Program Review and Assessment Committee
May 12, 2011, 1:30 – 3: 00 p.m., UL 1126
Minutes

Present: K. Alfrey (Chair), P. Altenburger, D. Bell, K. Black, C. Buyarski, W. Crabtree, C. Fitzpatrick, B. Gushrowski, M. Hansen, B. Hayes, S. Hundley, M. Irwin, K. Johnson, S. Kahn, H. Mzumara, J. Paine, J. Pedersen, J. Phillips, G. Pike, S. Rice, I. Ritchie, S. Scott, J. Singh, K. Steinberg, R. Stocker, C. Toledo, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Yard

1. **April Meeting Minutes:** approved as circulated

2. **Updates**
   - K. Alfrey reported for Trudy Banta on the most recent 2012 Committee meeting.
     - November 5 – 7, 2012, will be the dates for our reaffirmation visit.
     - The theme for the self study will be "Excellence through Collaboration and Innovation."
     - Another series of Town Hall meetings will be scheduled next winter to receive comments and suggestions on chapters of the draft self-study report.
   - S. Kahn and S. Scott reported on recently concluded work of the PRAC Report Review Subcommittee.
     - By way of introduction, K. Alfrey explained that each 2009-10 PRAC report was reviewed by two subcommittee members, so each representative of a particular school or unit received two distinct reviews, with rubric scoring and additional observations and suggestions, for that unit's report. An important goal was to provide this feedback before 2010-11 reports are prepared.
     - After thanking committee members, Kahn demonstrated a recent addition to the PAII web site section on Evaluation and Assessment. Using a transparency framework developed by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), the graphic organizes links to a variety of campus assessment data located in different sections of the IUPUI web site to improve its accessibility for web visitors. She also recommended the NILOA web site (at www.learningoutcomeassessment.org) as a useful resource on topics related to assessment of student learning.
     - Scott highlighted patterns across the rubrics used for review, noting that differences among the reviews suggested a need to spend time working for inter-rater consistency next year. Several comments noted challenges due to the wide variation in reports' formats, which may also have caused reviewers not to find information they expected. She suggested that next year's reports might begin with a brief introduction that provides some context for readers who may not be familiar with the structure and programs of the school. She added that directions on the PRAC web site state that this report is to emphasize assessment of student learning (including related support structures such as advising and improvements based on program review findings) for both undergraduate and graduate (and non-credit) programs. She noted that some large schools have worked around the challenges of

very long reports by using a rotation over two or three years rather than detail every program every year.
- o Kahn added that the reaffirmation visiting team is likely to include at least one or two members with expertise in assessment, who will be able to see through vague wording. I. Ritchie asked for guidance about interests members should be aware of regarding reaffirmation, and K. Alfrey agreed to send a supplemental email message with more information. Kahn encouraged PRAC members to be in touch with those who reviewed their previous reports to discuss questions.
- o Alfrey and Yard added their thanks to subcommittee members Aaron, Agbor-Baiyee, Altenburger, Defazio, Kahn, Lee, Martin, and Urtel and to Scott for support.

3. **Update on Program Review Guidelines**
- S. Hundley reviewed the history and purposes of IUPUI's Program Review process, noting that the subcommittee strongly reaffirmed its focus on improvement.
- The draft language intends to provide programs flexibility in preparing their self studies by offering three options for structuring their reports, identifying a set of core elements to be included whichever organizational structure is adopted.
- The review subcommittee will work over the summer to integrate previously separate sections for undergraduate and graduate programs.
- PRAC members are encouraged to contact Hundley or K. Black with comments, questions, and suggestions.

4. **ePortfolio as platform for the Personal Development Plan**
- Cathy Buyarski, Assistant Dean of University College, provided an overview of the Personal Development Plan assembled by IUPUI students in their First Year Seminars. The PDP is designed to develop goal commitment, strengthen academic achievement, provide understanding of curricular coherence and meaning, and foster student development. Initiated in Fall 2008, the PDP was envisioned as process as much as product, to be updated and expanded throughout the undergraduate experience; however, early assessment indicated that students liked some parts but were missing the sense of the PDP as a whole.
- In Fall 2010, University College piloted a version of the PDP based in the ePortfolio (the "ePDP") with the goal of building an engaging, unified environment that could be easily shared with others such as advisors and accessible for long-term modification. The fall pilot provided several valuable insights for improvement and will be expanded to forty percent of first-year seminars in Fall 2011. As a FYS instructor, Joan Pedersen added some student feedback from course evaluations. She noted that the pilot version of the ePDP required considerably more time for her and her students, so she is exploring ways to use the new environment as an alternative rather than an addition.

5. **Preliminary Results from the Student Evaluation of Teaching Survey**
   - David Bell described preliminary results from a survey of faculty about student course evaluations (with an exceptional 40.6 percent response rate).
     - Characteristics for analyzing results include type of faculty appointment, level of courses taught, teaching load, and years of teaching experience.
     - Questions range widely across uses of ratings (ways that respondents actually use student ratings and beliefs about how they should be used, perceived importance of student ratings in annual reviews, and availability of student ratings), actual and preferred methods of obtaining the ratings; respondents' trust toward the student ratings; and whether student ratings depend on course, student, or instructor characteristics.
   - Subcommittee members will be exploring the data more deeply and will have a final report for PRAC members next year.

6. **Announcements**
   - K. Alfrey thanked all PRAC members for their service in the past year.
   - Alfrey also acknowledged Russell Vertner on his retirement at the end of this academic year.
   - On behalf of the committee members, G. Pike thanked the Chair for her leadership this year.

7. **Adjournment at 3:05 p.m.**

Minutes recorded by S. Scott and respectfully submitted by M. Yard, Vice Chair