Program Review and Assessment Committee

January 14, 2010
1:30-3:00 p.m.
UL 1126

~ Minutes ~

1. **Members Present:** W. Agbor-Baiyee, K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, D. Appleby, S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, P. Boruff-Jones, W. Crabtree, Y. Fu, B. Gushrowski, K. Hart, B. Hayes, K. Hoffmann-Longtin, F. Joyner, S. Kahn, J. Lee, H. Mzumara, J. Omachonu, J. Orr, J. Paine, G. Pike, I. Queiro-Tajalli, I. Ritchie, J. Singh, J. Smith, R. Stocker, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, N. Young

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

3. **Agenda overview:** given by Chair Urtel (emphasizing links between past and future PRAC work, and providing a preview of topics for this semester, including upcoming reports on the ongoing assessment work by prior PRAC grant awardees).

4. **Presentation:** *Early Adopters of PUL Assessment: The UCOL Gateway Perspective* – Sarah Baker
Several courses in Summer Session II and Fall 2009 were targeted as early adopters of the PUL assessment process. Observations, reflections, and suggestions from these early adopters include:

- Some users experienced database usability issues, particularly in defining their PUL matrix (entered data did not appear in the database, users would be "kicked out" before they had completed data entry). Such issues are expected to be minimized when these PUL assessment tools are incorporated directly into Oncourse/SIS (projected to be rolled out in February, per T. Banta).

- Most instructors mapped the PUL(s) to be assessed to <u>existing</u> assignments in their courses; no additional coursework was necessary to meet the needs of PUL assessment. PUL ratings (0-3) were mapped directly to level of performance on these assignments/tests, with each instructor developing his or her own rubric or mapping.

- Instructors in this pilot group indicated that some effort should be made to standardize the meaning of PUL rating scores: what does a "0" indicate? A "1"? etc. A majority of these instructors did not use the VALUE rubrics, or used them only in combination with some other rubric (or their own definitions) to assign each student a score of 0, 1, 2, or 3.

- Difficulties noted by these early adopters included the challenge of assessing every student in a large class (> 50 students), lack of standardization of the PUL rating scale, and selecting appropriate assignments to target the specific PUL to be assessed.

5. **Course Evaluation Subcommittee: Survey Pilot Test**

   Ingrid Ritchie provided a draft of a survey on end-of-course evaluations: how they are being used, how they SHOULD be used, what information they provide, and factors that influence course evaluation scores. PRAC members took a few minutes to complete and make comments on the survey. Discussion of suggestions followed.

6. **Old Business/New Business/Announcements**

   Chair Urtel brought to the committee's attention several upcoming workshops of interest to the campus assessment community, including the PUL Symposium on February 1.

7. **Adjournment** at 2:50 pm; minutes respectfully submitted by Karen Alfrey.