IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee
February 20, 2014, 1:30-3:00pm, CE 309
Minutes

Attendance: R. Aaron; K. Alfrey; P. Altenburger; E. Ardemagni; S. Baker; T. Banta; R. Bentley; T. Davis; P. Ebright; C. Gentle-Genitty; S. Graunke; M. Hansen; S. Hendricks; S. Hundley; K. Johnson; C. Lamb; J. Lee; K. MacDorman; L. Maxwell; M. Meadows; A. Mitchell; H. Mzumara; K. Norris; T. Ribera; S. Rice; L. Ruch; C. Schuck; S. Scott; M. Urtel; C. Walcott; W. Wang; and S. Weeden.

Minutes: approved as circulated

Kathy Johnson: Multi-state collaborative

Kathy Johnson updated PRAC on a multi-state collaborative that began a couple of years ago. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education has been part of the planning process, and this initiative also provides linkages to the AAC&U Quality Collaboratives project in which IUPUI and Ivy Tech are participating. Johnson is serving on the pilot study steering committee.

9 states are involved in the collaborative. The goal is to pilot a model of assessing student learning outcomes that have more than one purpose:
- Useful for improving student learning, teaching practices, curricula
- Support cross-institutional and/or cross-state benchmarking and for public reports on the quality of student learning

Rather than starting w/ a standardized test (e.g., CLA), the pilot seeks a better way of demonstrating student learning and accountability. AAC&U's VALUE Rubrics are being used in conjunction with the three domains of competency for this collaborative:
- Written communication
- Quantitative Literacy
- Critical Thinking (optional)

The pilot test will begin in Fall 2014:
- Will need to sample student work at the capstone level
- Students must have completed more than 75% of credits toward degree
- We need to de-identify and share 75-100 artifacts per competency domain (but could certainly go beyond this)
- We can choose to engage in a parallel process at IUPUI (as well as send one faculty member to be trained at the national level on VALUE rubric use)
- PRAC engagement is critical

Pilot is being funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to support some of this work. It is unclear at this time how much money is available and there is still some decision-making at the state level regarding allocation of funding. Johnson indicated that volunteers will be sought for the project once more guidance is provided.

Stephen Hundley: PRAC Workshop Development subcommittee

A new PRAC subcommittee on Workshop Development was created, comprising the following members:
- James Gregory
- Terri Tarr
- Stephen Hundley
- Karen Alfrey
- Annela Teemant
- Sue Hendricks

Workshops for Learning Outcomes

- Developing and Implementing Learning Outcomes
- Assessing, Evaluating, and Improving Learning Outcomes

Other topics:
- Orientation to PRAC is needed for its members
- Online modules for new faculty members related to:
    - Assessment 101
    - PULs
    - PGPLs
    - Tie to new faculty orientation
    - Make them interactive, representative of IUPUI's portfolio of programs

- IUPUI's approach to student learning, assessment, and evaluation
- Face-to-face training leading to certification
- How to get others involved in this process
- Need a series of targets that can help schools have buy-in
- "Workshops" should be inquiry based that solve a problem
- Need to have them integrated rather than isolated
- Train-the-trainer
- Course vs. program-level assessment and alignment
- Basic structure for each module that can be adapted
- Series of templates that can be tailored to school's

Assessment in a box approach

- Developing and implementing program-level learning outcomes
- Developing and implementing course-level learning outcomes aligned with and derived from program-level learning outcomes
- Instructional strategies to support course- and program-level learning outcomes
- Rubrics to assess student learning
- Processes to use assessment of student learning for improvement

Peter Altenburger: PRAC reports

Peter asked members when will your PRAC reports be submitted this year? Who is the author? Ideally, we would like to have the reports in by the end of May, but recognize that other pressures (accreditation reports, etc.) might push this deadline back a bit

PRAC and the development of professional and graduate learning outcomes – where is this process? Within PRAC reports, each unit should also be reporting on PGPLs and outcomes

GAC has 'issues' with PGPLs in terms of developing and vetting them. Should PRAC have more direct interaction/communication with GAC?
Is anyone from PRAC also on GAC?
      Pat Ebright - Nursing
      Sonja Rice - Law
They will liaise between PRAC and GAC for purposes of PGPLs

