

# Program Review and Assessment Committee

November 19, 2009

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Campus Center 405

~ Minutes ~

1. **Called to order at 1:30 p.m.** Chair J. Smith introduced two new members of the committee. A hearty welcome was extended to Linda Girard (Ivy Tech) and John Omachonu (ACE Fellow).
2. **Members Present:** Aaron, Alfrey, Altenburger, Appleby, Baker, Banta, Bell, Black, Boland, Boruff-Jones, Girard, Gushrowski, Hansen, Hart, Hayes, Hundley, Kahn, Mzumara, Omachonu, Paine, Pike, Queiro-Tajalli, Ritchie, Singh, Smith, Steinberg, Urtel, Vertner, Wendeln, Wokeck, Young.

**Guest:** Steve Graunke

3. **Approval of October 2009 Minutes**

Minutes reviewed and approved.

4. **Meeting Theme: IUPUI Assessment Initiatives Near and Far**

Chair Smith introduced the theme for today's meeting and explained how the various agenda items would support the theme.

5. **Fall PRAC Grants Program Update**

Chair Smith, on behalf of L. Houser, updated the membership on the Fall Call for Proposals and the review timeline. Look for an action item regarding submissions before the December meeting.

6. **Tuning: Pilot Project of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the Lumina Foundation.**

M. Wokeck described this new project, which is piloting features of a European Union higher education initiative, the Bologna Process. Talking points included: (a) the genesis and application of the term "tuning" to the process; (b) the kinds of institutions that have been or will be recruited; (c) the focus on student mobility from university to university in the European project, including mobility from country to country; (d) the ways in which the project fits into the Lumina Foundation's overall purposes, especially higher education reform to help more students enter and complete higher education.

For the U.S. project, Utah, Minnesota, and Indiana were selected as participating states. Indiana's project focuses on the disciplines of Chemistry, Education, and History, with appropriate groups on participating campuses working on different disciplines. Wokeck explained that the History cohort identified 31 competencies and grouped them by category, based on groupings defined by the Dublin descriptors developed for the EU project. This type of wide-ranging discussion and mapping should serve U.S. higher education well. For Indiana in particular, the project was discussed within the context of accountability overall, Core 40, and support for comparisons among institutions.

Finally, members asked several questions, including (a) What is Lumina hoping to get out of this project? (b) How has this initiative been viewed at the high school level? And (c) What is the URL of the report/project site? Informational handouts were provided.

## **7. School of Business Exit Survey Findings**

K. Wendeln began with observations from the recent Assessment Institute, noting that: (a) Many faculty do not know what to do with assessment data; and (b) IUPUI faculty involvement did not appear to be all that it could be. He noted that the Kelley School of Business Assessment Committee has aggregated the last five years of data gathered from exit surveys, and then organized his comments around two questions: (a) What do students think about their experience at the Kelley School? (b) How have faculty made changes based on these findings?

Using spider charts, Wendeln explained the year-to-year findings from each category of responses to the surveys, highlighting trends, high- and low-performing areas, and the Assessment Committee and school's responses to the findings. The charts included data on: (a) student learning in selected knowledge areas; (b) career skills; (c) non-academic outcomes; (d) plans after graduation; (e) career placement office; (f) student activities; (g) time spent per week on extracurricular activities; (h) recommendation of program to others.

Finally, Wendeln mentioned the high response rate to this survey and then took questions from the membership. Questions included: (a) How are findings shared with faculty? (b) Do you share findings with students?

## **8. Results of the 2009 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

G. Pike and Steve Graunke (from IMIR) summarized findings from IUPUI's Spring 2009 administration of the NSSE, along with comparisons with our peer institutions. They explained the scales used and discussed the various measures, which include: (a) academic challenge; (b) active and collaborative learning; (c) student-faculty interaction; (d) enriching educational activities; and (e) supportive campus environment.

Key talking points included the relationship between overall "engagement" and academic success (as defined by retention and GPA). Summary points included: (a) Diversity experiences in the first year are not as prevalent as we would like; (b) We have a higher subsequent dropout rate than our peers after the first year (with some thoughtful explanations as to why this may be occurring); (c) High expectations via challenging coursework often yield higher grades and higher retention (i.e., high performance); (d) Our freshmen often do not become our seniors—these are two distinct populations.

Pike and Graunke concluded by addressing questions and comments from the membership. These included some concern with the reported means and effect sizes.

## **9. Looking Forward**

- (a) Next Meeting: December 10, 2009
- (b) Subcommittee Reports
- (c) Previous Grantee Reports

## **10. Nominations for Vice Chair of PRAC were opened.**

T. Banta explained that according to PRAC tradition, the current Vice Chair transitions into the Chair role over winter break and that nominations for a new Vice Chair are solicited prior to the December meeting. Hearing this, a motion for nomination of Karen Alfrey (by Drew Appleby) was accepted. Remaining nominations are to be forwarded to Banta for a December (ballot) vote.

\*\* Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

\*\* Minutes respectfully submitted by M. Urtel