1. Grad Assessment Inventory –
   a. Tyler and Robert are looking at what is currently there and meeting with programs to determine how decisions are made for program change.
   b. Tyler and Robert will attend the March AA deans meeting to explain what they are doing and to ask: Who do we need to talk to about program assessment?
   c. Is there anything programs can do to prepare for this?
      i. Initial conversation will be “what are you doing for program assessment?”
      ii. Tell chair that the request is coming, let them know that Tyler will be coming to meet about it.
      iii. Chairs could prepare by identifying their current program assessment plan:
         1. What they already do for program assessment?
         2. Specialized accreditation reports?
         3. Curriculum map?
         4. Learning outcomes?
         5. Examples of closing the feedback loop? How do you use data?
         6. Since DeLys came in 2008, what has been done since?
   d. One of the products will be identifying the differences between programs with accreditation and without accreditation.
   e. The assessment module lists assessment activities but does not include information on how programs are closing the feedback loop and using data for decision making.
   f. Inventory might be able to identify what elements make a robust assessment system.
   g. Some programs list courses tied to outcomes.
   h. This inventory and process can be tools for curriculum review.
i. Requires resources – education, motivation, support, resources, models.
j. A lot of programs use data for program review, but don’t look at it that way.
k. Mandated program review is at the 5-year cycle (OUS). But, now institutions create their own program review – almost everyone is covered with their own specialized accreditation. PSU requirement is in development – ideally program review requirements would be for programs that are not doing their own specialized accreditation to allow those on an accreditation cycle to use that process.
l. Professional accreditation is a higher standard but varies across disciplines in regards to focus areas.
m. Next steps – Tyler and Robert will be developing a list of questions to take to programs. Plan is to speak to as many programs/schools as possible.
n. Suggest to attend CLAS chairs meetings. Best contact for getting on the agenda at these meetings is Grant Farr.
o. Could also do a pre-survey in order to get some general information.
p. Important not to duplicate efforts.
q. Accreditation report states “not enough to have learning outcomes at the graduate level for specialized accreditation, but need to have institutional graduate assessment plan.”
r. Is it possible that somewhere down the road PSU will identify some common learning outcomes across grad and undergrad programs? It seems like the kind of thing that will eventually be necessary.
s. Liza will email Lynn to set up subcommittee meeting.

2. Update on Pilot for communications campus wide learning outcome, part 1 – broad survey
   a. Goal was to submit IRB by this meeting; probably will be done by the end of the week.
   b. Got confirmation that it doesn’t need to go to a full IRB meeting. Can do expedited review.
   c. Tyler is contacting individuals for the broader sampling aspect of the pilot – asking for 1-3 samples of student work from various disciplines.
   d. Next hurdle – getting people to assess the work. Aim to have 18 samples – see how rubric holds up across disciplines. Hoping to finalize this by next meeting.
   e. Choosing samples from 300 and 400 level courses that have a significant writing component. Each department determines what “significant” means.
   f. Departments identify whether or not they are requiring specific criteria and can disaggregate by that data.
   g. Suggest using the value rubric and training scorers.
   h. Rowanna has agreed to run a training for the rubric when it is ready.
   i. Could use English GAs, might need more – might need anywhere from 4-6.
j. Departments will be invited to participate by identifying a course or a faculty member.

k. What we are assessing is “campus readiness” – internal capacity and internal preparation.

3. Part two, deep survey:
   a. Have identified 2 classes in Poli-Sci.
   b. Designed a survey to get perspective of assignment, writing in the major, writing in the careers.
   c. Will use value rubric and have rater training. Will use faculty and graduate students to do scoring. Bring in outside raters to see if their reviews match our own (other institution faculty, other, industry experts).
   d. Will examine reliability of different rating. Will examine how well rubric applies to the assignment.
   e. Will have faculty interviews.
   f. Will be asking faculty – what do you do with what you’ve learned?
   g. Need to identify how much time this is taking and how sustainable is the process (or how sustainable could it be over time).
   h. Will use the 2007 survey to gather evidence about if that survey or others will be useful.
   i. Need to think about what role the IAC should play in assessment – change the expectations. How do we best use this council? Pair membership with the practice?