Steve Graunke: 2013 IUPUI Staff Survey: Selected Results

- Survey conducted in collaboration between IMIR, HRA, Staff Council, and union
- Results are consistent with management indicators provided to Deans and PRAC members
- Items reflect context prior to strategic plan
- Fall 2013
    - 4,882 full and part-time Indianapolis campus (IUPUC excluded)
    - Recruitment emails
    - Response rate: 47.5%
- Consistent level of satisfaction over the years
- Supervision, evaluation, and rewards – generally, not a whole lot of change over time
- Biggest change over the years: Decline in agreement with the item, "I have a good understanding of objectives and plans for the next few years at IUPUI." More work needs to be done in this area (strategic plan not fully released at this time; ambiguity exists)
- Campus climate for diversity
- Summary:
    - 2013 is generally consistent with previous years
    - Hourly staff more likely to be satisfied on a number of items
    - Salaried monthly staff more likely to be satisfied than bi-weekly staff on many items
    - Students (CSS 2013) perceive climate for diversity better than staff

Trudy Banta: Principles of Undergraduate Learning

- Trudy noted that we have had a change in how IMIR is now functioning:
    - Student Data, Analysis, and Evaluation under Michele Hansen's leadership
    - Ann Mitchell joins PAII for survey research

- PULs are being taught in some areas, overlooked in other areas—this was noted in the lead-up to the accreditation self-study

- PULs underlie general education from freshman to senior year; every course should emphasize one or more PULs
- Small groups of faculty in each department determined where PULs existed across the curriculum; PULs mapped to each course; multiple opportunities for students to practice mastery of the PULs throughout the curriculum
- Next phase involved faculty ratings of student effectiveness of demonstrating the knowledge and skills for each PUL
- Aggregate data to demonstrate student learning of PULs
- For the PULs that faculty emphasize in a major or moderate way, faculty were asked to evaluate student effectiveness (4, 3, 2, 1) in demonstrating the knowledge and skills related to the PULs
- From there, a schedule was developed to have every course evaluated at least once over a 5 year period; we have a 4-year set of data and annual sets of data; 2014 is our 5th year of this process
- Now, we find ourselves in the situation of determining whether or not we should adopt another 5 year schedule or should we have a different approach?
- Central questions:
  - What is the process for monitoring submission of faculty ratings in each unit?
  - What have units been doing with the PUL data?
  - How long should the next PUL reporting cycle be?
  - What could PRAC do to improve the process?
  - How do we advise our students in their PUL outcomes?

Karen Alfrey – Engineering and Technology's PUL Approach

- Most programs undergo discipline-specific accreditation
- Primary assessment focus is on discipline-specific outcomes defined by accreditors
- Individual programs have the freedom to design, implement, and oversee their own assessment plans
- Each year in the fall semester we provide a workshop through our Lunch-n-Learn series
  - Campus PUL assessment process
  - Tips for meeting both PUL and discipline-specific assessment needs with minimal additional burden
- It is up to the individual programs to monitor PUL implementation/review
- Compliance is highly variable
  - Programs using PULs as their primary outcomes (OLS, TCM) ans those using PULs explicitly in their assessment plans (ECET, BMET) have assessed PULs in virtually all classes
  - In ENGR programs, trend toward greater compliance in courses that emphasize less-technical content (1st year seminar, Engineering Economics, Senior seminar)
  - A couple of programs do not have any data
- Five-year cycle means PUL assessment does not become habitual unless it is explicitly linked with existing assessment activities
- Existing processes use a sampling-based approach

- Lack of faith among some faculty that PUL assessment data are as meaningful/valid as data from existing assessment processes
- Possible mismatch between the purpose of PUL assessment and insights of what faculty want out of assessment
- E&T faculty think they already know how students are doing in our classes, yet they want to know how they are doing in other classes
- Some programs use PULs as program outcomes
- PUL assessment process stimulates conversation about what we need to do to have confidence that our assessment results are meaningful
- Some programs incorporate PULs directly into their discipline-specific assessment process
- Unfortunately, ABET program evaluators found PUL data somewhat confusing, even though they are linked explicitly to discipline-specific outcomes
- PULs are a way of summarizing our more discipline-specific results
- More accountability for individual program assessment plans and compliance with those plans

Jennifer Lee: Herron School of Art and Design's PUL Approach

- PUL Assessment Schedule within Herron
- Each class covered every five years; working from bottom up and then top down; and some 'clean up' semesters
- Some problems, as there is dwindling data set each year; changes over time make comparisons difficult
  - Which courses were assessed?
  - Which courses were supposed to have been assessed?
  - Which of those courses were offered?
  - Who taught those courses?
  - Remind those instructors
  - While well intentioned, some of the efforts have not been as good as they could have been in Herron. Faculty sometimes question value of PULs, especially in relationship to discipline-specific accreditation outcomes – rely on specific learning artifacts and external evaluators didn't seem as interested in PUL data; some PUL data did provide a bit of context for overall IUPUI student performance in a given competence domain.

