

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, November 6, 2003

1:30 to 3:00 p.m., UL 1126

Joyce Mac Kinnon, Chair

Karen Johnson, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of October minutesJ. Mac Kinnon
2. CLASSiFY/faculty development in assessment/documenting
assessment work for P&TN. Chism
3. Update on e-Port S. Hamilton
4. Assessment web site discussionJ. Mac Kinnon
5. Assessment overview and curriculum discussion..... T. Banta
6. AdjournmentJ. Mac Kinnon

MINUTES –

Present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, D. Appleby, S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, P. Boruff-Jones, C. Dobbs, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen, K. Johnson, S. Kahn, L. Kasper, J. Mac Kinnon, D. McSwane, S. Milosevich, K. Morrow, E. Sener, R. Vertner, and N. Young

The minutes of the October meeting were approved as written.

The first item of business was a presentation by Nancy Chism about the CLASSiFY Project. CLASSiFY is part of the Carnegie Clusters Project; it is part of Phase 3 of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Since these affiliations provide no financial support, the Office of Professional Development is looking for funding from FIPSE for the IUPUI portion of the project.

The CLASSiFY Mission is to

- Identify common first-year learning outcomes used across disciplines and institutional types--including curricular, co-curricular, and first year seminar outcomes.
- Through Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) projects, develop, field test, and share a collection of effective and efficient approaches for assessing, measuring, and documenting student achievement of common first-year learning outcomes.

Goals for 2003-4

Identify common, core learning outcomes for the first year curriculum and co-curriculum in the areas of writing/written communication, critical thinking, and civic engagement

Goals for 2004-5

Identify common, core learning outcomes for the first-year curriculum and co-curriculum in the areas of oral communication, quantitative literacy, and diversity.

Objectives for Both Years

- Develop explicit, common standards--expectations for achievement--for those common outcomes.
- Identify the best available measures--commercial and home-grown--for assessing those outcomes.
- Adapt existing measures and develop new ones, where required, to meet the common needs of Core Members.
- Develop assessment strategies for triangulating course-level--or analogous co-curricular learning measures--with other relevant, routinely collected data from grades, placement tests, surveys, etc.
- Design and implement modular training programs—on-line and face-to-face—in assessment and SoTL to prepare campus participants to develop, adapt, and field-test standards, measures, and strategies.
- Share experiences and outcomes of the Cluster's efforts through disciplinary societies, regional and national association conferences, and higher education listservs, websites, and publications.
- Share institutional and cluster findings with researchers from The National Project on the Future of Higher Education, The Policy Center on First Year of College, The National Survey of Student Engagement, etc.

The Carnegie CLASSiFY project has identified a set of learning outcomes related to Civic Engagement, and a final task will be to look for ways to measure whether or not students have achieved these learning outcomes and then engage our faculty or that at fellow institutions in SoTL to assess these outcomes and measures.

Susan Kahn inquired about overlap with the ePort and whether or not this project could use that format. Chism felt that the format could "fit nicely."

Trudy Banta asked who will do this work? Chism responded that it would primarily be done by learning communities, the SoTL group, and the Center for Service and Learning. PRAC members are welcome to be involved, also.

Karen Black asked if the project can continue without funding, to which the answer was a resounding yes, although it will proceed more slowly.

Banta noted that to the extent that the civic engagement component grows out of PULs, it would be important for PRAC members to be involved.

Faculty development in assessment/documenting assessment for P&T:

Nancy Chism then led the group in a discussion of means for recognizing assessment in promotion and tenure decisions. She noted opportunities for making assessment visible through PRAC and the Office for Professional Development (OPD). Various grants, for example, are available. Joyce Mac Kinnon expressed concern that our committee has done a lot of work and asked what reward structure exists for this work? How can PRAC members present their work so that it will be recognized and rewarded? She noted that members need to present their work properly and need also to assist in creating an environment in which this work will be rewarded. Chism pointed out that she has oriented the campus P and T committee to how to evaluate teaching cases. She also said that membership on PRAC will be a means to document service contributions in this area. Donna Boland reported that, in the Nursing School, they often take a value added approach, emphasizing what was accomplished and how that work contributed to a larger dialogue. Susan Kahn noted that some impact is being documented in the School PRAC reports. William Agbor-Baiyee asked if the major issue is assessment in general or assessment of academic programs? Kahn responded that part of the difficulty lies in the range of subjects, and Chism added that program evaluation is central, suggesting that perhaps we might do more with this evidence.

