

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, October 9, 2003

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

Joyce Mac Kinnon, Chair

Karen Johnson, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of September minutesJ. Mac Kinnon
2. Campus diversity indicators..... K. Rome and K. Morrow
3. Our assessment report—How we did it K. Johnson
4. Discussion of PRAC priorities and activities for 2003-04.....J. Mac Kinnon
5. Volunteers/suggestions for presentations at future meetingsJ. Mac Kinnon
6. Brief meeting of PRAC subcommittees
7. AdjournmentJ. Mac Kinnon

MINUTES –

Present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, S.Baker, T.Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, P. Boruff-Jones, C. Dobbs, M. Hansen, L. Houser, K. Johnson, E. Jones, L. Kasper, J. Kuczkowski, J. Mac Kinnon, M Meadows, D. McSwane, K. Morrow, H. Mzumara, M. Plummer, I. Queiro-Tajalli, K. Rome, E. Sener, J. Smith, C. Souch, E. Udry, R. Vertner, C. Yokomoto, N. Young

The minutes of the September meeting were approved as written.

Campus Diversity Indicators:

Kevin Rome and Katie Morrow gave a report on the **IUPUI Diversity Indicators**, beginning with the formation in 2000 of the Diversity Cabinet. Its members, who include the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Whitney, and faculty and community representatives, built on the work of Planning and Institutional Improvement staff in creating a set of performance indicators. The Cabinet works with senior central and school administrators and key faculty members in refining the campus mission statement and developing a set of goals for each mission component as well as for diversity. Evidence of progress was identified, and the institutional research staff identified data that are already being generated and those that could be added, as well as, for each, the resources that would be needed for their addition. The Diversity Cabinet reviews the available data and evaluates institutional performance for each indicator, as well as for the strategic goal. The rubric used incorporates the familiar Green/Yellow/Red symbols. Individual rankings for the various indicators are available on the web at http://www.iport.iupui.edu/performance/perf_diversity.htm. The unit's overall ranking is

currently yellow, but the next evaluation will take place shortly, and since the unit has implemented the Diversity Cabinet's recommendations, higher rankings are expected. Given the relative youth of the project, however, time must be allowed for improvements to take effect.

Several diversity events, including the successful Diversity Fair, have taken place. The Cabinet is working with Becky Porter on recruitment and with University College (UC) to create a joint position to be shared between Student Life and Diversity (SLD) and UC.

As data relating to diversity initiatives are reported by the schools and units, the Cabinet will be looking at indicators so as to offer faculty a report on improvements across the board.

Erdogan Sener inquired about terminology: For IUPUI's purposes, what is the definition of a minority? Rome responded that, currently, the focus is on African-American and Hispanic populations, but the programs will move from this most immediately critical base to serve the student body at large.

Joe Kuczkowski asked if we are looking at target groups and their specific needs, and there followed a discussion of the political ramifications of the term "targeted programs." Rome pointed out that while the Cabinet is beginning with a more limited focus on African-American males, the clear mandate is to move beyond this focus, taking these projects as pilots for expanded ones. The intention is not to create race-based programs.

The person who is hired for the joint appointment between SLD and UC will work initially with African-American males, but will be setting up a program of mentoring that will not be limited in its application to that group. William Agbor-Baiyee suggested that we be direct in acknowledging the sources of resistance to targeted programs. Betty Jones noted that many of the data components presented to us are quantitative, focusing on enrollment and graduation statistics for example, and she wondered if the Diversity Cabinet is working also on fostering effective interactions between the groups on campus. Morrow replied that it is, and that much of this information is available on the web site. Rome pointed out that the Diversity Cabinet set priorities and that enrollment came first. Joyce Mac Kinnon asked how interested individuals could get involved or express opinions, and Rome said that individuals can respond to any of the materials on the web site. He also welcomes contact from any individual and promises to take input to the Diversity Cabinet.

