

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

December 9, 2004

1:30 – 3:05 p.m., UL 1126

Martel Plummer, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of November 11, 2004 minutes..... Plummer
2. Report of Grants Subcommittee..... Plummer
3. PUL discussion Plummer
4. AIR/NPEC Grant synopsis Kahn
5. Members’ discussion with their deans
regarding *Outcomes of Program Review* (attached) Banta
6. Adjournment Plummer

MINUTES –

Members present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, D. Appleby, R. Applegate, T. Banta, K. Black, P. Boruff-Jones, W. Crabtree, J. Everly, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen, A. Helman, L. Houser, K. Janke, E. Jones, S. Kahn, J. Kuczkowski, M. Meadows, H. Mzumara, M. Plummer, I. Queiro-Tajalli, James Smith, Joshua Smith, C. Souch, G. Whitchurch, D. Winikates, C. Yokomoto, N. Young

Minutes from the November 11, 2004 meeting were amended by Howard Mzumara. The last sentence in the section titled: Web-based Course Evaluations should read: He can track who has completed an online evaluation, but not their answers. Minutes were approved as amended.

Report of Grant Subcommittee – Martel reported that the final evaluation of the grant proposal entitled: Program Review and Assessment for Placement and Instructional Effectiveness in the IUPUI English as a Second Language Program submitted by Lynne Stallings, Acting Director & Lecturer, and Thomas Upton, Director and Associate Professor, English as a Second Language Program, Department of English, had been completed. The final point average was 8.5 on a 10 point scale. The subcommittee recommended that the grant be awarded. As there was no dissent, no vote was taken.

Members’ Discussion with their deans regarding Outcomes of Program Review – Banta said that PRAC members had agreed to share the report prepared by the Sub-Committee on Program Review with their deans. She asked for feedback. Most reported they had shared the document with their deans, department chairs, and/or other faculty groups but have received little feedback yet. They believed that there will be some. Catherine Souch reported that her dean thought the document was useful and that it should be presented to the deans at a Deans’ Council meeting. However, he thought that the results of the reviews belong at the program level. The specifics of program review recommendations and decisions to take action on those reside with the individual departments. Karen Black and Michele Hansen spoke as members of the Program

Review Sub-Committee and reported that the group had discussed this at length and agreed with Dean White. The purpose of the sub-committee's work was to look for cross-cutting campus themes rather than specifics related to individual departments. Banta encouraged the members to elicit more feedback.

AIR/NPEC Grant Synopsis – Susan Kahn provided a brief overview of the grant she and Sharon Hamilton received entitled: **Enhancing Student Success through Electronic Portfolios**. The project is concluding the first of two semesters of work. Josh Smith asked how the e-port enhances learning rather than merely serving as a repository. Kahn indicated that the e-port is organized around the PULs and will be organized around specific course goals next semester. In this way, faculty can make learning outcomes more explicit to students. Additionally, students are asked to reflect upon their learning. Students are asked a series of questions that require them to present evidence of learning and to make connections between their work and the intended outcomes of the course. Students are asked how they have grown and integrated what they have done across courses. Banta added that the work of the e-port reflects the Wingspread Principles of Undergraduate Learning, specifically active learning, time on task, higher expectations, and the support of diverse learning styles.

Martel asked how many students were in the pilot project this semester. Kahn responded: approximately 200.

Bill Crabtree asked if someone was tracking the amount of time students were spending developing their portfolios. He suggested that this be measured. He wondered if the time spent was adversely affecting student grades and retention. Mzumara indicated that one of the criteria is that developing the portfolio should not be an add-on requiring additional work. Kahn added that the portfolio should not be external to the work students are doing for a class.

Crabtree asked about other artifacts appropriate to include in the portfolio. He indicated that most of the examples have centered on written papers. Kahn offered that lab reports, photographs, art work, videos, and any other items that can be digitized are appropriate.

Yokomoto said that there are two processes involved in launching the e-port: the actual development of the structure and the implementation. Hamilton agreed and said that the structure will be in place and faculty will be encouraged to implement. She hopes that at a minimum, first year students will be asked to complete the first cell in the learning matrix in a learning community. Then if the infrastructure is good, other faculty will likely incorporate the e-port in their courses.

William Agbor-Baiyee asked how students were placed in courses that used the e-port this semester. Faculty teaching the Thematic Learning Communities volunteered to use the e-port. Mzumara offered that while students were not randomly assigned, the grade point averages for the groups were similar.

