

## **Program Review and Assessment Committee**

**Thursday, April 11th, 2002**

9:30-11:00 a.m. AO 103

Ingrid Ritchie, Chair

Sara Heiliger, Recorder

### **AGENDA –**

1. Approval of Minutes of the March Meeting.....I. Ritchie
2. Report of Assessment Grants Subcommittee.....B. Jackson
3. Discussion of PRAC Annual Reports for 2002.....T. Banta
4. Small-Group Discussion of Performance Indicators for  
NCA Teaching and Learning Self-Study.....Membership

### **MINUTES –**

Present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, S. Avgoustis, T. Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, C. Guba, S. Heiliger, K. Johnson, D. Koerner, J. Kuczkowski, J. McDonald, S. Milosevich, H. Mzumara, A. Olson, R. Osgood, M. Phillabaum, M. Plummer, I. Ritchie, K. Rome, D. Schuetz, E. Sener, R. Vertner, R. White, G. Williams, C. Yokomoto

#### **Approval of March minutes (I. Ritchie)**

- o Minutes approved

#### **Report of Assessment Grants Subcommittee (C. Yokomoto)**

C. Yokomoto reported that the subcommittee is still awaiting responses from the developers of the postponed proposals. Subcommittee members will contact the developers of the postponed proposals about their responses. Report postponed.

#### **Discussion of PRAC Annual Reports for 2002 (T. Banta)**

T. Banta distributed a handout on the 2001-02 PRAC reports, detailing the reporting options. These reports will be made available to the NCA accreditation

review team for their fall visit. Reports are due at the end of the spring term or June 1, 2002 at the latest.

S. Milosevich, M. Plummer, and D. Koerner requested copies of the Assessment Plan submitted to the North Central Association in 1995.

Yokomoto asked whether this year's PRAC presentations were on the Web. S. Heiliger answered that they are available on the Web and are linked to the minutes at <http://www.planning.iupui.edu/prac/minutes/2001-2002/01-02minutes.html> .

I. Ritchie mentioned that committee members can view and suggest updates to the PULs faculty associates' matrices at <http://www.iport.iupui.edu/OLD%20SITE/matrix.asp> .

### **Small Group Discussion of Performance Indicators for NCA Teaching and Learning Self-Study. (T. Banta)**

Banta asked members to form four groups to discuss the Teaching and Learning major performance indicators/objectives. The purpose of the discussions was to provide the NCA Steering Committee with guidance on IUPUI's strengths and weaknesses in these areas. She asked that each group assign a traffic light designation and explain why that designation is appropriate for each of two assigned performance objectives from the blue handout.

- Green is at or above desired level
- Yellow is slightly below desired level
- Red is significantly below desired level
- "I" means that improvement is underway

She further asked each group to complete the green worksheet, with particular attention to question three: "Why would you make this assessment? That is, on what basis would you make your argument? Are any of the performance indicators in the right columns of the matrix helpful? Would you add other indicators? If so, what would you add?"

Ritchie asked how this information would be used. Banta explained that the information will be useful to Susan Kahn as she writes the Teaching and Learning self study.

The committee divided into four groups to work on the task.

#### **GROUP 1**

*A1. Maintain teaching as an institutional priority*

D. Boland reported that the group designated this objective as yellow, green, and improving. She noted that while institutional resources dedicated to this objective have significantly improved, there is often a disconnect between campus priorities and school/disciplinary priorities for teaching. Department chairs seem to value research over teaching and this message is what gets communicated to faculty. In many departments, faculty are expected to bring in external funds.

**Individual comments:** 1. Over the years, the administration has made available more resources and has recognized and supported teaching and encouraged faculty to collect, review, and utilize evidence of student accomplishments. 2. Faculty are focused, generally, on research in order to survive professionally. Therefore, teaching is an institutional priority, but this emphasis has not evolved to a level that might be exemplified by a four-year teaching college.

**Additional Indicators:** The group suggested that faculty members' reputation/recognition for teaching excellence and their publications on teaching might be additional indicators of effectiveness.

*A2. Provide adequate resources for teaching*

Boland noted that the group gave this objective a red light. The group found it difficult to judge the objective because of disparity among the sub-indicators. Class size often is dictated by resources. Group members believed that the current expectation of a minimum enrollment of 10-15 students per section in some departments slows student progress and/or increases faculty workloads. Workloads are affected because faculty members often work with students in independent study courses to substitute for canceled sections; these independent study courses do not count as part of faculty workload. In addition, advisors/faculty often allow students to substitute courses that may not be entirely comparable to the canceled sections, depriving students of potentially richer learning experiences.

