Present: Beth Horvath, Tatiana Nazarenko, Mark Nelson, Helen Rhee, Tim Wilson, and Bill Wright.

Excused: Christen Foell

1. Prayer

Tatiana Nazarenko opened the meeting with prayer.

2. April 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes

The PRC reviewed and approved the minutes for the April 14, 2016 PRC meeting.

3. Revisiting the Annual Report Template and Rubric

The PRC discussed the Annual Assessment Report Template.

Tatiana Nazarenko raised the question of how we are going to assess Annual Reports that are focused not on PLOs but on Key Questions. It was observed that many colleagues are not aware that some annual reports need not be based on PLOs. It was agreed that it would desirable to remind report-writers of this possibility.

Tatiana Nazarenko also noted that the current “II. Follow-ups” section of the rubric was ambiguous as between: a) a Department’s response to previous PRC recommendations for last year’s report, and b) the Department’s follow-up on their own previous decisions.

It was agreed that both sorts of information should be included in an Annual Report, and that the format of the Template should be modified so as to include (a) in Part I and (b) in Part II.

The PRC discussed the Rubric for Evaluating Annual Assessment Reports. Tatiana Nazarenko asked if the rubric needed all the present categories and if anything was missing.

Bill Wright asked whether we needed separate lines for “Quality of Evidence” and “Quality of Measuring Instruments”, because good instruments tend to produce good evidence, and poor instruments tend to produce poor evidence. It was agreed that these lines could be combined and that residual worries (e.g., about cases in which good instruments applied to small classes produced insignificant data) could be relegated to the “comments” section.

4. Six-year Program Review Report Template for Student Life
Tim Wilson circulated a document entitled “Six-year Program Review Report as Vehicle to Improve Assessment Practices” (from the Dean’s Council Strategic Meeting Agenda, April 26), and reported on the discussions and plans of the Student Life Division as it prepares to write its upcoming Six-year Program Review Report. He expressed the Student Life Division’s appreciation of the fact that the format of their review can be adapted to the distinctive nature of their work, and that they would not be required to follow a format intended for purely academic departments.

5. Oral Communication Institutional Learning Outcome

Tatiana Nazarenko circulated the document “Oral Communication ILO Assessment” and reported on her findings about how and whether various departments address the Oral Communication ILO. She noted that only two departments (Art and Philosophy) do not address this outcome at the department level. Tatiana Nazarenko reported that this issue will be referred to the Academic Senate. Tatiana Nazarenko also reported the results of her discussions with students from WCSA concerning efforts by faculty to inform students about ILOs.

6. ILO Project Discussion

The PRC considered the summary presented in the document “ILO Research Project Completed by the PRC Committee, March-April 2016”. Bill Wright asked whether sufficient attention is given to “Closing the Loop” on this point: we need to find out not merely how well or poorly our students achieve these outcomes, but also to change things so as to help future students do better.

The question was posed, “What are we going communicate to the Academic Senate?”

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm

Recorded by Mark T. Nelson.