Sarah Baker: University College's PUL Approach

- UCOL is a gateway and not a degree-granting unit
- Focus is on first-year seminars

First year seminars
  - Faculty assignments
  - Terms and expectations
  - Template for first-year seminars
  - Responsibilities, resources, and opportunities

Responsibilities
- All U110 FYS sections to participate in Administrative Withdrawal
- All FYS faculty evaluate student attainment of PULs

PULs
- U110 First Year Seminar
- Each U110 instructor to evaluate student attainment of PUL 1a – major emphasis
- Critical thinking – moderate emphasis
- You will determine what student assessments/evaluations best demonstrate the PUL identified for your course
- This might be papers, presentations, projects, exam questions, portfolios, or any number of items
- Late semester reminder from UCOL academic advisors
- "Later in the semester, when grade rosters become available, you will find an "SIS PUL Evaluation" Link immediately under the "SIS Grade Roster link in the SIS system."
- "Approximately a month after submission of this information, the Office of Academic Affairs will receive aggregate summaries of student performance in our UCOL courses."
- "This information will be used to improve teaching and learning."

Assessment of Instructor Responsibilities
- Completed list of U110 PULs
- Shared annually at curriculum meetings
- Reassessment of PUL

Future improvements
- Increase professional development related to PUL evaluation and assessment with faculty
- Review curriculum and align curricular changes with PUL assessment

Use of PUL Data
- Supplement indirect measures of student learning such as grades, self-report questionnaires, and focus groups
- Enhance understanding of student learning for courses in the aggregate
- Facilitate dialogue among instructional team members regarding expected levels of learning vs. actual
- Ideally, create culture of designing assessments and activities that facilitate stated student learning outcomes

Results
- Most students rated by the faculty are very effective or effective
- This closely aligns with grade data

Changes in FYS
- FYS template has been revised in light of evaluation findings
- Student learning outcomes were developed and made more explicit
- Second PUL – Critical Thinking – was added

- More focus on Critical Thinking and deeper approaches to learning in FYS rather than "busy work"
- Based on evaluation findings and a desire among UC faculty to improve their own professional development and improve student learning outcomes, a Faculty Learning Community for FYS instructors was established to assist new and veteran faculty with planning, problem solving, and sharing of best practices

Trudy noted that we need to have far more discussion re: what we are doing with PULs; we have gaps between expectations/goals and how this is playing out in a number of places.

Comments about what is heard? Reactions:

- Some of this may be occurring, but the follow-up/checking-up hasn't been fully accomplished
- "How do you know?"
    - Report goes to the unit (Deans, Associate Deans, PRAC members)
- Mentoring of more senior faculty may be needed
- Each unit has unique characteristics; consider creating general guidance (with parameters) about what is needed vs. a common plan
- Consider linking PUL assessment to something that is of scholarly value to the individual faculty member

Other items:

Homework for PRAC members: review questions and we will discuss at the next meeting

Finally, a handout was circulated to capture 2014 PRAC Annual Report Submission Dates; this information is contained in Appendix A.

Appendix A: 2014 PRAC Annual Report Submission Dates

School/Unit	Primary Report Author/Contact	Date of Expected Submission
Journalism	Chris Lamb	School is becoming a department within another unit
PETM	Mark Urtel	11/1/14
Science	Kathy Marrs	7/31/14
Herron	Jennifer Lee	6/20/14
Medicine	Tony Ribera	7/1/14
Engineering and Technology	Karen Alfrey	No later than 7/15/14
Nursing	Pat Ebright/Sue Hendricks	7/31/14
SPEA	Suzann Lupton	TBD
McKinney Law	Sonja rice	Mid-October; after bar passage statistics are released
Student Affairs	Rob Aaron	6/30/14
UC	Michele J. Hanson	8/25/14
Liberal Arts	Tom Davis	9/30/14
CSL	Kristin Norris	8/25/14
Honors College	Lisa Ruch	5/31/14
IUPUC	Crystal Walcott	5/31/14
Social Work	Carolyn Gentle-Genitty	8/31/14 (optimal)
Dental School/DH	Lisa Maxwell	8/1/14
Dental School/DDS and Grad	Melinda Meadows	8/31/14
SHRS	Peter Altenburger	9/1/14