She added that IUPUI lacks sufficient facilities for celebrations of student success and the like. There is little time available for curriculum and professional development. The group felt that technology resources on campus are good, but was concerned that current budget constraints may impede further growth in this area.

**Individual comments:** 1. Physical facilities, e.g., classrooms, severely need improvements. 2. Technology is great, campus-wide, but support of specialty needs at unit levels is almost non-existent in some areas. 3. Curriculum development effort is good. 4. Control over class size and available class sections is severely limited.

**Group 2**

*A3. Maintain and enhance inclusiveness in the curriculum*

K. Johnson reported that the group assigned this objective a yellow light and improving. Group members also suggested that the objective be changed to read: "Student opportunities to become aware of/exposed to a variety of other cultures and belief systems within the curriculum and other campus experiences." The group believed that curricula cannot be all-inclusive and that co-curricular experiences can also contribute to student learning about other cultures and belief systems.

**Additional indicators:** 1. General education comparative culture requirements. 2. Minority Scholars Program and targeted scholarships. 3. Programs and departments specifically devoted to this area (Women's Studies, African-American Studies, Anthropology, etc.). 4. Student/Instructor groups (like Black Engineers, etc). 5. Hiring and retention of faculty and students from different cultures. 6. Priority given to international experiences and related activities. 7. Faith in the Academy and similar groups for faculty and staff and/or students. 8. Ethics classes and other ethics components in various programs.

**Other suggestions:** Change the evaluation form to include the possibility of combining an "I" rating with "G", "Y", or "R." Make sure that this kind of information is collected in a central place to minimize chances of overlooking evidence.

*A4. Use of evidence of student learning to guide teaching and curricular improvement*

The group assigned this objective a yellow light and improving also. They suggested that the objective be changed to read: "Use of assessment results to support and enhance effective teaching and student learning and course and curriculum changes."

**Additional indicators:** 1. Gateway initiatives. 2. Learning Communities. 3. Institutional grants for work on assessment.

**Other suggestions:** The group suggested that the indicator "Course-embedded assignments for electronic student portfolio" be revised to emphasize the evaluation or assessment of the assignments, not their number. Finally, the group recommended that the indicator "PRAC reports" include a more specific statement about the PRAC reports as sources of information on use of assessment evidence and resulting improvements.

### **Group 3**

*B1. Continually improve students' general and major-specific learning outcomes.*

E. Sener reported that the group did not reach a consensus on what light to assign this objective. Three out of five gave this objective a green light, while two

said it was improving. They did not feel knowledgeable enough to make overall judgments about the status of this objective at the campus level.

**Individual comments:** 1. I do not know exactly what is going on in each school and/or department. I think a better approach to this undertaking would have been to start at the department level and go up. 2. Most schools are making efforts to establish and measure learning outcomes, but they are not where they would like to be in implementing this goal. Once a good foundation of measurable learning outcomes is established, it will take years to realize improvements. 3. I sense that not all schools have complete assessment programs/findings. From the school oral reports, it appears that schools have integrated learning outcomes across the curriculum to varied extents. Would rate this as Y+. 4. We are moving toward assessing everything we do. Assessment is a part of IUPUI's vocabulary.

**Additional indicators:** 1. Results from the department's campus-initiated program review. 2. Department self-studies and accreditation reports for external bodies. 3. Other accountability measures for schools' attention to the principles – efforts like PRAC that pull schools together to work as one. 4. A list of new courses, new certificates, and new minors since last NCA study (curricular enhancements).

*B2. Enhance quality of the learning environment.*

Three of five members gave this objective a yellow light, while two gave it a green light. Sener suggested that indicators of improvement of the learning environment might include establishment of new labs, professional registrations for faculty, and internal reviews of departments.

**Individual comments:** 1. Enrolled student and alumni surveys continue to show students' overall satisfaction with faculty, curriculum, facilities, etc. I rate this area higher. Experiential work opportunities, e.g., internships, appear to be on the rise. Employer support of career fairs, talks to classrooms, clubs, etc., is very high or steady. These all add an element of realism to the learning environment, albeit an off-campus/workplace extension of the classroom. 2. My personal knowledge regarding students' satisfaction with the quality of teaching in and outside their majors at IUPUI is extremely limited. My guess is that it is improving but could improve more??. Rating Y+ or Y. 3. Still think student co-curricular could have a higher rate of participation.

