

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, February 22, 2007

UL1126

1:30-3:30 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Welcome and introductionsK. Johnson
2. Approval of January minutesK. Johnson
3. PRAC grant report.....J. Smith
Paula Magee
4. Program Review Panel T. Banta
Cliff Goodwin
Michael Patchner
Mark Sothmann
5. PRAC grant reports.....K. Johnson
Charles Feldhaus
Tim Diemer
6. AdjournmentK. Johnson

MINUTES –

Members Present: Rachel Applegate, Kate Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Yao-Yi Fu, Janet Fulton, Michele Hansen, Krista Hoffmann-Longtin, Linda Houser, Karen Johnson, Susan Kahn, Hea-Won Kim, Joyce Mac Kinnon, Howard Mzumara, Joanne Orr, Gary Pike, Ingrid Ritchie, Elizabeth Rubens, Katherine Schilling, Joshua Smith, Russell Vertner, Debra Winikates, Marianne Wokeck

Guest speakers: Paula Magee, Cliff Goodwin, Michael Patchner, Mark Sothmann, Charles Feldhaus, and Tim Diemer

Minutes from the January meeting were approved as written.

PRAC Grant Report

J. Smith introduced Paula Magee, science educator in the School of Education. Magee presented findings from a 2005-2006 PRAC grant, “Secondary Education Benchmark Development,” that used a video case study approach to assess student learning near the end of the program. The purpose of the project was to refine a Secondary Education Benchmark assessment protocol, instrument, and scoring rubric. For this Benchmark,

students viewed a video clip of a lesson in their content area and critically evaluated it by responding to a series of prompts. The next step in the project will be to develop rubrics to score student responses and use the results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the Secondary Education program. The PRAC support resulted in:

1. Refinement of the field-testing instruments.
2. Development of a document that introduces the task.
3. Development of a scoring rubric (in progress).
4. A presentation at AERA in April.

The pilot testing of the procedure began with 10 English/Language Arts students. School of Education faculty then met with the students in a focus group to discuss how well the Benchmark tested their depth of knowledge. Faculty members used the resulting data to guide revision of the original prompts to make them less “leading.” In addition, a document was developed to introduce the task to students and to explain its purpose. The document also encouraged students to bring materials (i.e., class notes and articles) that would help them in analyzing the videos. A scoring process, using the newly developed rubrics, will establish inter-rater reliability estimates.

T. Banta asked whether other units were using video case studies or developing rubrics as part of assessment initiatives. Smith mentioned that faculty in some Nursing programs use the case method. Fulton added that Nursing currently uses reflective journaling. R. Applegate asked Magee whether changing the prompts complicated the use of the scoring rubric. Magee responded that scoring was easier when the prompts were more narrowly focused, but now she thinks that it will be a more challenging, but also more useful, process. I. Ritchie asked whether the teaching episodes represented best practices or if the instructional styles represented “good” and “not so good” teaching approaches. Magee indicated that the clips included various “good” and “not so good” elements designed to prompt students to think deeply.

Magee noted that this assessment is not tied to a specific class grade, but rather is a Benchmark assessment at the end of the third semester of the teacher education program. The students understand that the Benchmark is not connected to a class or grade, but is an element of their program. M. Hansen asked whether students were motivated to perform their best under these circumstances. Magee responded that students tend to take the assessment seriously.

Program Review Panel

Banta introduced the Program Review Panel: Michael Patchner (School of Social Work), Cliff Goodwin (School of Engineering and Technology), and Mark Sothmann (School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences). She explained that the units represented had experience with the IUPUI program review as a supplement to their specialized accreditation reviews. These units designed focused program reviews to help them improve in specific areas either not reviewed or noted as an area needing attention in the accreditation process.

Patchner described the School of Social Work’s programs, which include accredited bachelor’s and master’s degree programs. The school’s last accreditation visit occurred in Fall 2004 and examined curriculum, structure, and learning outcomes. The focused

program review was aimed at identifying strategies for increasing external funding. The review panel visited the school in March 2006, meeting faculty, external constituents, and administrators, and then wrote a report providing recommendations in response to a series of guiding questions. One recommendation suggested enhancing relationships with the community and state to include collaborative research activities connected to teaching and service. As a result of the review, the school recruited a high-profile visiting professor in Child Welfare and secured a \$6 million grant from the state. The school also improved its Office of Research Services.

