

**Program Review and Assessment Committee**  
**November 28, 2010, 1:30-3:00 p.m., UL 1126**  
**Minutes**

1. **Members Present:** W. Agbor-Baiyee, K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, S. Baker, T. Banta, R. Bennett, W. Crabtree, E. Dill, C. Fitzpatrick, B. Gushrowski, M. Hansen, B. Hayes, S. Hundley, S. Kahn, J. Lee, A. Martin, L. McGuire, H. Mzumara, W. Orme, G. Pike, J. Smith, K. Steinberg, M. Urtel, R. Vertner, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Yard, N. Young
2. **Approval of September Minutes:** approved.
3. **Quick Hits: Updates from subcommittees and from October meeting**
  - 2012 Committee: T. Banta provided a summary of the most recent meeting of the 2012 Committee, as well as what to expect from the 2012 NCA accreditation visit itself:
    - Criterion teams (one for each of the five NCA criteria for accreditation) have met and are making progress on the self-study
    - During the accreditation visit, the visiting team will meet primarily with administrators and deans. The team will receive links to PRAC reports and other evidence of ongoing assessment processes as part of their pre-visit work; as a result of reviewing this documentation, they may want to schedule visits with particular schools (generally with the dean, associate deans, and some key faculty)
      - The team may pay closer attention to or have more questions for schools whose programs do not undergo separate program accreditation, such as Liberal Arts and Science
      - The campus will probably know about a month in advance of the visit which individuals and units the team will want to meet with
    - CTL staff are happy to run workshops for individual departments or schools on PUL assessment, writing good SLOs, or other learning- and assessment-related topics, as needed; they report that so far this year there has been very limited faculty participation in PUL and SLO workshops
      - PRAC members report that many schools (including Science, Engr/Tech, Herron, Business, and the Columbus campus) are engaging faculty in discussion of PUL assessment
      - Some schools have likewise provided faculty development opportunities in PUL assessment specifically targeted to part-time/associate faculty who might not otherwise be part of the ongoing faculty conversation on PULs
    - Per G. Pike, PUL evaluation will soon allow the option not to have to evaluate students who dropped the course late in the semester (and thus still appear on the PUL roster) or who received an incomplete. Currently, courses for which

instructors do not evaluate all students on the roster are not recognized as having completed PUL evaluations.

- M. Urtel encourages programs to develop a graphic display or representation of how PULs fit into the program curriculum: such a display may help with faculty buy-in by making the relevance of PULs more evident. Urtel provided an example of such a graphic display via email after the meeting.
- Subcommittee updates:
  - Advanced Practitioners: Have been meeting once a month, primarily working on 2012 reaccreditation and instructions for developing SLOs. Next major task is development of an assessment glossary.
  - Grants: Two grants were recommended for funding:
    - Examining Preceptor-Student Interactions in Clinical Settings: A Pilot Study – Ironside, McNelis, Ebright (School of Nursing)
    - Using the EQ-I to Measure Professional Dispositions of Pre-service Elementary Teachers – Gustashaw and Howland (Columbus campus)By vote of PRAC members, both grants were approved for funding.
  - Performance Indicators: G. Pike reports that the committee has completed analysis on a number of performance indicators:
    - Performance indicators on academic preparedness of incoming students have continued to rise sharply over the last few years; however, the incoming class is less diverse than the local population of college-bound students (as determined from demographic data on SAT-takers in Marion and surrounding counties).
    - Indicators on effectiveness of teaching raise concerns that effective teaching is not well-recognized or rewarded by the campus. This message needs to be brought before the Chancellor and the IFC Executive Committee.
    - Indicators of retention have risen over recent years, but we cannot expect to continue to see the linear increase in graduation rates we have seen previously.
  - Program Review: Guidelines will be finalized at the next meeting of the subcommittee, with the focus of program review shifted toward student outcomes.
  - Other committees (ePort, Graduate, Course Evaluations) had not yet met as of the November meeting.
- Nominations for PRAC vice-chair: Vote will take place at the December meeting; nominations are ongoing until then.
- A task force is being convened to provide recommendations on a process for reviewing and providing feedback on annual reports. Members include Bill Crabtree, Linda Houser, Susan Kahn, and Michael Yard.

#### 4. **Looking Forward**

- Principles of Graduate Learning (PGLs) will be discussed at the December meeting.
- New IRB enforcement: impact on assessment projects
  - IUPUI and IUB Board on Human Subject Research is now a combined entity and is going through reaccreditation (AAHRPP).
  - There is now a greater concern from IRB on using ID numbers (e.g. student IDs) to merge research data. IMIR links survey responses to IDs so they will know who has responded; in the future, departments working with such data will instead receive tracking numbers that cannot be linked back to individual student identity.
  - Anyone who sends to IMIR data with ID numbers (or other identifying information) to be merged should check with IRB first; working with such data for research purposes may require consent forms. (Currently, IRB defines “research” narrowly to include publication and conference presentation; however, if you are not sure whether the work you are doing falls into this category, check with IRB.)
  - If student work is to be used, make sure to get informed consent from students – even for normal classroom activity. However, if that work will be used for research purposes, someone besides the faculty member in charge of the class should collect these forms if they are submitted before grades are due, in order to avoid undue influence on either the student’s final grade or the student’s freedom to consent or refuse.
  - Effective 1 October, anyone (PIs, co-investigators, etc.) going through IRB must go through re-training and re-certification.
  - Unsure whether your study requires IRB review? The Office of Research Administration’s Human Subjects Research page ([http://researchadmin.iu.edu/HumanSubjects/IUPUI/hs\\_home.html](http://researchadmin.iu.edu/HumanSubjects/IUPUI/hs_home.html)) provides a checklist: [http://researchadmin.iu.edu/HumanSubjects/IUPUI/hs\\_needto\\_submit.html](http://researchadmin.iu.edu/HumanSubjects/IUPUI/hs_needto_submit.html)
- Engaging students in PRAC:
  - Student involvement and representation in PRAC-related activities might in general be fostered more effectively at the school or department level rather than at the campus level.
  - However, the committee should be on the lookout for items that should be disseminated to students, and in particular on items on which we would like student feedback. Perhaps some students could be brought into PRAC meetings when their involvement is appropriate; Pulse surveys (<http://survey.iupui.edu/pulse/>) could provide another mechanism for student feedback to PRAC.
- PUL evaluation: There have been some minor changes to the PUL evaluation system; we will discuss these in a brief report at a future meeting.

5. **SLOs Update**

- Committee members had a chance to voice questions and concerns about defining student learning outcomes. Looking ahead, once these outcomes have been defined for all programs, we will have some flexibility in how we evaluate them.

6. **Adjournment** at 3:02 pm; minutes respectfully submitted by Karen Alfrey.