Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: May 7, 2009
Location: UL 1116
Time: 1:30-3:00

Members Present: R. Aaron, H. Akay, S. Baker, T. Banta, P. Boruff-Jones, E. Cooney, M. Hansen, B. Hayes, K. Hoffmann-Longtin, J. Johnson, K. Johnson, S. Kahn, A. Martin, C. McDaniel, H. Mzumara, G. Pike, L. Riolo, I. Ritchie, J. Singh, J. Smith, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wendeln, M. Wokeck

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm.

1. ***Approval of the March Minutes***
   a. M. Urtel offered an addendum to the proposed April minutes to add the title of the second PRAC grant that was awarded. Let the record state that the Bannatyne, Baldwin, and Marshall project is titled *"Assessing sophomore-level student technical expertise through digital portfolio reviews."*
   b. The minutes were approved as amended.
   c. T. Banta noted that almost all academic units responded to the letter to the deans requesting PUL assignments to courses.

2. ***Group Discussion Share-Back***
   a. The five working groups from the April meeting provided summaries (below) of their discussions; this was followed by some discussion among the whole group.
   b. Group 1-How can PRAC members and others publicize the need for assessment in ways that attract, or at least not repel, faculty?
       i. Work with Faculty Council; emphasize linkage between research and assessment, and standardize assessment "language" across campus (e.g., for grant applications).
   c. Group 2- Create a list of resources (existing or needed) that PRAC, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and other entities on campus can provide to units. For example, who is doing good work with PUL assessment? How might these individuals or units provide help to others?
       i. Past winners of PUL competition, CTL, PRAC web site, Communities of Practice, and others.
       ii. Project sites on Oncourse focused on course mapping (among many ideas) for feedback and sampling.
   d. Group 3-Review the sample PUL rubrics. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses in each and ways of simplifying them so that faculty and students might use them to assess learning of the knowledge and skills embodied in the PULs.
       i. Rubrics for assessment versus grading; holistic versus granular;

      ii. 4 Column levels may be clearest way of representing development over time.
- **e.** Group 4-Generate recommendations for sampling strategies that we can share with units. How should they go about identifying courses/faculty for Spring 2009 assessment and beyond?
  - i. Utilize Gateway, ePort, and RISE projects.
  - ii. Capstone courses and Freshman Learning Communities.
  - iii. Address issues of student and faculty motivation.
  - iv. Identify a solid framework for sampling—this is critical.
- **f.** Group 5-Review the sample student perceptions survey. Provide recommendations about wording changes on items and survey administration directions (faculty and students).
  - i. Update on Spring 2010 Continuing Student Survey.
  - ii. 2012 committee is using the survey.
  - iii. The goal is to demonstrate accountability.

3.   ***Subcommittee Reports***
- **a.** Performance Indicators (G. Pike)
  - *i.* Early version of survey items for PUL is being vetted.
  - *ii.* PIs on PAII web site are linked with the action plan.
- **b.** Course Evaluations (H. Mzumara)
  - *i.* Very active; they met monthly this AY.
  - *ii.* Expanded pilot survey and course evaluation inventory.
  - *iii.* Conversations with Faculty Affairs are ongoing.
  - *iv.* Will implement collaborative recommendations in Fall 2009.
  - *v.* Best practices were shared and reviewed.
  - *vi.* Online survey was developed and administered.
  - *vii.* Testing Center assisted with analysis of survey; evaluation results will be reported.
- **c.** ePort (S. Kahn)
  - *i.* Would like ePort subcommittee to advise ePort initiative. "Introduction to ePort" workshops will be offered to those wanting to learn about ePort—this should not be the function of the committee.
  - *ii.* Committee will work on developing an ePort matrix for the PULs, attached to sample rubrics. This will be offered as a resource, not as a mandated template.
  - *iii.* Invited members of PRAC to pilot an ePort in their classes in Spring 2010.
  - *iv.* Reviewed status of ePort and fielded questions about usability.
- **d.** Graduate
  - *i.* Developed the Graduate Principles of Learning, which have been approved by the Graduate Affairs Committee.
  - *ii.* Looking for graduate programs to pilot GPLs to develop exemplars.
  - *iii.* Need to disseminate this with a unified voice. We should try to develop some good sample work before any campus-wide roll-out.
- **e.** ***Advanced Practitioners***

        i. Have met regularly.
       ii. Served as a resource on assessment and assessment methods.

4. ***PRAC 2008-2009 reflection***
Each member was asked to write-pair-share (with a colleague or two) on the following prompts:
   a. the most meaningful moment in PRAC this year
   b. the biggest let-down
   c. what you expect of PRAC next year

A brief discussion focused on the year's accomplishments and shortcomings ensued.

Urtel collected the written notes from the prompts above and will compile, sort, and analyze them for the Fall 2009 meeting.

Happy Summer!

Respectfully submitted by M. Urtel, Vice-Chair, PRAC.