Goodwin discussed the focused review for the technology programs in his school. The school has 11 ABET-accredited degree programs and two programs not subject to accreditation. To prepare for the review, a 20-member committee met monthly for a year, developing a SWOT analysis and preparing 11 questions to guide the reviewers. The questions focused on four main areas:

1. Enrollment
2. Funding
3. Administration
4. Innovation and outreach

The two-day review included a seven-member team: four members from academia and three from the community. Whereas accreditation reviews are oriented toward the past and summative, this process was future-oriented and formative, examining opportunities for innovation and improvement. Reviewers focused on such areas as the need for reorganization and enrollment concerns. Goodwin emphasized the importance of selecting the right people for the review committee and asking the right questions.

Sothmann, the final panelist, described the just-completed focused review for the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences. This review explored possibilities for a Ph.D. program to be offered by the school and the related need for a strong research infrastructure. The day-long visit provided three critical pieces of information. First, the school needs to find productive ways for members of different departments to discuss a common doctoral degree. Second, although IUPUI is a very complex environment and the school is small, the unit is ready for the doctoral degree program. Third, the school must resolve a number of specific issues in order to improve the proposal for the Ph.D. program. Sothmann noted that the quality of the review depends on the quality of the reviewers and on the quality of the unit's preparation; the unit should know what it wants to learn from the review.

Ritchie asked whether attaching a focused program review to a general review would make the program review process more useful. K. Black commented that she was struck by the level of faculty involvement in these focused reviews. Applegate noted that programs not subject to accreditation benefit from full reviews that include some elements of the accreditation process and ask questions that faculty might not otherwise consider. Patchner said that focused reviews carry some risk, in that they ask visitors to examine a self-proclaimed "area of weakness." S. Baker asked whether the next series of reviews will study what has occurred since the first reviews of those programs. Banta responded that programs in their second round of reviews are encouraged to reflect on their progress and that recurring themes are noticeable across reviews campus-wide.

PRAC Grant Reports

Charlie Feldhaus and Tim Diemer (School of Engineering and Technology) presented the results of a PRAC-funded study of associate faculty in the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision. The project was designed to inform, support, and monitor the extent to which associate/adjunct faculty incorporate the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) in their courses. M. Wokeck asked how the terms “associate” and “adjunct” faculty were being used, and noted that adjunct faculty usually have a tenure home in a different department, while associate faculty members teach on a contracted basis by semester. The OLS department produces 5,000 credit hours per year and associate faculty members play an integral role in the unit. These 25 associate faculty members had previously not been engaged in the department’s assessment work. The goal of this project was to help OLS associate faculty appreciate the importance of assuring that the department’s core courses helped students achieve the PULs.

The intended outcomes of the project were to: (a) make the PULs visible to students via syllabi and other methods, (b) use systematic, authentic assessment approaches to gathering data about student learning, and (c) use the data as feedback to improve teaching and learning. The unit instituted faculty workshops focused on these outcomes, using PRAC grant funds to pay associate faculty members a small stipend to attend. The department holds one workshop per semester and has had six since April 2004. Topics have included assessment, teaching and learning strategies, and curriculum development and alignment. An Associate Faculty Assessment Checklist was developed, using Oncourse, and made available to all OLS faculty (see handouts). Associate faculty are now talking the “language” of the PULs and indicate that they appreciate the guidance and professional development they are receiving. Feldhaus showed the Web site that was developed to support associate faculty. S. Kahn commented that this project could serve as a useful model for other departments that rely heavily on associate faculty members.

Kahn presented the IUPUI annual Performance Report, produced in collaboration with the Office of Communications and Marketing. She noted that the report includes the IUPUI mission statement, narrative organized around the campus’s goals in each mission area, and data on performance indicators related to the goals. This year, committees were able to evaluate more indicators than ever before. She thanked the PRAC Performance Indicators Committee for its input.

New member Krista Hoffmann-Longtin announced the 2007 Solution Center Conference and invited PRAC members to attend.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.