersect with co-curricular learning outcomes.

VIII. **Review the charter/functionality of UAC**
Sharron reported briefly on a conversation she had with Marya about the functionality of the UAC. To be continued.

IX. **Call for a motion to adjourn,**
Motion: Noreen: Second; Jodi
Voice Vote: Unanimous
Meeting was adjourned at 10:31 AM

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Bay