

PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

~ Minutes ~

September 24, 2009

UL 1126

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

1. Members Present: Agbor-Baiyee, Alfrey, Appleby, Baker, Banta, Bell, Black, Boruff-Jones, Crabtree, DeFazio, Fu, Gushrowski (for Garetto), Hansen, Hayes, Hundley, Applegate (for Irwin), Johnson, J., Johnson, K., Joyner, Kahn, Majewski, Mzumara, Orr, Pike, Queiro-Tajalli, Riolo, Ritchie, Shea, Singh, Smith, Steinberg, Stocker, Urtel, Vertner, Wendeln, Wills, Wokeck.

2. Approval of May 2009 Minutes

Unanimously approved.

3. Meeting Focus: Process of Evaluating Student Learning of the PULs Campus Wide

Chair J. Smith provided a context for the theme of the meeting and described the overall process and rationale for evaluating student learning of the concepts embodied in the PULs.

4. Introduction of the T-Chart

- Smith explained a T-Chart then asked members to develop their own T-Charts to be used during the meeting and to submit those to M. Urtel for summary.

5. Reactions to the “Ensuring Student Attainment of the PULs...” document sent to deans, chairs, and faculty. (1:35-1:50)

- Various comments and questions were offered by the membership, including:
 - We need to agree on a common lexicon.
 - How should we define performance expectations for students in various categories:
 - Freshmen versus seniors?
 - Course by course?
 - Different sections of the same course taught by different instructors?
 - A concern was raised about assessing learning gains for students who start at different levels of proficiency. For example, how would we quantify learning for a student who entered a course with an A-level understanding and exited with an A-level understanding versus a student who entered with a D-level understanding and exited with a B-level understanding?
 - There is a risk of faculty teaching to the PULs and omitting key course content.
 - What is the official position of the IUPUI Faculty Council on this?

- Is this a “top-down” initiative?
- How are the expectations being communicated across campus?
- How are part-time faculty exposed to the PULs?
- Some academic programs at IUPUI are IU-wide, while the PULs are campus-based; emphasizing the PULs in programs in core schools and IU-wide schools creates the potential for conflicting expectations of students.
- The timing of PUL initiatives is critical; we do not want to begin an initiative at a point when it may be likely to “drop off the radar.”
- Should we simply link PULs to already existing course objectives?

6. Vignette 1—PUL X Program/Department Matrix (1:50-2:15)

The IUPUI PUL matrix web site was shown to the group. The School of Education’s data were presented and members discussed expectations in various academic units.

- Concerns were raised about the web site’s usability.
- Details on the construction and maintenance of the web site were provided.
 - During the current semester, 15 course instructors are pilot-testing the proposed evaluation of the PULs.
 - By Spring 2010, the evaluation software environment is expected to be functional for four to five courses in each department.
 - Any revisions that need to be made in the PUL designations in the matrix should be sent to the course scheduler in your school, who will transmit this information to the Office of the Registrar.

7. Vignette 2—PUL Evaluation Testimony (2:15-2:30)

- Jennifer Nelson of the Department of Earth Sciences described a project she conducted during the summer in a Gateway Course, observing that it was easy to link class assignments to PULs and then assess student learning related to the PULs. In essence, she used multiple data points to evaluate student learning in a course focused on Critical Thinking and Written Communication. Three essays were used to assess students’ critical thinking and writing proficiency and to demonstrate growth in both areas at the end of the semester.
- Nelson answered questions from members and clarified the process she used. Several scenarios were discussed—for example, what if a student passes the content and not the PUL or vice versa.

8. Vignette 3—5-Year Schedule (2:30-2:50)

- The goal is that relevant PULs will be assessed in at least one section of every course over five years.

9. S. Kahn reported on the ICHE Goal 6 report

- While Goal 6 reporting is no longer required by the ICHE, the campus did find the format and content of that report useful. We will continue to develop a similar annual report for our own campus purposes, including creation of a record for the reaccreditation review in 2012. The report will be based on the 2009 PRAC reports; Kahn urged schools that have not yet submitted the 2009 report to do so ASAP.

10. Looking Forward (2:50-3:00)

- Reminder that the Fall 2009 Meetings are scheduled for: October 22, November 19, and December 10
- At the October meeting we will welcome volunteers for subcommittees that will function during 2009-10. Please review the attachment, which describes each subcommittee.

11. New members were introduced.

12. Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by M. Urtel