

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Tuesday, December 7, 2006

UL1126

3:00-4:30 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of the November Minutes K. Johnson

2. Using Program Theory in Assessment Research
Presented by:
 Jacqueline H. Singh, M.P.P., Ph.D., Assessment Specialist,
 Office for Professional Development and
 Michele J. Hansen, Ph.D., Director of Assessment, University College

 The workshop will: Provide context and a brief history of program theory, address the utility of visual models to explain inner workings of programs and guide research, discuss the importance of using theory and conceptualization in assessment, introduce tools and approaches that expose program theory (or, logic) through building models, and show examples.

3. Teaching/learning performance indicators G. Pike

4. Additional sub-committee reports

5. Adjournment K. Johnson

MINUTES –

Minutes from the November meeting were approved without correction.

Using Program Theory in Assessment Research

Michele Hansen and Jacqueline Singh (OPD assessment specialist) from the Advanced Practitioner’s Subcommittee of PRAC gave a presentation on program theory in assessment research.

Hansen articulated the goals of the presentation:

- Provide context and brief history of program theory
- Address utility of visual models to explain inner workings of programs and guide research
- Discuss importance of understanding purpose and conceptualization
- Introduce tools and approaches that expose program theory (or, logic) through building models
- Show examples of program theory in practice

Several handouts were provided as supplemental materials. The included:

- Program Analysis Notes
- Performance Measures
- Program Theory and Logic Modeling Resources
- Selected Sources of Evidence

Singh pointed to the growing use of logic models to support grant applications. She recommended faculty/staff review the Kellogg Foundation document that provides examples of the various types of logic models. J. Mac Kinnon commented that the presentation helped to put the ideas into context and welcomed further discussion. Hansen and Singh said that they could follow up at a different PRAC meeting or meet individuals to discuss/create a logic model to support grant writing and unit assessment processes.

The complete PowerPoint is available upon request from mhansen@iupui.edu.

Teaching/Learning Performance Indicators

G. Pike shared a summary of conclusions reached by the Performance Indicator Subcommittee. He focused on the “Support and Enhance Effective Teaching” indicator and thanked subcommittee members for their work. He noted that due to scheduling difficulties the subcommittee completed much of its work electronically. The overall ratings were generally the same as those assigned the previous year. However, a few of the sub-goals changed from the previous year’s assessment. Goals included:

- Institutional priorities for teaching development and practices
- Development of technology-based and technology-assisted teaching capacities
- Engagement of students, through the curriculum and co-curriculum, in learning about their own and other culture and belief systems
- Use of assessment results to support and enhance effective teaching and student learning and course and curriculum changes.
- Demonstration of students’ general education and major-specific learning outcomes
- Quality of the learning environment
- Student academic progress and achievement
- Success of recent graduates in obtaining suitable employment or pursuing further education.

Referring to the student academic progress and achievement goal, R. Vertner asked Pike to clarify stated retention rates. The first- to second-year retention rate for full-time, degree-seeking students was 67% and the percentage of sophomores in good standing, as defined by earning 26 credits and having a 2.0 or above, was approximately 50%. The six-year graduation rate for first-time/full-time degree-seeking students is 23%. *U.S. News and World Report* uses this criterion on 240 national universities and IUPUI ranks 230.

D. Appleby summarized the overall indicator report by saying that it appears IUPUI is providing an excellent learning environment; students are learning, have access to resources, and graduates are getting jobs. The caveat is that this scenario only applies to a fraction of the student body.

C. McDaniel wondered about the factors associated with dropping out. Several PRAC members suggested the following factors: the DFW rates are going up after years of decline; 40% of students leave IUPUI in good academic standing; some students come here as a stepping stone to IUB or Purdue; students lack institutional commitment.

W. Agbor-Baiyee reflected back on the program theory presentation and asked if one of the program theory methodologies might provide some guidance to help explain the predicament. He also thought the process might illuminate a pathway forward toward improving graduation rates at IUPUI. Pike pointed to John Bean's work on retention as a good resource and also cited the work of Cabrera and Nora on campus climate. T. Banta pointed out that we have numerous quantitative indicators, but we might need to invest energies in additional qualitative indicators to improve our understanding of the context and interactions among many variables. Pike agreed, noting the importance of understanding the needs of the students. Others observed that students in greatest need are often hardest to reach, and they are not utilizing the supports available. Agbor-Baiyee asked about the impact of learning communities on achievement and retention. Hansen reported some positive effects on retention based on studies using a quasi-experimental design. K. Johnson ended the meeting by stating that we need to continue the conversation in the spring. PRAC members will talk about general education at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37PM