

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, December 6, 2007

UL 1126

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of October Minutes..... K. Johnson
2. Discussion of November 15th PUL Presentations All Attendees
3. Reflecting on the Current Role of PRAC Dyads
 - a. Membership
 - b. Tangible Activities
4. Looking Ahead to 2008 J. Smith
 - a. Vision for PRAC
 - b. Strategies for Communication
 - c. Technical Assistance for Program Review
 - d. Resource to Individuals and Units
5. Announcement of PRAC Grant Recipients L. Houser
6. Election of Vice Chair and Chair of PRAC K. Johnson
7. Subcommittee Reports Chairs
8. Announcements J. Smith
K. Johnson
9. Adjournment K. Johnson

MINUTES –

Members Present:

Robert Aaron, William Agbor-Baiyee, Drew Appleby, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Polly Boruff-Jones, Richard Edwards, Yao-Yi Fu, Michele Hansen, Krista Hoffman-Longtin, Karen Johnson, Timothy Lyons, Allison Martin, Howard Mzumara, Gary Pike, Lisa Riolo, Irene Queiro-Tajalli, Elizabeth Rubens, Jackie Singh, Joshua Smith, Kathryn Steinberg, Randi Stocker, Mark Urtel, Russell Vertner, Ken Wendeln,

Approval of October Minutes

The minutes were approved as written.

K. Johnson requested that subcommittee reports be the first item on today's agenda.

Subcommittee Reports

Performance Indicators Subcommittee

G. Pike discussed two indicators pertaining to undergraduate teaching and learning:

- Support and enhance effective teaching
- Support undergraduate student learning and success

The first indicator moved from green to green-yellow last year and was rated as yellow this year. One reason was that the number and rate of faculty going up for tenure on teaching has

decreased. In the past five years, the rate has declined from 40 percent to 13 percent of the faculty basing their tenure cases on excellence in teaching. Other issues were related to Oncourse CL experiences and technology support. Some suggested that PRAC members meet with Vice Chancellor Sukhatme and the deans to discuss these issues, along with the decrease in funding to support teaching and learning, particularly within the Office of Professional Development.

J. Smith asked what direct indicators helped the committee make its determination. Pike pointed to NSSE results suggesting that IUPUI was lower than peers on many teaching and learning indicators. He also noted that six-year graduation rates have increased from 24 percent to 28 percent and predicted that the rate would be 31 percent for next year, which is an improvement, but is still below our peer institutions. K. Wendeln pointed out that DFW rates have been flat. A. Martin noted that excellence in teaching is not clearly defined. Johnson agreed that defining excellence in teaching is difficult.

Course Evaluation Subcommittee

The subcommittee has been meeting regularly to take a snapshot of current practice. The group began by examining data provided by the Testing Center, which has a graduate assistant who will study current evaluation form questions by department. The Faculty Affairs Committee is also investigating the issue; the two committees will meet to discuss possible collaboration. Referring to the earlier discussion about teaching and tenure, Johnson cautioned that “how committees view course evaluations makes a difference.” The goal of the PRAC Course Evaluation Subcommittee is to get faculty buy-in and potentially identify some common items across the campus. Wendeln pointed out that the core campus situation further complicates the issue. H. Mzumara added that SPEA’s course evaluation is used almost system-wide and that there are additional ways to assess excellence in teaching, such as peer review.

Program Review Subcommittee

The group previews self-studies for units and provides feedback. The process appears valuable for units and committee members.

Reflecting on the November 15 PUL Presentations

Johnson pointed to the practical applications presented at the session and the ways in which the PULs unite academic units at IUPUI. E. Rubens reported that one faculty member commented that she was new to the campus and didn’t know about the PULs. Questions were raised about the ways in which schools orient new faculty to the PULs. K. Longtin-Hoffman encouraged members of Career Council to attend the session and Wendeln brought students along to see how governance works and to listen to the discussion across disciplines. R. Vertner wasn’t sure about the purpose of the program, but encouraged more such presentations/opportunities for a variety of faculty and staff to get together, possibly quarterly or bi-annually. M. Hansen was pleased with the balance of theory and practice, noting that presentations were well done. Johnson mentioned the conversation following the formal presentations, when Smith asked about valuing the PULs and assessing mastery of them as part of graduation requirements. D. Appleby referred to Alverno College and its emphasis on development throughout the degree.

Reflecting on Current Role of PRAC

A. Martin commented that PRAC lacks a clear role in relation to legal education because of the perception that the PULs apply only to undergraduate learning. Pike argued that more faculty than staff should be represented on PRAC. K. Black noted that student learning occurs outside the classroom and therefore staff should be on the committee as well. Johnson asked whether

Deans were appointing more staff and noted that much assessment work is being conducted by professional staff rather than faculty.

Black said she thought that PRAC should include more department chairs to enrich discussions about curriculum. L. Riolo noted for the record that she is a chair of her department. Vertner added that it is important for members to share information with their units and to bring faculty to meetings periodically. S. Baker agreed, but commented that it's hard to find people who want to be on the committee and that the institution needs a change in culture in order for the committee to flourish.

Tangible PRAC Activities

Johnson asked about the effectiveness of the subcommittee structure. Wendeln suggested implementing a more task-force-oriented approach. Identify a clear task with a beginning and an end. He would like to see PRAC focus on tasks rather than standing subcommittees and cited work on the Kelley senior exit survey as a collaborative task that was useful to the faculty. R. Aaron felt he could benefit from reports on current national issues and discussion of how IUPUI is thinking/responding to these large issues. Vertner proposed brown bags to highlight the PULs and workshops on aligning/assessing each of the PULs within curricula. These would showcase current practices and expose others to opportunities/ideas to begin a project. Wendeln commented that student voices are missing from assessment and argued that students would benefit from understanding of assessment, while PRAC would gain momentum from student participation.

Election of Vice Chair/Chair

K. Johnson called for additional nominations from the floor. None were put forward and Mark Urtel and Joshua Smith were elected Vice Chair and Chair, respectively, by consensus.

Looking Ahead

PRAC needs to plan activities for the upcoming year and beyond. Smith and Urtel will meet to propose discussions aimed at clarifying unresolved issues. Smith invited members to email with ideas for spring. Suggestions included using PRAC as (a) a sounding board for project ideas, (b) a resource for providing technical assistance for programming and preparing for program review, (c) a medium for sharing best practices on strategies for communicating about and assessing particular PULs.

Announcements

Smith offered his thanks to Johnson for her service as Chair and her personal mentoring. The members agreed with heartfelt clapping.

Meeting adjourned at 3:25PM.