

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, October 06, 2005

University Library, UL 1126

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Interim Vice Chair

AGENDA -

1. Approval of September Minutes K. Johnson
2. Update on the progress of the PUL revisions..... K. Johnson
3. Discussion of issues regarding the PULs..... T. Banta and K. Johnson
4. Discussion of Program Review issues T. Banta
 - PRAC's role in Program Review
 - Program Review Guidelines
5. PRAC and Faculty Involvement K. Johnson
 - Reporting Template Project J. Mac Kinnon and T. Banta
 - PRAC projects to assist faculty K. Johnson
6. PRAC Subcommittees K. Johnson
 - General Discussion of Subcommittee Charges
 - Establishment of Subcommittee Membership
7. Short Subcommittee Meetings
8. Adjournment..... K. Johnson

MINUTES -

Members Present: D. Appleby, R. Applegate, K. Baird, T. Banta, K. Black, P. Boruff-Jones, K. Busby, J. Chen, Y. Fu, J. Fulton, A. Gavrin, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen, L. Houser, K. Janke, K. Johnson, S. Kahn, J. Mac Kinnon, A. Martin, C. McDaniel, M. Meadows, H. Mzumara, J. Orr, I. Ritchie, C. Souch, J. Thompson, R. Vertner, G. Whitchurch, D. Winikates, and N. Young

Minutes of the September 8, 2005 meeting were approved.

Update on PUL Revisions

K. Johnson reported on the status of efforts to update the PULs. The proposed revisions were presented to the Faculty Council on September 6

http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/proposed_PUL_changes_7-05.htm.

The comments made during that discussion can be found

<http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/fc050906html.htm>.

The Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Council is reviewing the September 6 comments, as well as the comments made by faculty at large during the various meetings on revising the PULs last year. The committee plans to bring the proposal back to Faculty Council for a second reading at the November meeting. The proposed changes will be presented side-by-side with the current text of the PULs so that readers can see precisely what the changes are.

Discussion of Issues Regarding the PULs

S. Hamilton announced that she is writing an application for a Hesburgh Award from TIAA-CREF that would recognize IUPUI for creating and implementing the PULs. To address the need to cite specific evidence of impact in the application, she asked PRAC members to provide her or T. Banta with examples of the impact of the PULs on their own teaching or their department's or school's teaching and curriculum. The Kelley School of Business faculty's reconfiguring of its curriculum around Values and Ethics is the sort of example she seeks.

Johnson suggested that we try to foster the idea that the PULs are not fixed for eternity, but rather constantly evolving over time just as IUPUI is; they are our way of talking together about undergraduate education. S. Kahn noted that the faculty Communities of Practice (COPs) on the various PULs support this idea. Hamilton, whose office sponsors the communities, explained that they provide opportunities for scholarship, research, and improvement of one's own teaching and encouraged PRAC members to contact her about joining one. Information about the COPs is available at the Center on Integrating Learning (COIL) Web site (www.opd.iupui.edu/COIL).

Johnson noted that we might consider a presentation on the work of the COPs at a future PRAC meeting. She asked that members let her, Banta, or Hamilton know if they have specific agenda items they would like PRAC to discuss or ideas for language that would provide brief and pithy clarification of particular PULs. Banta added that it is especially important to Herron faculty that the PULs incorporate visual literacy; if Herron representatives to PRAC have ideas about ways of doing this, they should let her know.

Program Review Issues

Banta briefly explained the background for this particular agenda item. IUPUI's program review process has been evolving since 1994, with much support from the deans of SLA and SOS, since these schools generally lack specialized accrediting bodies that evaluate their programs. The original idea behind program review was to further the campus mission and foster collaboration. The composition of program review teams reflects these purposes; the teams include two or three members from other institutions; two IUPUI members, one from the same school as the program under review, the other from a different school; and a community member to strengthen community partnerships. Programs in SLA and SOS undergo full-fledged review every five to seven years.

