Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

February 10, 2005
1:30 – 3:00 p.m., UL 1126
Joyce MacKinnon, Chair
Martel Plummer, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

MINUTES –

Members present: D. Appleby, K. Baird, T. Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, W. Crabtree, R. Dittmer, C. Dobbs, J. Everly, A. Gavrin, M. Hansen, L. Houser, S. Kahn, J. Mac Kinnon, D. McSwane, S. Milosevich, K. Morrow, H. Mzumara, J. Orr, M. Plummer, K. Rennels, J. Smith, J. Smith, C. Souch, R. Vertner, D. Winikates, C. Yokomoto and N. Young

Minutes from the January 13, 2005 meeting were approved.

James Madison University Assessment Instruments: Katie Morrow reported on several of the assessment initiatives at her home institution, James Madison University (JMU), and at its Center for Assessment and Research Studies (CARS). JMU offers a masters degree in assessment and is the only university awarding a doctorate in assessment. This degree prepares graduates for work in university assessment.

JMU has a comprehensive general education program built around five clusters that are similar to IUPUI's PULs – broad abilities that cross the disciplines. CARS has focused on assessment of general education, working hand-in-hand with JMU faculty. Assessment activities are more broadly based than simply in individual courses.

JMU faculty, with CARS staff, have developed online instruments to assess learning in each of the five clusters. Three of the instruments are more polished than the others and are being shared with colleagues in other institutions. They cover quantitative reasoning, scientific reasoning, and information literacy. PRAC members who are interested in seeing these instruments or who have questions should contact Morrow at akbusby@iupui.edu or 278-3365 to request temporary access online. The software was developed in-house at JMU.

Kelley School of Business Indianapolis (KSBI) Assessment Results: Russell Vertner provided a table of assessment activities undertaken by KSB faculty over the past five years. The Kelley Indianapolis Assessment Task Force (KIATF) piloted ePort, developed a senior exit survey tool, solicited employer feedback, pilot-tested an exam from the Education Testing Service (ETS), developed Principles of Business Learning (PBL) aligned with the PULs, had faculty analyze learning outcomes in their courses and how those were assessed, participated in communities of practice, and got feedback from directors of the masters programs about the PBLs in graduate courses. KIATF members now are considering developing course-embedded assessment tools, in conjunction with the school's Undergraduate Policy Committee.

Jim Smith then reported on the **Senior Exit Survey**, which the KIATF designed, based on a Kelley Bloomington model. Dean Roger Schmenner and Professor Gyula Vastag analyzed the results and were able to draw some helpful conclusions (e.g., 95% of graduates would recommend Kelley to their friends and family, 25% are over the age of 27 years, etc.) Students voiced concerns about grading, prerequisite courses on campus, advisors, classmates, and extra-curricular activities. The survey will be tweaked to clarify some of the questions/statements. It was also suggested that the questionnaire be shortened. Information from the survey was shared with the entire faculty. Overall the instrument has provided meaningful, useful information. The results of the survey are being used in the deliberations of the KSBI undergraduate policy committee. The KSBI committee on institutional strategy is also using the information.

Plagiarism and Civility Issues: In the past, a suggestion was made that plagiarism and civility be topics for future PRAC discussion. Joyce Mac Kinnon asked for feedback from the membership. People interested in the topics are asked to email Mac Kinnon or Banta indicating their interest, and particularly stating what focus or aspect of these would be helpful.

ICHE Goal 6: Trudy Banta distributed the matrix that was created last summer in reporting to the ICHE on Goal 6. That information had been taken from PRAC reports. Now we are invited to update the information. Eventually the campus will use the ePortfolio to assess student learning in general education. However, for the near future, we are asked to review and update the contents of the matrix. School faculty will still complete the annual PRAC report matrix as usual.

Future Agenda Items: Agenda topics were solicited and include:
1. more program reviews
2. IRB
3. plagiarism
4. civility
5. update on PULs
6. assessment of civic engagement
7. reports from the councils on Enrollment Management, Civic Engagement, and Retention
8. consider again the reviewers' advice from the 2003 North Central Accreditation report

Philosophy Department Program Review Update: Michael Burke reported that his departmental review occurred in 1998; overall it was quite positive. He indicated that there have been 11 positive developments since that time.   A couple of those include: a new master's degree to be implemented this fall, and enrollments are up 48%.

Burke followed his report with a suggestion for the review process. He proposed that a new second type of review be made available for strong departments that have a history of positive program reviews. This *action oriented review* would consist of two elements: 1) an abbreviated version of the standard review with external reviewers (curriculum quality and stature of faculty, etc.), and 2) special projects that would improve the department. The special projects would be proposed by the faculty and approved by the dean.

Susan Kahn indicated that this is similar to some new regional accreditation initiatives. There are also some national conversations related to continual improvement that sound similar.

Donna Boland asked what a department would base its plan for improvement on (formal conversations within the department, reflections, etc.). Results of past reviews would give ideas for possible projects. Ideas suggested for improvement plans included creating several new distance education courses and writing grant proposals for special projects.

Banta pointed out that even with specialized project plans, reviewers may still ask for all the routine self-study information as well. North Central did that in the IUPUI Review.

The question was raised whether this was a "tool for low-hanging fruit' vs. real student learning and growing. Let's be careful not to use assessment as a reward or punishment. Assessment as we think of it in PRAC rises above that.

Generally PRAC members seemed to think this idea would be worth further consideration.

Susan Kahn reported that a recurring theme in program review presentations has been that departments cannot tackle some of the recommendations made by reviewers due to serious budget constraints.

The meeting concluded at 3 p.m.
The next meeting will be on **Thursday March 10, 2005 at 1:30** in UL1126.

Respectfully submitted,

Martel Plummer, Vice Chair and Recorder