Update on e-Port:

Sharon Hamilton provided an update on ePort. A copy of the new brochure available from her office. She presented the preliminary plan for assessment of ePort, focusing on Planning Process, Impact, Use, Now and Later, and Cost. This process will explain what specific aspects will be assessed, by whom, how and when. It will begin in Spring-Fall 04 and will continue through the life of ePort. Mandates, if they come, will be at school, department, or professional program level. She then presented a sample of what an individual portfolio might look like, stressing the many options for customization that students will have.

Hamilton also introduced a new IUPUI project, the Communities of Practice. This project offers faculty an opportunity to participate in multidisciplinary scholarly discussions about teaching and learning in relation to the PULs. Four communities will be funded during the 2004 calendar year: critical thinking, integration and application of knowledge, understanding society and culture, and values and ethics. Faculty may apply and, if accepted, will receive a \$500 stipend. Faculty in each community will discuss their PUL and do research and development activities related to it. The project is co-sponsored by University College, the Office of the Dean of the Faculties, and the Office for Integrating Learning.

Assessment web site:

Joyce Mac Kinnon led a discussion about the possibility of creating an assessment web site. She pointed out that PRAC does not have the resources (time and money) to create and keep up a website. She asked the group to suggest other vehicles (such as the PRAC listserv) that might serve the same purpose. Erdogan Sener said that Engineering and Technology is in the process of creating an assessment web site of its own; he asked if other Schools are doing this and suggested that PRAC might maintain links to such sites. Michele Hansen said that University College has such a site, but she noted that, in creating a site, groups must go through the Institutional Review Board. Susan Kahn requested that any unit that creates such a site send her a link. Kahn also reported that a new iteration of the institutional portfolio is in progress. Nancy Young reported that she has a "Director's Corner" site on Oncourse for her program in Dentistry and suggested the possibility of a similar Assessment Corner. Mac Kinnon requested that members with other ideas notify her or Banta.

Assessment overview and curriculum discussion:

Trudy Banta presented an Assessment Overview and led a discussion on curriculum issues. She gave an overview of the recent history of undergraduate curriculum committees at IUPUI. The Council on Undergraduate Learning, which was not conceived as a true undergraduate curriculum committee, was disbanded approximately three years ago, in the hope that PRAC and APPC could take on its charge. PRAC, however, has not been able to take on any new work. Meanwhile, APPC has been reviewing new programs. In the near future, the Faculty Council Executive Committee will begin discussion of the need for a new undergraduate curriculum committee to look at overlap of courses and to consult with programs with similar needs. Such a committee might foster collaboration to save money, which is especially important as our funding may be cut. She asked the Committee to discuss whether or not there is a need for such a committee. Sarah Baker, a member of the original CUL, does see such a need, particularly to deal with issues of overlap. Baker added that interdisciplinary opportunities could be developed. Karen Black noted that one value would be to foster an enhanced planning process for our undergraduate curriculum. William Agbor-Baiyee felt that the committee could be a forum for discussion of a common curriculum for the campus and provide a common framework to explore the question of whether we need a common curriculum and of how the PULs could fit in. Sam Milosevich noted the benefit of bringing together departments, such as the 27 departments that now have "computer" or "information" in their missions. Milosevich reiterated the importance of strategic discussion of common goals. He further pointed out the need to be clear about the committee's mandate and to give it a name that reflects that mandate. Banta ended the discussion by pointing out that our focus now must be on how to cut back, for IUPUI has, literally, no more room to grow without an infusion of new resources.

Russell Vertner reported on his outstanding experience at the 2003 Assessment Institute. He particularly noted the presentation of the University of Charleston, which received a mandate to create an assessment program and did a great job from scratch.

The meeting was adjourned.