

**2012 Committee**  
**~ Meeting Summary ~**  
**February 24, 2010**

**Present:** S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, M. Fisher, M. Hansen, R. Jackson, S. Kahn, J. Omachonu, R. Porter, I. Ritchie, J. Smith, T. Tarr, P. Varma-Nelson.

1. Carla Boyd from the Office of the Registrar demonstrated the **process that will enable faculty to use either Oncourse or OneStart to post their ratings of student learning** related to the PULs. Members commented on the written instructions and made a few suggestions for revision. Carla will send a new copy of the instructions so that we can see it one more time before we announce its availability to faculty. Points made during the discussion include the following:
  - According to the IRB document that has been approved, PUL data will only be aggregated and reported at school and campus levels.
  - By virtue of its placement on the sidebar of the SIS Web site, the opportunity to use the evaluation site will be available to all faculty. But we anticipate that only those whose course section has been designated for evaluation that semester will take advantage of that opportunity☺.
  - The SIS evaluation form will become available, along with grade rosters, on May 4.
  - We will ask Gary Pike to set deadlines for faculty to enter their ratings and for freezing the file.
  - M. Fisher will provide for Carla an up-to-date list of associate deans so that Carla can refer faculty questions about the evaluation process to the appropriate associate dean.
  - S. Baker will convene a group of the PUL Pioneers to test the usability of the evaluation process.
2. M. Fisher reported that the **PUL Web site** should become available within two weeks.
3. T. Tarr reported that the **PUL Symposium** in early February attracted 94 faculty and staff members. This all-day format seems to be the best way of providing PUL-related teaching and evaluation information to the most people. Subsequent workshops on teaching and assessing individual PULs have not been as well attended—fewer than 10 individuals have attended the last two workshops. Video tapes of particularly good workshop presentations should be made available on the PUL and CTL Web sites. Tarr and P. Varma-Nelson will survey the deans about future workshop needs. Another Symposium in April was suggested.
4. S. Kahn reported that some **faculty who would like to use ePort** have been discouraged by the possibility that they would not be able to use ePort student evaluations to fulfill expectations for the kind of PUL evaluation that we have been discussing. T. Banta and M. Fisher volunteered to speak with faculty, chairs, and deans who have questions about this since we do believe that the ePort evaluation should suffice. We believe that

Gary Pike should be able to transfer data collected in ePorts and merge it with data collected using the SIS system.

5. K. Black will develop a **list of questions** that faculty attending the **North Central Association meeting in April** might use as guides for selecting sessions. Fisher will convene the group of seven who plan to make the trip to Chicago in April so that the questions can be considered and assignments made. Following the NCA meeting, the team will draft a plan for the 2012 North Central self study.
  
6. T. Banta summarized some **comments and questions** that have been posed by PRAC members **concerning the PUL evaluation process**. The list includes the following:
  - We need a body that will actually oversee the process of teaching and evaluating student learning of the PULs.
  - The PULs really need to be evaluated in more core sections more often than once in five years, so someone needs to encourage that.
  - Students ultimately need to know how their learning of the PULs is being evaluated in various courses so that they can strengthen areas of weakness through further coursework. Thus there should be a process for informing students of their PUL evaluations and then informing advisors so that they can help students select additional courses that will enable the students to strengthen their areas of weakness.
  - We must communicate more clearly the policy decision that we are assessing students' levels of performance near the end of a course as opposed to their growth over time.
  - We should provide some encouragement for program faculty to come together to define student learning collaboratively and evaluate it using some standard rating system.
  - Currently we are planning to aggregate data only at the campus and school levels, but it needs to be aggregated at the department level, and even at the program level, in order to give faculty information that can guide improvement. How can we accomplish this?
  - We need to be able to aggregate PUL data in different ways to answer various research questions.

The desirability of forming a new Undergraduate Curriculum Committee was mentioned again in connection with responding to comments and questions like those above.