Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 27, 2008
UL 1126
1:30-3:00

MINUTES –

Members Present: Peter Altenburger, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Donna Boland, Polly Boruff-Jones, Elaine Cooney, Michele Hansen, Kristin Hoffmann-Longtin, Linda Houser, James Johnson, Susan Kahn, Howard Mzumara, Joanne Orr, Lisa Riolo, Elizabeth Rubens, Katherine Schilling, Jackie Singh, Joshua Smith, Mark Urtel, Russell Vertner, Ken Wendeln.

1. ***Approval of the February Minutes***
   a. Unanimously, without edits.

2. ***Subcommittee and temporary taskforce reports***
   a. L. Houser (chair of PRAC Grants Subcommittee) reported that two proposals were submitted for the spring 2008 funding cycle and moved that both be recommended for funding. PRAC members voted in favor. The two funded projects are:
      i. "Development of a Phase One Portfolio Project for the Assessment of Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers' Content Knowledge," by Katie Stanton-Nichols.
      ii. "Students' Assessment on Race: Haitian and Dominican Populations," by Rosa Tezanos-Pinto.
   b. S. Kahn (chair of the ePort Subcommittee) gave the following updates:
      i. Assessment functionalities are being built into the e-port software.
      ii. With assistance from UITS, capabilities to link assignments with learning outcomes and the ability to map outcomes to unit and institution outcomes are being developed.
      iii. An attempt should be made to broaden the membership of this subcommittee, so that more faculty on PRAC can participate in discussions about the assessment needs ePort might address.
      iv. D. Boland (chair of the Program Review Subcommittee) reported that the subcommittee has been very active in reviewing the self-study reports of campus units, as well as the self-study process for program review. T. Banta extended thanks to this group for its efforts to produce effective and timely feedback.
         1. K. Black gave an overview of how to reframe the program review guidelines to link program review more strongly to campus goals (e.g., the PULs); she also noted a need for department chairs' thoughts on the process.
         2. S. Baker suggested that if program reviews are to address common questions or themes, it would be helpful to send relevant self-study materials out early to the internal

colleagues who will be asked to review them. Additionally, an interview or survey of those campus colleagues who have recently been involved in program reviews may yield other suggestions or ideas for streamlining the process.

c. M. Hansen (chair of the Advanced Practice Subcommittee) provided the following updates:
   i. The subcommittee can serve as a resource in several areas of expertise for all faculty and staff on campus, as well as for various campus initiatives. A testimonial was offered by J. Singh.
   ii. Hansen asked whether the group should remain a PRAC subcommittee or be broadened to include a wider campus audience.
      1. J. Smith asked PRAC members to remind colleagues that this subcommittee and, in fact, PRAC overall can be a resource for the campus.
d. H. Mzumara (chair of the Course Evaluation Task Force) provided the following summary:
   i. The task force has been meeting regularly.
   ii. The group has shared information with the Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Council and collaborated with that committee to review course evaluations. The discussion included:
      1. The role of the task force and the scope of its work.
      2. The group's interest in offering help as requested (as opposed to advocating an administrative agenda).
   iii. Faculty Affairs agreed to move ahead with its work on reviewing the course evaluation process at IUPUI. Meanwhile, the task force will continue to collect instruments and to review, analyze, and summarize them in hopes of enhancing the process and finding out what is out there and what works.
      1. T. Banta offered perspective on the significance of this work for the IUPUI 2012 accreditation process. She also noted that, for the first time at IUPUI, there appears to be agreement to constitute an elected undergraduate curriculum committee.
      2. There was further discussion about PRAC's role in relation to that of this new committee. It was suggested that a "wait and see" approach might be best as this moves forward.
e. K. Schilling and L. Riolo spoke on behalf of the Graduate Affairs Subcommittee. They are awaiting further updates on the subcommittee's past work and are working together to build an agenda for the next academic year.
f. Smith offered final points on the distinctions between a subcommittee and a taskforce:
   i. Standing versus temporary.
   ii. Disband, keep, overhaul.

        iii. E. Rubens noted that it might be useful to expand subcommittee and task force membership to add colleagues who are not PRAC members.

        iv. Baker suggested that we might want to review the PRAC bylaws to address the issues presented.

3. ***Using data to inform decision-making***
   a. PRAC members reported the following:
      i. J. Orr – how graduation rates and Bar Exam pass rates inform curriculum and pedagogy at the Law School; these results catalyzed curriculum discussions intended to ensure that success rates are maintained.
      ii. Boland – Accreditation information helped guide outcomes assessment conversations among School of Nursing faculty and continues to do so.
      iii. E. Cooney – Data reporting helps with planning in the School of Engineering and Technology and the ensuing conversations open up student work and faculty pedagogy for review.
      iv. Smith – The presentation of data, if effective, can help guide planning in public schools; he shared a few examples.

4. ***The Matrix***
   a. Banta prefaced the conversation with information on what other institutions are doing to maintain accreditation; they depend significantly on the use of a matrix or matrices as tools to (a) map curricula and (b) assess internship and capstone course experiences.
   b. K. Hoffmann-Longtin and Singh each commented on how their units use and are considering using matrices to help students or evaluate programs.
   c. Boland described how the School of Nursing finds a weakness and then maps it back to the curriculum so that faculty can adjust as needed to close the gap.
   d. Houser noted that the School of Education uses a matrix to assess the elementary education program.
   e. K. Wendeln described how the Kelley School of Business processes complex data using a weighted matrix to create a visual dashboard.
   f. R. Vertner offered an account of how the Kelley School of Business mapped Problem Based Learning and used the map to assess the effectiveness of PBL.
   g. Smith closed the discussion by summarizing the pros and cons of curriculum mapping.

**   The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm
**   Reminder, next meeting: **May 1st - 1:30pm - 3:00pm – UL 1126**

Respectfully submitted by M. Urtel, Vice-Chair of PRAC.