Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

April 9, 2009
UL 1126
1:30-3:00

MINTUES –

Members Present: R. Aaron, W. Agbor-Baiyee, H. Akay, P. Altenburger, T. Banta, D. Bell, K. Black, D. Boland, C. Borgmann, E. Cooney, W. Crabtree, D. Dunn, B. Hayes, L. Houser, K. Johnson, F. Joyner, S. Kahn, C. McDaniel, H Mzumara, G. Pike, I. Queiro-Tajalli, L. Riolo, E. Rubens, J. Singh, J. Smith, K. Steinberg, R. Stocker, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Wokeck, N. Young

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

1. ***Approval of the March Minutes***
   a. Approved as submitted.

2. ***Addendum to Agenda***
   a. S. Kahn distributed two RFPs related to the ePortfolio
      i. Faculty Scholar for the ePortfolio—deadline May 18, 2009
      ii. Integrative Department Grant—deadline April 30, 2009
   b. PRAC Grant Update – L. Houser forwarded two proposals for approval
      i. Ashburn-Nardo (Psychology): *Assessing the Effectiveness of the Psychology Research Methods Curriculum*
      ii. *Bannatyne, Baldwin, & Marshall (*Design and Communication Technology, Computer Graphics Technology Program)***.***
      iii. The proposals were unanimously approved.

3. ***Discussing the letter to the deans about identifying 1, 2, or 3 PULs emphasized in each undergraduate course and reactions to suggested timeline***
   a. Members reported varied reactions to the letter
      i. Discussion centered on:
         1. Levels of internal communication.
         2. Difficulties in bridging gaps between professional accreditation learning outcomes and PULs (not always an obvious fit).
         3. Deadline may not work well given that it falls during final exam week.
         4. We should avoid haste and be sure we are asking for what we really want.
         5. Is this merely an "exercise" or is it intended to be integrated with assessment efforts?
         6. How was the process shared with faculty?

                7. Given the timeline, it may be difficult to get authentic and usable information.
          ii. Suggestions:
                1. Let academic units assess learning (for their discipline) as it relates to the PULs. This may look very different from unit to unit.
                2. Require that content outcomes be linked with PULs.
                3. Rethink the format/layout (spreadsheet); it looks too much like a set of check-boxes.
                4. Let's try to clarify:
                    a. What is next?
                    b. How will it be used?
                    c. Why is it helpful?
                    d. Can/should we be able to compare across units?
                5. Mapping professional standards to the PULs should be the focus.
                6. Is there a misunderstanding about the extent to which the PULs should be measured?
                7. Given the consequences of not being reaccredited— loss of all federal funds, including student financial aid and access to grant and contract income—we need to have more focused discussion about this process.
                8. Might translation tables be a way for each content area to link PULs to their standards?
                9. The key is that these are PRINCIPLES of undergraduate learning.

     4. ***Working Groups (ran out of time for reporting)***
        a. Group 1 articulated a need to address the "who" versus the "how" in regard to PUL assessment. In particular, the PULs were faculty generated, yet appear to be administratively assessed.
        b. Maybe Faculty Council should revisit this.
        c. Communication gaps seem to be evident in discussions of the PULs at all levels (administration – faculty – students).

**   Time ran out and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm, with an announcement that the May meeting agenda will provide time for the working groups to report on their discussions.
       Respectfully submitted by M. Urtel, Vice-Chair, PRAC.