

University Assessment Committee

November 16, 2012

Minutes

ATTENDANCE:

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Lea Acord, Patricia Bradford Rebecca Bardwell, Kim Halula, Noreen Lephardt, Laura McBride, Michelle Nemer, Chris Perez, Sonia Shah, John Su, Joyce Wolburg, Jean Zanoni

Guest: Alix Riley (OIRA)

REFLECTION/PRAYER

The meeting was called to order at 9:00am by Sharron Ronco. Chris Perez and Noreen Lephardt offered prayer and a reflection.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the October 24, 2012 meeting were approved with one minor update. Noreen Lephardt suggested highlighting the recommendation of creating a permanent paid position or paid graduate assistantship.

CONTINUING ITEMS

- **Graduating Senior Survey**

Alix Riley, Jon Dooley and Sharron Ronco are on a committee working to update the Senior Student Survey. They are meeting with various committees to get feedback on the instrument with the goal of implementation in spring. They are planning on giving the survey to test groups of students. The instrument is designed to be survey of academic experience, not the auxiliary services. They want feedback on specific items or categories of items and are asking if there are specific items or broad institutional data that should be captured in the survey. The following is a list of comments provided by UAC:

Noreen suggested unbundle q79. "Other Masters degree" maybe by college.

Also, when you ask 2 things in one question- caution against "and, or" in statements.

Lea: concern on length of survey and time to complete. Alix indicated there are branching questions, not all questions will be answered, depending on the student's responses.

Jean: suggestion: Add a question for using resources for research effectively.

Use research and information resources effectively,, from HLC Criterion

Rebecca: Are you expecting to give data back to specific department for use or is it all Marquette info? This survey is not to be anonymous. We will know what college and major. Instructions will indicate it is not an anonymous survey. We will be able to break down by college and perhaps major.

Q70 may be changed to get more information- what degree and what discipline

Noreen: suggested asking a question to determine if a student intends to pursue grad program at MU or another school? Alix said using National clearing house we can find out where our alumni go for graduate school.

Joyce: q35-42, relate to core, concern about how a student answers a question if they do not take related courses.

Noreen: if we ask questions specifically about core, why not tell students that they are about the core and separate the math concepts from statistical reasoning.

We can pick up gender and ethnicity through Campus labs. Students will be sent an individual email invitation to take the survey. It is not necessary to ask question about demographics.

In freshman survey, we do not ask students to provide demographic information.

Sonia (Student rep): Concern about not being truly anonymous. Can it be offered as an anonymous?

John suggested survey the students to see how they would feel about it not being anonymous.

Noreen: Q62- suggest making a 5 point scale instead of yes, no, not sure. Ask how satisfied are you with completing your degree as you had planned.

Comments were made that it is a well-written survey.

Sonia: Suggested a question about satisfaction of the core in general?

Q29-34 Participation in activities meaningful interactions with people of race/ethnicity different than your own? What about homogeneous interactions?

Noreen: Do we have a question having to do with negative experience? This is all academic. There are open ended questions, which can be used for negative experiences.

- **Update on Pending Assessment Plans**

Most of the pending Assessment plans issues have been worked out. The plan for the Construction Engineering and Management major is still missing. Chris will talk with the Program Director to get the plan submitted.

- **Debriefing on Peer Review Working Seminar**

A discussion on the Peer Review Working Seminar followed. Some of the comments made included:

- the deeper discussion with group. It allowed us to discuss plans in general and had interesting conversation about improving assessment.
- the note-taking responsibilities was shared among the group was a positive

- participants seemed to be more engaged and thinking this out. A person new to the assessment group was quiet but this is understandable since he was new there seemed to be a great interaction between people
- grouping by similar programs helped
- Some departments such as Philosophy and History, whose programs allow students to pick a track, experienced difficulty writing objectives since they were dependent on the track selected. The discussion included the possibility of rethinking objectives to what skills are needed rather than the knowledge for a particular subject area.
- Not using the rubric sheet was a positive. It felt like people were graded.
- Emailing of reports as pdf documents worked well.
- It was not always necessary to have a table leader/facilitator. The discussions went well. Having a designated timekeeper can be important. Some tables may need a discussion leader.

Suggestion: In the future, more people may bring laptops to view the PDF documents, we should make sure there is enough power outlets available.

Commendations were made to Sharron and Michelle for all the hard work they did to make the event a success.

Suggestions for future peer reviews:

Have separate sessions for grad and undergrad

Have several small meetings throughout year

Include faculty that are not assessment aware

Patricia commented that most law faculty may not be aware of assessment and the process. The Law School has a new Assessment Committee. It seemed like their faculty were not aware that the University has assessment committee. She suggested that perhaps coming in as a guest speaker at faculty meetings to get the faculty more aware of assessment. Sharron said she would be happy come to meet at a faculty meeting.

Feedback forms will be sent back to PAL, dept. chair and dean. Opportunity to send information about key talking points to the departments.

- **Assessment Results to External Audiences**

A discussion regarding the list of information that will be made available to external audiences followed. Currently, the following items are available to anyone through our website:

- objectives/outcomes
- Program Assessment Plans
- Highlights
- Individual Assessment reports from 2009 (available to MU campus only)

With ARMS, only those with login capability have access to the system. A decision was made to give View access to other PALS and participants.

There are more details and information placed into ARMS that might not want to be made available to students.

A list of items that should be reporting to external include: evidence of learning, descriptive information, indicators of learning performance, results of evidence

It was suggested that we Create an annual report including: information on process, types of direct and indirect measures used, passage of licensure and certification exams, dashboard information- retention and graduation rates, employment of graduates, graduates going on to graduate studies

Rebecca suggested that it would be a good idea for faculty in a program to get access to the reports. This can be done in the ARMS Institution Tab, and then grant access to any other programs report. ARMS is “live”, so there is a need to rerun the report since the reports are not static.

Noreen suggested that everyone should have access to the reflection and that other faculty should be able to view deeper.

A discussion on making the an overarching report accessible by students would be a good idea, but there was doubt expressed that students would not read the report.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Perez, Recorder