

**Program Review and Assessment Committee**  
**December 9, 2010, 1:30-3:00 p.m., UL 1126**  
**Minutes**

1. **Members Present:** K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, S. Baker, R. Bennett, K. Black, D. Boland, W. Crabtree, J. Defazio, C. Fitzpatrick, Y. Fu, M. Hansen, B. Hayes, S. Hundley, M. Irwin, S. Kahn, J. Lee, L. McGuire, H. Mzumara, W. Orme, J. Phillips, G. Pike, I. Queiro-Tajalli, I. Ritchie, J. Singh, J. Smith, R. Stocker, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wills, M. Wokeck, M. Yard, and N. Young
  
2. **Approval of November Minutes:** approved.
  
3. **Follow-up Topics:**
  - Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):
    - Instructions and a template for adding SLOs to the campus bulletin have been distributed. It is important that all programs offering a credential define SLOs for the program; it is less important that they follow the suggested template exactly. In particular, the SLOs of many programs may include language dictated by their accrediting bodies, or shaped by feedback from their faculty or other constituencies.
    - Each program that grants a credential should have program-specific outcomes defined, although there may be some overlap in the outcomes of related programs (e.g. engineering programs, medical programs). The distributed template includes example SLOs for “Health Professions Programs” in the School of Medicine, rather than for a particular program; B. Crabtree notes that individual medical programs do have separate, program-specific outcomes as dictated by their individual accreditors
  - Task force on annual report feedback has its first meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 14 December
  - Weighting of PUL data (G. Pike):
    - Because the early PUL data is only a relatively small sample that may over- or underrepresent some schools, there has been some discussion as to whether it is appropriate to weight the data, and if so, how.
    - G. Pike reports that weighting last semester’s data based on the number of overall credit hours in each school did not significantly change the overall means on each PUL; furthermore, as data accumulates over time, the law of large numbers dictates that only significant changes in the data will change the means.
    - Pike advocates caution in weighting and averaging data, as some manipulations will change the meaning of the final answer: for example, calculating the means for each PUL in each school, and then averaging those values to get a “mean of

means” changes the meaning of the resultant number so that it answers the question, “How is the average school doing in attaining the PULs?” rather than the (arguably) more important question, “How is the average student doing in attaining the PULs?” We are most interested in student-level data.

- PUL Evaluation Updates:
  - There is increasing interest from schools in having PUL data reported at the program or course level rather than at the school level in order to help understand what the results mean and how to make improvements based on those results.
  - G. Pike will work on a report for deans outlining appropriate (and not-appropriate) uses for PUL data. He will bring that report to PRAC for discussion and feedback before disseminating to deans.
  - As noted at last month’s meeting, students receiving a grade of I, FN, or FNN for a course can be given a mark of “N” (not applicable) for PUL evaluation, if there is not sufficient work from that student to evaluate the relevant PUL.
  - PRAC members debated whether these PUL assessments really target attainment of PULs by students in a particular course, or whether the assessment instead reveals the effectiveness of the particular course in helping students toward attaining the PULs. Several argued that PULs should be viewed more as principles we strive to develop and continually strengthen in our students, rather than as skills we expect them to attain to a specified level.

4. **Principles of Graduate Learning** – Sherry Queener, Director, IUPUI Graduate Office; Barry Barker, president of the Graduate Student Organization (GSO); Robbie Janik, Sociology representative to the GSO

- S. Queener provided an overview of the Principles of Graduate Learning (PGLs):
  - The PGLs were developed to be similar to the SLOs for Purdue University graduate programs. They emphasize mastery of knowledge and skills appropriate for one’s major field; critical thinking; effective communication both to others in the field and to the general public; and ethical professional and personal behavior.
  - S. Queener provided suggestions for how to adapt the PGLs to Ph.D. programs, as well as for assessing PGLs in the context of activities common to many graduate students (e.g. presentation at laboratory meetings and formal seminars; mentored writing of grant proposals and manuscripts)
  - The PowerPoint presentation of Queener’s remarks was distributed to PRAC members following the meeting
- The Graduate Affairs Committee recommends that assessment of PGLs does not need to take place course-by-course, particularly since integration of knowledge in activities outside the classroom (e.g. thesis research, manuscript writing) is a key component of graduate education

- B. Barker and R. Janik shared feedback on the PGLs from the graduate student community:
  - The GSO affirms the four broad outcomes targeted by the PGLs, particularly the emphasis on communication
  - For some students (and professors), the initial response to the PGLs is fear that they restrict academic freedom; they request clarification for the graduate community of how the PGLs positively impact campus and students.
- S. Queener discussed with PRAC members their questions and concerns about the PGLs:
  - M. Wockeck suggests PGLs should be not only endorsed by Graduate Affairs, but actively dispersed to graduate student governance
  - How do the PGLs apply to medical students? Accreditation standards for those programs, which already have defined SLOs, supersede PGLs. Even M.S./Ph.D. programs in the medical school have not undergone program review through Trudy Banta's office, but do go through internal review according to their own accreditation-driven standards.
  - Programs should make an effort to collect and use data on attainment of outcomes; having some suggested format for reporting such data may be useful as we prepare for 2012 re-accreditation.

5. **2012 Update** – Susan Kahn

- Schools are making progress on assessing PULs and are more interested in seeing disaggregated data.
- Criterion teams are meeting and making progress, as are the schools represented on the 2012 committee.
- The PUL website (<http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu>) includes information on rubrics that may be of use to programs as they continue to refine their assessment processes.
- Some PRAC members note dead links on the PUL roster and other websites that will need to be cleaned up before the 2012 visit.

6. **Topics for future meetings** – PRAC members suggested the following topics of interest:

- Continue updates on 2012 committee and other PRAC-related activities
- Improvement initiatives: how do we use data to get better?
- Role of PRAC members in communicating back to chairs, deans, directors, and other faculty: what message(s) should we be carrying back – and what related messages (reinforcing or contradictory) are they hearing from other places?
- Feedback to PRAC from faculty
- Small-group opportunities to share what individual schools/units are doing
- Presentations from schools: where are they in their process, what pitfalls have they encountered, and how have they overcome them?

- Better communication of the background and purpose of the PULs so that we communicate them with one voice

7. **Nominations and voting for PRAC officers**

By vote of PRAC members, Karen Alfrey was confirmed as chair and Michael Yard as vice-chair of PRAC for 2011.

8. **Announcements**

- The Course Evaluations subcommittee reports two items of interest:
  - A task force on course evaluations is being put together by Faculty Council
  - The committee has put together a “road show” that they have taken to South Bend and may be presenting at IUPUI in the spring.

9. **Adjournment** at 2:55 pm; minutes respectfully submitted by Karen Alfrey.