Drew Appleby participated in this year's project and said that he will be asking his students what they understand the goal of the e-port assignment to be and if the goal was accomplished.

Several times during the course of the semester he spoke of the e-port and the goals, but he is still not convinced that students understand the goal.

Kahn and Hamilton will be using the e-port as a part of a capstone course they will teach in the spring. Michele Hansen offered her experience with upper-classmen and the use of a portfolio. She was pleased with the thoughtfulness and quality of the portfolios she received. One caveat she offered was that she required the portfolio as part of the course and it comprised a substantial portion of the final grade.

Souch asked if all learning communities will be required to use the e-port next year. Hamilton responded that they would not, although she hopes many will volunteer. She believes it will be helpful for faculty members to have a year to “play with” the e-port and see how it will benefit them and their programs. Joe Kuczkowski suggested that if Hamilton wants faculty to be involved in the fall semester she should invite people now before they finalize their syllabi. Timing is important.

Josh Smith recommended that Hamilton and others begin to work with faculty to ensure that they align syllabi with the PULs. If faculty have their syllabi and courses aligned with the PULs, the transition to the e-port should be a logical and smooth one.

Banta asked members to indicate if the PULs were a part of the syllabi in their schools, and if so, were the PULs really integrated in the course or merely stated on the syllabi. Irene Queiro-Tajalli believes faculty in Social Work both list them on their syllabi and attend to them throughout their courses. Gail Whitchurch believes that she attends to the PULs during the course of the semester but does not list them on the syllabi.

Amanda Helman reported that she attended portfolio presentations given by senior General Studies students and found that students demonstrated competence in many of the PULs by providing artifacts from their workplace rather than from previously taken coursework.

Linda Houser said that while faculty in the School of Education may not put the PULs on their syllabi, they use them in scoring rubrics. This communicates to students the importance of the PULs and how assessment of them will be carried out.

PUL Discussion – Plummer distributed a compilation of comments turned in after the town hall meeting on the PULs and asked for feedback.

- Comments on the title of the principles indicated a preference for leaving them as they are. One member suggested that professional schools without undergraduate programs may like a broader title such as Principles of Learning. Others suggested that faculty in graduate and professional programs can match their competences to the principles if they think it appropriate.
- Written Communication
 1. How do “opinions and beliefs” differ from ideas?
 2. The key is to express “ideas”
- Oral Communication
 1. Issue with adding speak and listen – One may not be able to speak or hear but still can communicate effectively.

2. What is meant by ‘factors that facilitate and impede?’ Hamilton said someone suggested this phrase because communication is not only delivery or performance but also is analytical.
 3. Leave as is.
 4. Wanted to make it explicit that communication is speaking and listening.
- Quantitative Reasoning
 1. Suggested wording: solve problems using quantitative tools and reasoning.
 2. Should “effective” be a part of the phrase? (solve problems effectively?)
 3. Where do qualitative tools fit? Critical thinking PUL was suggested.
 - Information Resources and Technology
 1. Replace “efficient” with “effective.”
 - Integration and Application of Knowledge
 1. The explanation seems redundant. It appears to be a re-statement of the title.
 - Integration and Application of Knowledge (p11)
 1. The first suggested rewording seems too prescriptive. Should add ‘for example’ or include in the second tier of examples
 - Definition of Values and Ethics
 1. “Decisions” may be a better word than “judging.”
 2. Questioned the consistency of the wording. Others begin with ‘to’.
Suggestion – ‘to make decision with respect to...
 - Outcomes for Values & Ethics
 1. Isn’t aesthetics a value?
 2. Possibly move aesthetics to the communication PUL

Overall the members tended to want to keep the name as it is, to keep the PULs as simple statements, and add a second tier or layer that would include examples or descriptions.

Kuczkowski asked what President Herbert’s stance was on undergraduate education and a common curriculum. Banta responded that Betty Jones is co-chairing a university-wide committee charged with reviewing general education. Sharon Hamilton offered that three of the campuses have principled approaches (IUN, IUK, and IUPUI). However, Bloomington faculty appear to be convinced that the core curriculum approach is most appropriate. Thus she speculated that a hybrid approach much like the earlier general education program at IUPUI may be the outcome.

Next meeting: Thursday, January 13, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. in UL 1126

Respectfully submitted,

Martel Plummer, Vice Chair