Marquette University Assessment Committee Meeting
January 18, 2019 Minutes

Attendees: Sierra Jones, Hannah Gross, Margaret Stacy-Duffy, James Marten, Sharon Yu, Karen Evans, Susan Bay, Jen Reid, Jeannette Kraemer, Stephen Guastello, Jeremey Barret, Jean Zanoni, Crystal Lendved, Paul McInerny, Marilyn Bratt, Carrianne Hayslett

1.) Called to order at 9:00 am. Undergraduate representatives were welcomed: Sierra Jones and Hannah Gross; and Sharon Yu was officially added as another Graduate School representative. Jeannette Kraemer rejoined the Committee as a College of Arts & Sciences representative. Carrianne Hayslett is representing the Graduate School.

2.) Minutes from November 30th were approved with the addition that Margaret Stacy-Duffy was in attendance. Barret moved for approval, Kraemer seconded.

3.) Area Updates

   A. Bratt reported that the College of Nursing was preparing for its accreditation visit at the end of this month. Five evaluators will be on site.

   B. Marten reported the Core Curriculum committee will be meeting next week so no update at this time.

   C. Reid reported Student Life is finalizing measurements for student wholistic development assessment. Data will be collected this semester and analyzed in summer. The challenge concerns data measurements since no assignments are obviously given, just experiential significance is sought. Both rubric and survey instruments are being used. Curtis offered that this could be explored further at future dates.

   D. Undergraduate and Graduate Students update – no report. But thanks again for your involvement!

4.) What are the key factors, situations, and contexts necessary for assessment work to lead to innovation or improvement in program-level student learning and development?

Curtis walked the committee through a discussion which summarized the first semester's work culminating in a draft document. The ultimate purpose is to continue moving from assessment as mere compliance to meaningful and practical improvements. The goal then of the developing document is to help stimulate conversation across the university.

Past discussions included assessment instruments and relation to program-level assessment beyond class assignments. In the last meeting, time also was spent examining curriculum structure and whether the "scaffold" approach has meaning. Best courses leverage faculty experiences and talents with meaningful connections.

The document rubric positions criteria with programs and level of advancement. The criteria for programs were: Beginning Assessment Practices; Developing Assessment Practices; Compliance Focused Assessment Practices; Innovation Improvement and Distinctiveness Focused Assessment Practices; and Exemplary Assessment Practices. Various key components of assessment programs were tabulated under each criteria.

Discussion: Do students reflect on what they've learned with regard to the stated learning outcomes of courses and programs? An example was a professor who asked students to report these connections at the end of class. Another example was to survey students who go out to the real world and report connections that they learned or made there.

Continuing with the committee's rubric:

- Use of structure and chaining levels of courses to develop program-level coherence. Different programs have different structures that involve different degrees of chaining.
- Alignment of curriculum outcomes and measurements. Use of a curriculum map for this purpose. How does one course connect to another?
- How is "constructive failure" represented in the program evaluations? The range is from "not allowed" to "treating failures as learning opportunities."

(draft document not ready to be shared yet; however, the feedback from this meeting will be incorporated and a new draft will be presented during the next meeting)

5. Unfinished or New Business: A brief announcement that the subcommittee on software was working on a plan to evaluate new software options.

NEXT UAC Meeting: February 8th, 2019