Program Review and Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2008
UL 1126
1:30-3:00

MINUTES –

Members Present: R. Aaron; W. Agbor-Baiyee; P. Altenburger; D. Appleby; T. Banta; C. Borgmann; E. Cooney; D. Dunn; R. Edwards; M. Hansen; B. Hayes; L. Houser; J. Johnson; S. Kahn; C. McDaniel; J. Orr; I.Queiro-Tajalli; L. Riolo; J. Smith; R.. Stocker, M. Urtel; K.. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Wokeck, N. Young.

Guests: Chasity Thompson and LaWanda Ward

1. ***Meeting called to order at 1:35 pm with the approval of the October Minutes***
   a. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. ***Announcements***
   a. PRAC Grant Updates
      i. L. Houser reported that, currently, there are two proposals responding to the Fall 2008 PRAC *call for proposals*. The committee could either issue a second call or the PRAC Grant Subcommittee could review the two proposals submitted. Members suggested that there was no need to offer a second call and that the two submitted should be reviewed.

   b. Program Review Subcommittee Membership
      i. J. Smith noted the Program Review Subcommittee is due to review guidelines for the IUPUI campus program review policy. It has been nearly 10 years since the policy has been reviewed and/or updated.

   c. PRAC Subcommittee Membership
      i. Smith asked members in attendance to denote their subcommittee membership, as the attendance roster was circulated; a legend was provided.

   d. Small Group Summary Report
      i. M. Urtel reported the results of the last meeting's ballot requesting the top three themes the membership would like to see integrated into this AY meetings. *Developing exit-survey/capstone assessments* garnered the most votes, appearing on 64 percent of the ballots, while *assessing the PULs* appeared on 43 percent of the ballots.

3. ***Working Group Meeting***
    a. Smith reiterated the focus of the working groups as noted below:
    b. If one was a part of an <u>undergraduate</u> working group, the discussion topics were:
        i. Reflecting on your school/units entry in the ICHE Goal 6 Report, discuss ways in which you can improve the use of data to inform decisions.
        ii. Describe at least three ways your school/unit currently or could inform faculty about assessment (purpose, findings, and uses).
        iii. Describe at least three ways your school/unit currently or could inform students about assessment (purpose, findings, and uses).
        iv. Describe the ways in which your school/unit currently or could reward faculty for engaging in assessment.

    c. If one was part of the <u>graduate issues</u> working group, the discussion topics were:
        i. Review examples of principles for graduate learning used in some programs.
        ii. Generate a conceptual list of principles of graduate learning that apply to all schools.
        iii. Describe the ways in which your school/unit currently or could reward faculty for engaging in assessment.

    d. Groups were asked to record the essence of their discussions and submit these notes shortly after the meeting (including electronically). Each group then shared one essential point that was discussed. The following list is reflective of the share-back discussion:
        i. CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) could become an integral part of campus assessment; each type of assessment would have a CTL specialist.
        ii. ICHE Goal 6 reporting:
            1. The non-data factors (micro-politics, etc.) that affect decision-making are not reflected in the report.
            2. Various strengths and weaknesses of the report were presented; these included, but were not limited to: (a) linking state funding to four- year graduation rates; (b) linking faculty excellence (awards) to addressing graduation rates; (c) benchmarks reflect the first-time/full-time cohort and are not representative of IUPUI's student population; and (d) it is not clear that student learning and success is the focus of the report, but they probably ought to be.
            3. Developing a list of graduate-level PULs is uniquely challenging for several reasons. An ongoing e-mail discussion will attempt to address this further.

4. ***Course Evaluation Update***
   a. T. Banta introduced the guests and provided a perspective on their project, which focuses on course evaluations.
   b. C. Thompson and L. Ward provided an extensive review of literature regarding student course evaluations, including information and data about (a) validity; (b) reliability; and (c) perceptions of student evaluations of teaching.
   c. Various instructional assessment systems were discussed with a nod given to the University of Washington and its work to date. It was noted that the acronym SET is an industry standard (Student Evaluation of Teaching) that could serve as a starting point for those interested in joining the national dialogue on course evaluations.

** The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 pm.

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