Our Assessment Report—How We Did It:

Karen Johnson discussed the Department of English's work on the PRAC report form. She described the special challenges faced by the Department due to its size and diversity of specialization. The Department faculty began early to work on assessment, but then allowed the process to lapse until two years ago, when it began anew. The

faculty tried a number of ways to elicit both data and faculty participation in the process. Early obstacles included the changes in the department since the initial work had been done, the difficulty of finding quantitative measures for work that is largely in essay form rather than in objective testing, and the general feeling among the faculty that, as their work loads increased, they would need to take time away from teaching to report on teaching. An additional difficulty that quickly emerged was that, while the faculty did not feel that they had time to participate actively in assessment, they were also hesitant to leave reporting to a small group of people. After a false start, the Department achieved a great deal of success by forming an ad hoc committee to look at department goals and objectives and to consolidate these wherever possible. Various sub-disciplines within the Department created grids in which they identified the major skills and bodies of knowledge that students need and determined what aspects of those larger goals should be addressed at which level—freshman, sophomore, and so forth. This process went well, and the members of the subcommittee were able to report to their colleagues that the process had been rewarding. Meanwhile, Johnson, charged with completing the PRAC form, sent a new request for information, this time phrasing the request in terms that had emerged as faculty talked about their own perceptions of their work and including prompts to remind faculty of work that they might not view as immediately relevant to assessment. Most of the faculty in the department provided excellent information for most of the categories.

As the English Department moves forward, we plan to use Yokomoto's house call strategy to involve those faculty who are still resistant, to continue to stress the positive benefits of assessment, particularly its potential to save, rather than expend faculty time. Other strategies will include making sure that goals for improvement are framed realistically so that faculty can be encouraged with clear evidence of progress and that our assessment is placed within a context that acknowledges the extent to which factors beyond our control will shape our ability to fulfill particular goals.

Betty Jones suggested that the Department request a consultant from the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement who might help the Department locate the kinds of data to support its claims.

Michele Hansen pointed out that contextualization is done in the program review process and that useful strategies might come from reviewing that process.

Discussion of PRAC Priorities and Activities for 2003-04:

Joyce Mac Kinnon led a discussion on PRAC priorities and presentations for future meetings. She noted that Nancy Chism, Sharon Hamilton, and Charlie Yokomoto will present at the November meeting, and asked for volunteers for presentations or for suggestions for topics that PRAC should consider. Members also received a handout on possible activities and priorities (attached to the minutes). Michele Hansen could present or lead a discussion of models of evaluation, focusing on outcome assessment. Suggestions for PRAC activities include:

- looking at the areas—research and graduate rates—in which Chancellor Bantz wants to double our current statistics, and locating data to help the conversation on doubling move forward.
- looking closely at the context for our graduation rate--how long is it taking and how many actually graduate?
- examining the situations of transfer students to consider the support that IUPUI offers them.
- creating an assessment web site with resources so that people who need something can go to one central location. We might also highlight assessment successes on the site.
- reexamining the promotion and tenure policies and practices to ensure that assessment is valued in practice as well as in the guidelines.
- revisiting the question of whether or not the campus should have an undergraduate curriculum committee and/or a core curriculum and to what extent this issue is within the purview of PRAC.
- investigating statewide plans for curriculum alignment and the Governor's Roundtable.

Further suggestions are welcome, and can be e-mailed to Banta, Mac Kinnon, or Johnson.

Brief Meeting of PRAC Subcommittees:

The four subcommittees met briefly at the end of this meeting to choose chairs and begin their planning processes.

The meeting was, effectively, adjourned as the various groups completed their tasks.

Possible PRAC Activities and Priorities for 2003-04
(distilled from PRAC's own recommendations,
from the NCA review team, and from the
PRAC Executive Committee with thanks to Susan Kahn)

1. Increase involvement of faculty, students and deans in assessment (eg: by providing access to assessment expertise; assisting faculty to incorporate PULs and their assessments into syllabi and courses)

NOTE: We discussed some mechanisms for providing assistance at the Sept 03 PRAC meeting; refer to minutes.

2. Improve rewards and incentives for assessment (eg: P&T decisions; teaching awards and honors)

NOTE: We have scheduled Nancy Chism to attend our November meeting to talk about criteria for P&T; the executive committee met with Richard Turner who will be sharing written information with PRAC on this topic.

3. Continue and complete work on performance indicators for teaching and learning.

NOTE: PRAC has a subcommittee in this area.

4. Consider a "transition course or transition experience for transfer students entering with significant credits

5. Improve the campus infrastructure for assessment.

NOTE: Do we want to recommend a core curriculum; do all schools have assessment committees; do we need a university wide curriculum committee?.

6. Disseminate the results of assessment.

NOTE: Could we have a newsletter which would highlight achievement in this area?