

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, September 13, 2001

9:00-11:30 a.m. UC 115

Joyce Mac Kinnon, Convenor

Patti Holt, Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of May Minutes..... Ritchie
2. Welcome and Introductions Ritchie
3. PRAC Grant Guidelines..... Banta
4. Approval of Guidelines for Review of Service Units..... Ritchie
5. Appointment of Subcommittees Ritchie
6. Guidelines for NCA Self-Study on Teaching and Learning/Discussion of
School Presentations Banta
7. Nursing Program Assessment Presentation Boland
8. Topics for Future Discussion—Input from Members..... Ritchie

MINUTES -

Present: S. Baker, K. Black, D. Boland, K. Duckworth, L. Houser, B. Jackson, K. Johnson, D. Koerner, J. Kuczowski, J. Mac Kinnon, I. Queiro-Tajalli, R. Rigdon, E. Sener, R. Vertner, M. Wagner, G. Williams, C. Yokomoto, N. Young.

Guest: Sharon Vinten, School of Nursing; Patti Holt, Planning & Institutional Improvement

Agenda Item 1. Approval of Minutes of May 2001 Meeting (J. Mac Kinnon)

Minutes approved.

Agenda Item 2. Welcome and Introductions (J. Mac Kinnon)

Agenda Item 3. PRAC Grant Guidelines (J. Mac Kinnon)

Joyce Mac Kinnon asked for comments on the guidelines. She reminded the attendees that PRAC offers grants up to \$2,000 per project.

David Koerner voiced his concern regarding bullet number 3 on page 1, “Anticipated findings and uses to be made of findings for program improvement.” There was some discussion that this point may be in a “gray” area and that the wording should be changed.

It was decided to change this point to read, “How will findings be used for program improvement?”

Marion Wagner asked about the two deadlines for submitting proposals, as she had understood there would be more than two deadlines. Joyce Mac Kinnon stated that it had been collectively decided that there would be two deadlines.

The guidelines were approved.

At this time, Joyce Mac Kinnon briefly discussed the document, “Process for Review of PRAC Proposals.” Motion approved to review proposals using this process.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of Guidelines for Review of Service Units (K. Black)

Karen Black reported on how this document was originally created. There have been several opportunities to use this document, including with the Career Center. It has been reported that it worked well. Student Government is using this document as well.

Several questions were raised regarding how units would be identified for scheduling. Karen Black responded that each academic unit has been scheduled routinely, and “not because we perceive a problem.” This keeps units from feeling they have been “singled out” for review. We hope to be able to schedule administrative units in the same way.

It was pointed out that in the document, “Guidelines for Program Review at IUPUI – for Service Units,” the word service had been substituted for support.

The guidelines were approved.

At this time, Joyce Mac Kinnon referred to the PRAC mission statement and its importance in conveying the role and purpose of this committee.

Agenda Item 5. Appointment of Subcommittees (K. Black)

The following individuals volunteered for subcommittees:

- 1) **Grant Review Subcommittee**
 - S. Baker
 - B. Jackson
 - M. Wagner

- 2) **Student E-Portfolio Subcommittee**
 - D. Koerner
 - L. Houser
 - D. Boland
 - S. Hamilton

- 3) **Annual School PRAC Reports Subcommittee**
 - K. Black
 - I. Queiro-Tajalli
 - R. Vertner
 - N. Young

Agenda Item 6. Guidelines for NCA Self-Study on Teaching and Learning/Discussion of School Presentations (K. Black)

Karen Black announced that a schedule was being passed around for sign-ups for each school's presentation. She explained that copious notes would be taken at each presentation, which would in turn be used in developing the NCA self-study on teaching and learning. "An Approach to PRAC Reporting for 2001-02" guidelines are to be used in each presentation.

Agenda Item 7. Nursing Program Assessment Presentation (D. Boland and S. Vinten)

Donna Boland explained that this is a very complex package, which they continue to work on, and it is always evolving.

She began with Question 1 of "An Approach to PRAC Reporting for 2001-02" and explained that the School of Nursing publishes an Annual Report which contains many benchmarks that have been established to assess program quality. These benchmarks reflect the skills graduates should develop, with the goal of excellence in academic programming. She passed out diagrams, which indicated what they are trying to achieve as a school. The school's curriculum is outcomes-focused and driven by competences. She discussed how the faculty worked "backwards" by first determining the desired competences, then moving to establish milestones or benchmarks within the curriculum. As students meet the benchmarks, they move toward achieving the desired program competences.

She further explained that as the campus was coming to agreement on the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, the School of Nursing faculty had already determined the learning competences for their students. The SoN faculty were pleased to discover that their outcomes complemented the new Principles. Faculty developed a matrix that in part looks like this:

PUL ↓	Program Competence	Teaching Strategies	Measurement	Findings	Decisions Made

Faculty determined that a primary focus is on "critical thinking," and employers want people "who can hit the road running!"

The capstone experience answers the question, "What can Mary do?" This gives a great opportunity for assessment: Is the student ready to move out? Is the student ready to perform? Through this experience, students are able to see themselves grow. At this time, the capstone experience is the most valuable measure of student outcomes.

