Program Review and Assessment Committee
September 23, 2010, 1:30-3:00 p.m., UL 1126
Minutes

1. **Members Present:** R. Aaron, W. Agbor-Baiyee, K. Alfrey, D. Appleby, T. Banta,
    D. Bell, R. Bennett, K. Black, M. Brown, J. Defazio, C. Fitzpatrick, Y. Fu,
    B. Gushrowski, B. Hayes, S. Hundley, M. Irwin, K. Johnson, S. Kahn, J. Lee,
    L. McGuire, H. Mzumara, W. Orme, J. Phillips, G. Pike, I. Ritchie, J. Singh,
    K. Steinberg, R. Stocker, C. Toledo, M. Urtel, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, M. Yard, N. Young

2. **Approval of May Minutes**: unanimously approved.

3. **Updates on items from August meeting** – M. Urtel and K. Alfrey
    - Mission and Member Responsibilities: This document will provide a brief summary of
      the mission of PRAC and the responsibilities of its members. A new draft incorporating
      last month's suggestions was distributed for discussion. To ensure that the document
      does not erroneously imply that PRAC members are responsible for writing the annual
      assessment reports for their units, one further edit was suggested: to change "compile" to
      "coordinate the submission of" annual reports.
    - Subcommittee memberships: Those who want to join a PRAC subcommittee or change
      membership should let Mark Urtel or Karen Alfrey know; we will update the
      subcommittee rosters appropriately.
    - Principles of Graduate Learning: This emerged as a major topic of interest from the
      suggestions made at the end of the August meeting. At a future meeting we will invite
      Sherry Queener or another expert to talk in more detail about the PGLs.

4. **Follow-up: Interpreting the PUL Report** – G. Pike
    - A recurring question among the 2012 Committee and other faculty is: How do we use
      the PUL data for improvement? G. Pike provides several suggestions for starting-points:
        o Compare faculty PUL reports with student self-assessments. What conclusions
           can be drawn? (Pike notes that the student self-assessment data presented at the
           August meeting was compiled by major of the respondents, but may reflect
           experiences these students have had in classes outside their major school.)
        o It may be most instructive to compare PUL results not to other schools or the
           university, but to outcomes-based **standards** to determine whether the reported
           scores reflect sufficient achievement on each PUL.
        o The PUL results are being discussed by the 2012 Committee and should be
           discussed in the schools: the main goal is an ongoing dialogue on outcomes
           assessment.

- The questions used in the student self-assessment survey are available under the "surveys" link on the IMIR webpage (http://imir.iupui.edu).

5. **Student Learning Outcomes**
   - To comply with the expectations of our regional accreditor, **all** programs need to have program-specific student learning outcomes defined. These outcomes should be established **no later than** late 2011 (when the campus self-study is being written). A subcommittee is currently drafting instructions for establishing outcomes.
   - PRAC will take the lead on answering the following questions:
     - Which programs need outcomes defined?
     - What stakeholder-driven process will establish these outcomes?
     - What process is or will be used to assess them?
   - Our first priority will be those programs that do not yet have **any** outcomes defined. Programs with established outcomes that don't quite meet established campus guidelines are at least headed in the right direction; their outcomes can be revisited once we ensure that all programs have outcomes in place.
   - Program outcomes, once established, should be reported in the campus bulletin.
   - Because individual disciplines are using diverse assessment terminology with ill-defined or overlapping meaning (e.g. learning outcomes, professional standards, competencies, objectives), the Advanced Practitioners subcommittee may want to take on the task of compiling a glossary of such terms as they are being used by individual disciplines, and as they are defined by the campus.
   - Prior to the October meeting, PRAC members should look into which programs in their schools do and do not have established learning outcomes. To help guide the process of establishing outcomes for programs that lack them, PRAC members requested examples of good learning outcomes.

6. **Reports to PAII**
   - Questions at the Deans' Retreat indicated a desire for feedback on the reports submitted to PAII (dean's report, annual assessment report, etc.): are these reports meeting campus needs? If not, what can we do better?
   - A rubric was distributed (see below) providing a checklist for what the annual report should address. Small-group discussion addressed four questions:
     - What feedback about your report would you like to have?
     - Is the report format working for you? Should there be a common format for all units?
     - Should we appoint a subcommittee to evaluate the reports?
     - Should there be a common rubric for assessing the reports?
   - Small-group discussion produced the following questions, comments and suggestions:

- A good starting-point for feedback to the units is: How are these reports and the data therein being used?
- What is/should be the focus of the report: program review, or student outcomes? Some programs were unclear on precisely what to include, e.g. if a program wants to increase diversity, does that go into the annual assessment report or is such an item more related to program review?
- Can these reports be compiled straightforwardly by cutting and pasting from other reports that have already been compiled for other purposes?
- Should the dean's report and the annual PRAC report be merged? A single large report may be too daunting a task, particularly since both are due simultaneously; however, it might be worth a discussion between PRAC members and their deans.
- If a subcommittee is convened to review and provide feedback on these reports, it should be disciplinarily diverse.
- A common rubric may not be useful across all programs, but perhaps a flexible rubric customizable to different outcomes might be reasonable.

7.   **Adjournment** at 3:00 pm; minutes respectfully submitted by Karen Alfrey.

APPENDIX: Rubric for Assessing Assessment Materials

Learning Outcomes
__ A. Succinctly states what students should know and be able to do
__ B. Begins with an action verb
__ C. Incorporates PULs in disciplinary outcomes
__ D. Comprehensive – seems to cover the subject thoroughly
__ E. May incorporate assessment of effectiveness of support services like advising

Assessment Measures
__ A. Linked explicitly to learning outcome(s)
__ B. Includes both direct and indirect measures of the outcome(s)
__ C. Consistent attention to assessing learning outcomes over the years of interest

Assessment Findings
__ A. Linked explicitly to learning outcome(s)
__ B. Evidence obtained from direct measures
__ C. Evidence obtained from indirect measures
__ D. Measure seems appropriate for the learning outcome(s)

Action Taken in Response to Findings
__ A. Linked explicitly to learning outcome(s) and the assessment of the outcome(s)
__ B. Aimed at on-going improvement