The purpose of program review, however, is not to serve only programs that lack specialized accrediting bodies or other forms of external review. Other programs have also benefited from some form of program review. For example, the School of Engineering and Technology underwent a full-scale program review one year before its ABET visit; the program review helped the school to prepare for the accreditation review. Other programs have used the process to follow up on recommendations resulting from accreditation visits or to focus on selected initiatives or areas.

Generally, the program review process begins with a meeting among Banta, Bill Plater, and the dean of the school to discuss the focuses and procedures for the review and the composition of the review team. K. Black leads a team that meets with the department to help with planning and to explain what information the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement (PAII) can provide. Following the review, the department takes about six months to consider which of the team's recommendations to implement;

this is followed by a final meeting among the department chair, the dean, the internal reviewers, Plater, and Banta. Three to four years later, the department chair reports to PRAC on the long-term outcomes and value of the review process. This long-term follow-up is intended to emphasize that the purpose and process of program review go beyond the filing of the final team report. It also provides PRAC and PAII with ideas for improving the program review process. In fact, this year, the Program Review Subcommittee may want to study the entire process and the various recommendations that have been made to improve it.

Johnson suggested that it might be useful to bring together those on campus who have been involved with program reviews at the end of each semester or year to discuss their experiences and possible improvements to the process. Black noted that such meetings might include people scheduled to be involved the following year. Banta added that occasionally units want to do their own reviews, outside the auspices of PRAC and PAII, and that we have a set of written suggestions that offer guidance for such units.

At this point, Johnson departed from the formal agenda to thank D. Appleby for the “astonishing spread” of delectable goodies and gourmet coffee he provided for PRAC members during the meeting.

PRAC and Faculty Involvement

J. Mac Kinnon explained that she consulted on assessment during the summer with the Central University of Technology in South Africa, whose graduate dean is interested in collaborating with IUPUI on a book on best practices in assessment. This might be modeled on Sharon Hamilton’s edited book on *Writing in the Arts, Sciences, and Professional Disciplines*. The articles might follow the template Banta, Black and colleagues used for *Assessment in Practice*, the best-selling book ever done by PAII. (The template is attached.) Apparently, this kind of brief case study is very appealing to people. Banta urged members to think about and to contribute successful assessment strategies used in their schools that might be included in such a volume. Collecting these strategies would also allow PRAC to compile a portfolio of assessment approaches that could be posted with links on the PRAC web site to disseminate and support assessment campus-wide (as discussed at the September meeting).

PRAC Projects to Assist Faculty

Johnson noted that she and Interim Vice Chair J. Smith are planning to make a series of presentations on PRAC and the help it can provide to various groups around the campus. She urged each subcommittee to include something on its agenda for the year about collecting effective assessment strategies for the Web site; the Advanced Practice Subcommittee might take the lead in assembling these.

PRAC Subcommittees

PRAC has added two new subcommittees this year: one on Advanced Practice in assessment, evaluation, and research methods and one on Graduate Issues related to assessment. The Advanced Practice group has already begun meeting informally with a core group of members, but invites additional interested PRAC representatives to join. M. Hansen, one of the initial members of the Advanced Practice Subcommittee, suggested that members who have primary responsibility for assessment practice in their units might be interested in joining. Mac Kinnon, who expressed interest in the Graduate Issues Subcommittee, noted that graduate programs often have different focuses in their assessment and program review than undergraduate programs.

Johnson added that the subcommittee might be of interest to members whose programs prepare students for graduate school, as well as to members teaching in graduate programs.

Kahn, L. Houser, Black, and Hamilton explained the purposes of the Performance Indicators, PRAC Grants, Program Review, and ePort Subcommittees, respectively. Houser reported that the Fall date for submitting PRAC proposals for grants would be extended to the end of October. In response to a question from R. Vertner about whether non-PRAC members could attend or participate in the subcommittees, Banta noted that external participants are welcome and that PRAC members might be interested in joining more than one subcommittee.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40, so that the subcommittees could convene for brief organizing meetings.