A clinically-oriented practice capstone was established in the BSN program. This course was developed to provide students the opportunity to "put it all together" in a learning environment that fostered reality, independence, and accountability. The capstone also was designed to provide faculty with the opportunity to assess the degree to which students were able to meet the stated outcomes and competences of the BSN program. The capstone design further shaped the context in which assessment of student learning would occur and who the evaluators would be. Assessment became a collaborative effort with three major players. The student was actively involved in the process along with the faculty member. The third player in this collaboration was the nurse "preceptor". Preceptors are recognized nurse experts who have been

recommended for this role. These nurse experts understand both the role the student is expected to assume, the role of the learner, and the learning expectations of the program from which the student is about to graduate. Collaborative assessment appears to have enriched the process while increasing the importance and value for the student.

Donna observed that the students tend to be more critical of their performance than either the faculty member or preceptor. All three (the student, course faculty, and preceptor) complete a form that rates performance on a 5-point scale: 1-performed unsafely and unprofessionally; 2-performed under direction of preceptor (one-on-one direction); 3-performed with coaching from preceptor (some direction and much support); 4-accomplished with some preceptor support and minimal direction; and 5-accomplished task independently in an appropriate student role. In the clinical experience the program competences that are assessed are: Critical thinking, cultural competence; coordination of resources; political awareness; ethical and legal nursing practice; effective communication; competent care provider; professional role model; responsible care manager.

Student progress is also assessed within the program. For example, students who have earned a B- or less in H353 or H361 (5th and 6th semester courses) are asked to sign a “Progression Enhancement Agreement” in which the student agrees to work with a student mentor for the subsequent semester prior to its start; provides a study plan to course faculty for the next semester; revises and re-evaluates the study plan if course grades are C or less; meets with course faculty at least 3 times during the course to review achievement of course outcomes and study plan; attends Test Taking Strategies sessions; reviews each exam with faculty to analyze wrong responses, compares outcomes to study plan goals.

Other measures that the SoN faculty have used include:

The California Critical Thinking Inventory- They found that this was not sensitive enough to what they needed and didn’t measure what was being taught in the program. An additional critical problem with this test was that students did not take the test seriously.

Research Utilization: This complements the capstone experience and faculty are able to assess writing and critical thinking.

The school’s accrediting agency required the school to make clear distinctions between the ASN, BSN, and MSN. Faculty had to determine outcomes/differences for each program offered: Associate of Science in Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Doctorate in Nursing. This requirement made the faculty not only look at individual program outcomes but also at differences in outcomes between programs. One outcome of this process is that as faculty get better about articulating the differences between programs, students are better equipped to determine in which program they are most interested.

Ken Duckworth asked whether this motivated students to continue on to higher education. Donna Boland responded that they have no hard data on this yet, but guidelines help students know where they want to be. Sharon Vinten mentioned that exposure to faculty and students in

clinical environments is working well in motivating students to advance in their programs. Students are returning to further education.

Donna Boland described briefly the assessment process using critical thinking as an example. The faculty first identified the performance indicators, then the performance measures. The measures had to be valid and measure the appropriate skill or knowledge, and finally it had to be determined that these measures were worth the time and energy that were used to collect and analyze the information. Lastly, the faculty benchmarks are established.

Karen Black asked, “Where is the outcome of the whole curriculum going?” Donna Boland stated they are using the capstone program to evaluate this. This common tool incorporates all outcomes of the program. They summarize ratings across students and across classes to derive a class average. The first data are just now coming out of the experience with the first program graduates. These results will establish benchmarks for the entire program. Faculty are constantly reviewing these data.

Irene Quierro-Tajalli asked how this refers to the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning and what process has been used to achieve this. Donna Boland stated that the faculty began a comprehensive program review in 1993. They began with looking at what employers needed and what was being projected as best practice. This took an entire year. They then looked at outcomes based on these data. Sharon Vinten stated that the Principles fit well into life anywhere. Donna Boland said the challenges are that some campuses require a general education core. She also spoke about the “cluster concept,” where students have the opportunity to take different courses that reflect IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning themes.

Karen Black asked about the implications of the findings for the campus. Sharon Vinten suggested that one challenge for the campus is to ensure that students come to the major with a common set of competences upon which the major can build. The schools need to have assurance that students have a given level of competence before entering a program. The campus needs to undertake a comprehensive review of what students are learning before coming to the major to ensure that they are at an appropriate level and consistent with the Principles.

Ken Duckworth asked what the campus is doing to make students aware of this program. Donna Boland responded with recruitment, looking at the job market, and making sure the students are aware of what they need.

Joe Kuczowski raised the implication of the campus looking closely at a basic general education core, where units could add on other courses they see as important, before students move into various programs.

Agenda Item 8. Announcements (J. Mac Kinnon)

Karen Black distributed brochures for the 2001 Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. One member from each school can attend the institute for free. She briefly explained there would be 75-minute workshops, 20-minute presentations, and educators coming from all around the country. Joseph Kuczowski made the suggestion that the letters to the Deans offering a complimentary registration to the November Institute be copied to the Committee Members.

Karen Black was asked about the dates for **the North Central Association site visit**. The dates are: **November 18-20, 2002**.

Joe Kuczowski expressed interest in the self-studies that will be produced by service units as they conduct program reviews. He is interested in understanding how the units view the quality of their services and programs.

S. Baker and G. Williams are now Doctors!

S:\pholt\minutes of the program review and assessment committee.9-13-01