

# Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

December 4, 2008

UL 1126

1:30-3:00

## MINUTES –

Members Present: R. Aaron, H. Akay, P. Altenburger, T. Banta, D. Bell, K. Black, P. Boruff-Jones, E. Cooney, D. Dunn, R. Edwards, Y. Fu, M. Hansen, K. Hoffmann-Longtin, L. Houser, F. Joyner, S. Kahn, C. McDaniel, H. Mzumara, J. Orr, I. Queiro-Tajalli, L. Riolo, I. Ritchie, E. Rubens, K. Schilling, J. Singh, J. Smith, R. Stocker, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Wokeck.

The meeting was called to order at 1:37 pm.

1. **Approval of the November Minutes**
  - a. Unanimously.
  
2. **Election of Officers**
  - a. J. Smith and M. Urtel were elected by acclamation as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, for AY 2009.
  
3. **Subcommittee Meetings**
  - a. Each subcommittee had a half hour to complete the following:
    - i. Reflect on progress to date
    - ii. Discuss goals for next year
    - iii. Evaluate what role the PRAC meetings should play in subcommittee work
    - iv. Construct a goal statement
  
4. **Subcommittee Reports**
  - a. Grants – L. Houser reported that both grants submitted were approved for funding. She will send out the next call for proposals in early Spring 2009.
  - b. Graduate Issues – L. Riolo summarized the work of the committee and plans for progressing to the next level of discussion. She cited the need to work with the Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC) to minimize duplicative work and to keep communication lines open. T. Banta noted the interaction between GAC and IFC and suggested that any work done in PRAC on graduate issues include those two groups. M. Wokeck added that Sherry Queener should also be kept abreast of any issues pertaining to PRAC and graduate education.
  - c. Course Evaluations – H. Mzumara put forward the following working and action items for this subcommittee:
    - i. Work on the 2012 reaccreditation self study will suggest specific direction for course evaluation use.

- ii. The committee continues to seek to use existing instruments in meaningful ways.
  - iii. The committee would like to sponsor a study of the most economical ways to administer and process course evaluations.
  - iv. Wokeck reiterated that it would be helpful to know what each unit spends on course evaluations.
  - v. K. Wendeln suggested that it might be possible to connect course evaluations with other forms of campus assessment; Faculty Annual Reports are an example of this. At one point FARs were school-based, but now they are available as a system-wide comparative tool.
  - vi. Brief conversation ensued on how course evaluations are reviewed, audited, and analyzed.
- d. ePort – S. Kahn highlighted an upcoming symposium that will include a hands-on demonstration of the current ePort software. The committee will advise the ePort team on how to move ahead based on faculty input. P. Boruff-Jones expressed an interest in sharing University Library’s recent work on information literacy. The following points were also made:
  - i. I. Ritchie requested a presentation during the spring semester on the current status of ePort and Kahn agreed to provide this.
  - ii. An “employer perspective” may help shape how ePort evolves in its ability to help students present themselves effectively to prospective employers.
  - iii. Perhaps showcasing “exemplars” of current ePort usage would boost faculty adoption.
  - iv. PULs need to be clearly represented in the ePort.
  - v. What is “effective use” exactly?
  - vi. 2012 accreditation should drive campus units to address and integrate ePort in order to develop benchmarks from 2009 through 2012.
- e. Advanced Practitioners – M. Hansen reminded PRAC members that they can call on advanced practitioners to serve as resources, formal and informal, for various local and national assessment issues. For instance, accountability, accreditation, survey methods, and assessment planning are topics in which many group members have expertise.
- f. Program Review – Banta gave an overview of program review at IUPUI as a new committee is being formed to revise IUPUI’s *Guidelines for Program Review*. Main points that should be considered in the revision process include:
  - i. Programs reviews should be linked to the campus mission and IUPUI mission statement has changed twice since 1994, when the current program review guidelines were first written.
  - ii. Diversity needs to be included as a matter for attention in program reviews.
  - iii. Service courses should be addressed in the review process.

- iv. Multiple examples of good practice are not easily accessible; perhaps the PAII Web site can address this.
- v. Criteria for evaluating self-studies developed for program review are not well-understood.
- vi. Address the need to follow up on the outcomes of program reviews in a consistent way.

5. **Discussion**

- a. The Indiana Commission on Higher Education is moving away from funding based on head count to funding based on degrees granted.
- b. We need strategies for addressing the situation of students who overextend themselves and lower institutional graduation rates.
- c. We should be aware of the national conversation on these issues.
- d. Expanding summer school offerings is an option for students who need to carry heavier course loads.
- e. We should better match how we deliver courses and services like advising to students' schedules and other needs.
- f. We might consider classifying students according to their degree expectations (casual, degree, enrichment, and so on).
- g. We need to consider our responsibilities as a community citizen in these difficult times. Is it insensitive to our students to expect them to take full course loads for four years?
- h. What can we do to meet students' real needs?

The conversation concluded with a very poignant reminder that IUPUI is about to reach its 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Are there ways to use this occasion to address our stakeholders' expectations?

6. **Concluding Thoughts**

- a. Smith proposed a project site on Oncourse to support communication and collaboration on issues like the ICHE report and reconsideration of the program review process.
- b. The ICHE report may be well intended, yet misguided, given the wide range of students we serve.
- c. Perhaps the campus faculty and administrators should try to communicate with the ICHE more consistently, so that each entity learns more about the other; it is believed that each has the same set of goals.
- d. Should campus administrators, or even PRAC members, draft a letter expressing concern about the most recent ICHE report and its potential unintended consequences?

7. **Fall Feedback and Spring Ahead**

- a. The floor was open to comments on how the meetings to date have been conducted, with suggestions most welcomed.
- b. How are the working group meetings going?
- c. What format ideas are there for the Spring 2009 meetings?

- \*\* The meeting was adjourned at 3:04pm
- \*\* Reminder: This was the last meeting in Fall 2008

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