

# Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 24, 2008

UL 1126

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

## AGENDA –

1. Approval of December Minutes
2. Announcement of Fall PRAC Research Grants Winners
  - Assessment of First Year Residential Student Learning and Success (CoPIs)  
Noelle Goodwin, Eric Williams, & Frank E. Ross
  - Assessing Computer Science Majors Using the Capstone Experience (CoPIs)  
Snehasis Mukhopadhyay & Joshua Morrison
3. Exemplary Pedagogical and Assessment Approaches
  - In groups of 4, share one PUL that your school is going to report on the Institutional Portrait Matrix
  - Describe the pedagogical and/or assessment approach you will report
  - Select one exemplar from the group that will be shared back
  - List the PULs were selected
  - Share back one approach per group
4. Questions about the Institutional Portrait Matrix
  - Due February 20, 2008
  - “We are looking for just one good example for each PUL from each school.”
  - Contact Sharon Hamilton with any questions
5. Graduate Issues Discussion
  - What are the similarities and differences in graduate and undergraduate issues?
  - To what extent are PRAC meetings relevant to the needs of Assessment in Graduate programs?
6. Thinking Ahead: Potential Topics
  - Subcommittee vs. Taskforce
  - Annual Report
  - PRAC Membership

## MINUTES –

Members Present: Robert Aaron, Peter Altenburger, Drew Appleby, Kate Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Donna Boland, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Yao-Yi Fu, Michele Hansen, Linda Houser, Allison Martin, Craig McDaniel, Howard Mzumara, Joanne Orr, Gary Pike, Ingrid Ritchie, Elizabeth Reubens, Katherine Schilling, Jackie Singh, Joshua Smith, Mark Urtel, Ken Wendeln, Debra Winikates, Marianne Wokeck, Nancy Young.

1. **Approval of the December minutes.**
  - a. J. Smith proposed a deletion and subsequent change to the minutes. In particular, page two - section *Reflecting on current role of PRAC* – that the first complete sentence and everything after word 9 of sentence 2 be struck. So that starting with line 2 it shall read: “*Currently PRAC lacks a clear role in relation to legal education because the perception of PULs is that they relate to undergraduate learning*”.
  - b. No other corrections were submitted and they were unanimously approved as amended above.
2. Chair J. Smith extended a welcome to new member, P. Altenburger.
3. **Announcement of Fall PRAC Research Grant Winners.**
  - a. Based on the deliberations and scoring of the Grants Subcommittee, Chair L. Houser forwarded the following Fall submissions as candidates to be awardees (a) *Assessment of first year residential student learning and success by Goodwin, Williams, and Ross* and (b) *Assessing computer science majors using the capstone experience by Mukhopadhyay and Morrison*.
  - b. The aforementioned proposals were unanimously approved for funding.
  - c. Follow up conversation from the PRAC members ensued which focused on the logistics of PRAC projects and reports of completed work.
    - i. A suggestion was made that the PRAC recipients be invited to a PRAC meeting prior to starting their project so a mutually informing conversation can take place regarding the project and intended outcomes.
      1. **ACTION:** Follow up discussion prior to the Spring awards will occur.
    - ii. A question was posed as to the currency of the PRAC website and the linked reports of past PRAC funded projects.
      1. **ACTION:** K. Black will review the website and forward to J. Smith and M. Urtel a list of recently completed PRAC-funded projects that have not yet posted their final report.
4. **Exemplary pedagogical and assessment approaches.**
  - a. Prompted 20 minute break-out sessions in small group format occurred. The intent was to stimulate conversations among committee members about what their respective schools may be doing relating to PUL implementation and assessment generally and how that may be reflected in the institutional portrait matrix in particular.
  - b. Discussed points included:
    - i. Some schools report as departments and not in aggregate as one large school.
    - ii. D. Appleby highlighted a department example that focused on ‘critical thinking’ (newly revised definition) and how the scientific method in a capstone course is used to address that PUL.
    - iii. L. Houser highlighted a school example also focusing on ‘critical thinking’ and Multicultural, Language Arts, and Math Education. This sample involved observations, case studies, reflections, and summations that are linked to benchmarks. In addition, the benchmarks are assessed by school faculty and feedback given.
    - iv. J. Singh mentioned how non-academic units utilize a system of assessment and that PULs have a high level of significance.

- v. Finally, there was a point of clarification regarding the wording of the call for examples (PULs due 2/20/08). J. Smith mentioned that the actual expectation is that each unit forward one example of a PUL in action and that there was not an expectation to address each PUL.

**5. Graduate Issues Discussion**

- a. This working group reported on their discussion.
  - i. G. Pike reiterated the fundamental difference between graduate and undergraduate education; the optimism analogy was referred to.
  - ii. Also, even at the Graduate Program level there is much difference with regard to expectations, assessments, etc.
  - iii. G. Pike, K. Schilling, J. Orr, and A. Martin each cited examples and spoke to the differences among Graduate Programs regarding accreditation, licensure, and certifying exams.
  - iv. G. Pike submitted a working idea regarding CGE's (components of the graduate experience); these may be analogous to PULs and it would be tacitly understood that assessment would occur.
  - v. Brief discussion continued about the particular data points that programs could use for assessment.
  - vi. I. Ritchie reinforced the notion that no matter the name or particular data points, the assessment of learning outcomes per program is essential.
  - vii. H. Mzumara reminded the group that the work being done on course evaluations has strong relevance to these types of conversations and he invited input regarding this.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

**PRAC Spring Meeting Dates**

Thursday, February 28 from 1:30 to 3:00; UL 1126

Thursday, March 27 from 1:30 to 3:00; UL 1126

Thursday, May 1 from 1:30 to 3:00; UL 1126

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