PRAC Minutes
September 29, 2016

Present: Calin Costel, Marybeth Fede, Jesse Gleason, Tricia Lin, Charlie Dillinger-Pate, Anthony Richardson, Rebecca Silady (chair), and Jeff Webb

Guest: Wes O’Brien

Absent: none

Meeting began at 10:03am

Old Business

1. Addendum to PRAC Minutes of Sept 15: On Sept 8, 2016 at the first UCF meeting, Rebecca Silady was unanimously elected by the members of PRAC as chair.

2. LEP Assessment Discussion:
   a) Discussion of which learning objectives need to be measured: Do only the LEP Intellectual Competencies (Written Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Tech Fluency, Multilingual Communication & Critical Thinking) need to be measured or do the LEP Areas of Knowledge & Experience (Tier II categories) and Discussion of Values (embedded in Tier II) also need to be measured? Need to determine what NEASC requires. Also need to consider what we are interested in measuring for our own knowledge about the LEP. Are we just interested in verifying that students have reached a certain proficiency by graduation or do we want to measure their improvement? Do we want to collect just end point data or both pre and post data? Would be helpful to find out how other CSCU schools assess their general education programs.

   b) Discussion of who should collect the data: It is difficult for faculty members to evaluate artifacts from other disciplines even when they are within the same affinity group. Often different disciplines have different learning objectives for a particular competency even within the same affinity group. Some affinity groups have developed rubrics. Again it is hard to find measurement tools that work well for multiple disciplines in the same affinity group. The less specific the rubric, the more broadly it can be used. The rubrics could be used by faculty members to assess their own LEP classes. The data could then be reported to PRAC as part of the normal program review process.

   c) Discussion of who should analyze the data: Data needs to be analyzed across departments for meta-analysis.

   d) Discussion of who should write the report: Dependent on the fate of the LEP director position. Should be a faculty member or small committee of faculty members who are very familiar with the LEP.

Meeting adjourned 11:25am