

University Assessment Committee
March 2, 2018 9:00-10:30
Raynor Library Conference Room D

Present: Sharron Ronco (Chair), Jeremiah Barrett, Susan Bay, Marilyn Bratt, Joya Crear, Margaret Duffy, Steve Guastello, Jeanette Kraemer, Marta Magiera, Paul McInerny, Connie Peterson, Joshua Steinfels-Saenz, Fred Sutkiewicz, Baolin Wan, Britt Wyatt, Jean Zaroni

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m. by Sharron Ronco. Paul McInerny offered a reflection.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the February 9, 2018 meeting were reviewed and approved with Jeremiah Barrett motioning to approve and Connie Peterson seconding the motion.

Updates from the chair

Sharron Ronco updated the committee on the review of program assessment software including Task Stream (now called Watermark), Weave, AEFIS, and Campus Labs (currently in use). The University will extend its contract with Campus Labs for one year and look more closely at AEFIS as a possible replacement. The review committee has been impressed with the company and the product's flexibility. AEFIS could work for programs which have external accreditation including Engineering, Education, etc. as well as the Core and co-curriculars. The system also features a student component. In the coming year, there will be greater participation across campus in the review of AEFIS with more demos and contact with current users. An added benefit of moving to a new system will be the opportunity for the revision of program assessment plans.

Future of assessment and new assessment director

Jenny Watson, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, met with the committee to gather feedback on how to increase interest and enthusiasm on campus for assessment particularly with the hiring of a new assessment director. Currently, there is not a culture of appreciation for assessment on campus. There needs to be more support from university leadership including the Provost and the Deans. There should be more recognition for assessment efforts such as highlighting best practices on campus in *Newsbriefs*, for example. Assessment should be viewed as a collaborative effort and everyone's responsibility not just the responsibility of the point people, PALSs, etc. There are concerns about engaging part time faculty and the desire to streamline the process regarding what is required for external accreditation and what the university needs. The university has been in compliance mode for many years, but there is a need to close the loop and utilize the data. It should be stressed that multiple methods of assessment will meet assessment requirements. Another suggestion was to add more assessment into the program review process. Staff support to assist with clerical tasks would be helpful to the assessment director. Consideration should be given to the organizational structure of assessment as the director is currently a standalone position. It was also noted that the director is not part of any decision-making group on campus.

Topics for training materials for PALs and other faculty

Sharron shared a list of possible topics for assessment training videos which include:

- Rationale for program assessment, overview of Marquette's process
- Writing good program learning outcomes*
- Methods for collecting evidence of learning
- Information for new PALs: What to do right now*
- Summarizing and analyzing assessment results*
- Assessment in small programs
- Curriculum mapping
- How diagnostic assessment data leads to a more credible action plan.
- Setting benchmarks or targets
- Alternative approaches to assessment
- Creating an assessment plan

The Committee recommended that the starred (*) videos be given priority for completion and adding a video on closing the loop. It was also suggested that the videos include an introduction by the Provost and a self-quiz at the end. There is a concern that housing the videos in D2L would limit access. SharePoint is another possible venue.

Fred Sutkiewicz and Jeremiah Barrett volunteered to complete the assessment process rating guide for the biomedical sciences major with a deadline of April 16.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Zanoni