1. **Members Present:** Aaron, Alfrey, Appleby, Baker, Banta, Bell, Black, Boland, Borgmann, Boruff-Jones, Crabtree, DeFazio, Gushrowski, Hansen, Hayes, Houser, Irwin, Johnson (J.), Joyner, Kahn, Majewski, Martin, Mzumara, Omachonu, Orr, Phillips, Pike, Queiro-Tajalli, Shea, Smith, Stocker, Urtel, Vertner, Willis, Wokeck, Young.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** unanimously approved.

3. **Agenda overview:** given by Chair Smith (emphasizing rubrics as a thread for future discussion).

4. **Subcommittee Reports**
   Each of the following subcommittees gave a report/update on work so far this year:
   - **Advanced Practitioners** (M. Hansen)—This group currently operates more like a roundtable than a resource. The dialogue focuses on local and national topics/projects and on current assessment literature.
   - **Graduate Issues** (L. Riolo)—The subcommittee continues to be interested in Graduate Learning Objectives and discipline-specific competencies.
   - **Performance Indicators** (G. Pike)—The group is “cautiously optimistic” that the indicators are moving in the “right” direction (implying that there is improvement in support for enhancing effective teaching and undergraduate student success). Pike provided detailed explanation of data on entering student qualifications, faculty satisfaction (overall), and minority student retention rates.
   - **Grants** (L. Houser)—The following grants were forwarded for funding and approved unanimously by the whole committee:
     - *Assessing Student Interviewing Competencies Through Second Life*, Vernon, Lynch, and Ouellette, School of Social Work, and Tandy, Valdosta State University, GA.
Evaluation of a Competency-Based Curriculum Tied to Effective Assessment Measurement, Cecil and Krohn, School of Physical Education and Tourism Management.

- **Course Evaluations** (H. Mzumara)—The subcommittee is developing a faculty survey on end-of-course evaluations. Topics discussed have included: strength weighting, mode of delivery, and personal experience as factors contributing to students’ responses. Other key questions included: What should evaluations ‘look’ like? How does peer review and literature inform the evaluation process/tool? The subcommittee presented a workshop at the Assessment Institute that drew 40 participants and plans to conduct a follow-up discussion and pilot survey with PRAC as a whole.

- **Program Review** (M. Urtel)—Urtel announced that Stephen Hundley is now the chair of this subcommittee, which has updated its project site. First iteration of the revised guidelines has been circulated and generally approved by the group.

- **ePortfolio** (S. Kahn)—Meeting will be held today following the PRAC meeting to develop an agenda for the year. Four Integrative Department Grants have been funded with ePort initiative monies for the current year; three of these groups report that they are already using the ePort software. This equates to about several hundred student users.

5. **Previous PRAC Grant Award Presentation**

Rafael Bahamonde presented the findings from his PRAC-funded project, *Effects of the Diversity Scholars Research Program on Minority Students’ Graduation Rate at IUPUI*. After providing an overview of the DSRP, Bahamonde emphasized the following points:

- Even the “best” students take longer than four years to graduate from IUPUI.
- The program includes 25 students yearly; many majors are represented.
- 47 percent of the graduates are in or have graduated from graduate or professional programs.
- A brief Q & A session followed.
6. **Introduction to Rubrics**

Membership self-selected in dyads or triads to discuss construction and use of rubrics. The think-pair-share activity was introduced with the following quotation:

> While I think that sharing rubrics can help with brainstorming, I can’t emphasize enough that the process of developing a rubric like this is itself half the benefit of the assessment process. It is the conversation amongst faculty about expectations that begets the thinking about common standards across a curriculum. (Nasser, December 8, 2009)

To open the discussion, the following prompt was given to the membership:

> “Who is using rubrics to assess PULs? And what do they look like?”

A very robust discussion ensued, with members offering multiple perspectives on the ease of use of rubrics and discipline-specific concerns/endorsements of rubric creation and adoption.

7. **Feedback on Assessing PULs**

- Discussion focused on an update on the five-year mapping initiative, changing PUL designations once they’re in the system, and early adopters’ experience with the assessment process.

8. **2010 Chair and Vice Chair**

Mark Urtel and Karen Alfrey were affirmed as PRAC Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, for the 2010 year for PRAC.

9. **Adjournment** at 2:55 pm; minutes respectfully submitted by Mark Urtel.