**Additional indicators:** 1, Development of labs for specific area/discipline use. 2. Internal and external grants to revise curriculum and teaching. 3. Presentations on teaching and learning at professional meetings. 4. Attendance at teaching and learning conferences. 5. Add some student feedback; uniform student evaluations. 6. How do you measure time faculty spend with students outside class? 7. Percent of faculty in professional schools holding professional registrations. 8. Number of years faculty have spent

practicing what they are teaching. 9. Student and faculty involvement in service learning. 10. Number of different types of learning environments employed (e.g. field trips, lab work, etc.).

#### **Group 4**

*B3. Support and demonstrate student academic progress and achievement.*

This group felt they needed more information to designate a light for these objectives, since they didn't have the appropriate data. The group's general sense was that this objective may be between a red and yellow light because of the campus-wide focus on improving retention.

**Additional comments:** Clarify "honors distinctions" to include both 1. GPA-based honors--grad with honors, and 2. GPA + other-based honors—Top 100, Dean's list.

**Additional Indicators:** 1. Top 100 students. 2. Internship opportunities. 3. Dean's list/honor distinctions. 4. Scholarships.

*B4. Produce graduates who contribute to their professions and communities, economically, socially, and culturally*

**Additional Indicators:** 1. Alumni survey. 2. Exit interviews. 3. Alumni Association survey. 4. Alumni giving rates. 5. Local publications listings (top people, e.g., IBJ or Star). 6. Exit interviews at school level. 7. Alumni news (self-reported)—e.g., new job. 7. Community service. 8. College/university partnerships. 9. Internships. 10. Identify IUPUI student rankings from national publications. 11. Offer a "JAG brag" pin to those alumni who report news of new jobs/promotions.

Banta thanked the groups and explained that these objectives are based on IUPUI's strategic plan. She suggested that PRAC will become the primary overseer of these Teaching and Learning objectives. The plan is to revisit these in the fall. Banta will bring in V. Borden and M. Wince of IMIR to present data from the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) and other surveys administered recently to enrolled students and alumni, respectively.

Plummer asked whether NCA will be comparing us in teaching and learning to peer institutions and, if so, how we measure up. Banta explained that it is difficult to find comparative national data. The NSSE is one resource; graduation rates and grades are another.

Banta added that she believes PRAC's work on assessment, and the fact that we are addressing our problems, means that we are further along than many other institutions of our size and complexity. She hopes that the next time we revisit

these objectives the group will feel more confident about discussing IUPUI's progress campus-wide.

**NEXT MEETING**  
**May 9<sup>th</sup>, 9:30-11:30**  
**AO 103**

# Program Review and Assessment Committee

## *Annual Reports for 2001-02*

Sometime during the summer of 2002 NCA reviewers will begin to peruse the IUPUI self-study at [www.iport.iupui.edu](http://www.iport.iupui.edu). A prominent component of that site will be the school annual assessment reports currently posted to the PAII website ([www.planning.iupui.edu](http://www.planning.iupui.edu)). We certainly want to be sure that every school is represented there with a current report by **June 1, 2002** at the latest.

PRAC representatives from several schools have expressed interest in providing a summary of progress in assessment that has occurred over the past several years. This would make an excellent introduction to an update of the matrix that has served as the basis for PRAC reports in recent years.

Other representatives have responded conscientiously to the questions that have guided the oral presentations this year and may prefer to submit an annual report based on their oral presentation.

Still others may wish simply to continue the process of updating the matrix to which the school began to contribute years ago.

Thus there are at least three ways to complete your school's assessment report for 2001-02:

- 1) Complete the matrix\* as initiated previously (continue your usual method of reporting).
- 2) Add a history of assessment in your school to the updated matrix.
- 3) Use the presentation you made to PRAC during 2001-02 as the basis for your report.

In any case, please complete your report and submit it to Trudy Banta on email or diskette by the end of the spring term, or **June 1** at the latest.

**\*Please Note:** The heading for Column 6 of the matrix we have been using should be changed from "What improvements MIGHT BE based on assessment findings?" to "What improvements HAVE BEEN based on assessment findings?" (Making improvements is no longer a matter for speculation—we have done it!)



**Worksheet on Performance Indicators  
for NCA Self-Study on Teaching and Learning  
April 11, 2002**

1. Performance Objective (circle one):

A1    A2    A3    A4

B1    B2    B3    B4

2. How would you assess IUPUI's performance on this objective?

**G**  
**Green Light**  
(At or beyond  
desired level)

**Y**  
**Yellow Light**  
(Slightly below  
desired level)

**R**  
**Red Light**  
(Significantly below  
desired level)

**I**  
**Improving**

3. Why would you make this assessment; that is, on what basis would you make your argument? Are any of the performance indicators in the right columns of the matrix helpful? Would you add other indicators? If so, what would you add?