IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee
March 13, 2014, 1:30-3:00pm, CE 309
Minutes

Attendance: R.Aaron; K. Alfrey; P. Altenburger; S. Baker; T. Banta; R. Bennett; K. Black; T. Davis; P. Ebright; T. Freeman; C. Gentle-Gennity; K. Gilliam; S. Graunke; M. Hansen; J. Hassell; L. Houser; S. Hundley; K. Johnson; M. Kolb; C. Lamb; J. Lee; K. MacDorman; L. Maxwell; H. Mzumara; B. Orme; I Queiro-Tajalli; S. Rice; L. Ruch; M. Rust; C. Schuck; M. Urtel; C. Walcott; W. Wang; S. Weeden; K. Wills; W.Worley; and S. Zahl.

Minutes: approved as circulated

Introduction of new PRAC members:

Trudy introduced two new PRAC members:

- Kenneth Gilliam is a practicum student in Planning and Institutional Improvement and is helping to revise *Assessment Essentials* text.

- Sara Zahl is at Marian University and serves as Director of Assessment in the new College of Osteopathic Medicine.

Tyrone Freeman presentation on DQP/NILOA event:

- Tyrone Freeman from the Lilly School of Philanthropy presented on his work and involvement in a Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) project and event from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

- DQP is Lumina foundation initiative to identify competencies needed by students at associate, baccalaureate, and master degrees; NILOA is creating an online library of assignments in support of DQP; and faculty are encouraged to work together on assignments, review them, and upload them to the library.

- March 1 Tyrone participated in an event in Portland, OR, focusing on an Assignment Design Charette in support of the DQP; each faculty submits their assignment, along with a 4-page overview, including course/students/context; and the goal is to bring together faculty to 'workshop' the assignments.

- 30 minutes were spent on each individual faculty member's assignments, including strengths, questions that students might ask about meeting expectations, and additional information that other faculty might need in order to contextualize to other courses.

- Tyrone's assignment was the Philanthropic Autobiography submitted by School of Philanthropy; one big insight for students is to become aware of both their giving and receiving of philanthropic support.

- The 'take away' information from this event for Tyrone included: feedback on the assignment; definition of what a good assignment looks like, including material from Peter Ewell; and modeled peer review process for assignments.

- Other items discussed during the workshop included: how to document assignments in order to support promotion and tenure cases for faculty, making assignments public, and challenges included getting support from administrators for assessment.

- NILOA is considering replicating the workshop concept elsewhere, and Tyrone encouraged PRAC colleagues to consider replicating this concept locally, too.

- On a related note, Kathy Johnson mentioned that a Signature Assignment Workshop would be held at Ivy Tech on March 31, 2014; the format will use a peer review process – responding to specific questions about assignments and how students use them.

PUL Discussion:

- Trudy reminded PRAC members of the history of PUL development at IUPUI:
    - 8 years spent developing PULs (1990-98); Faculty Council endorsed principles.
    - In 2004, a few changes were made and approved.
    - The idea behind principles was that they would permeate the undergraduate curriculum beyond just gen education and first-year courses; every course would give students an opportunity to learn some of the PULs.
    - In 2010, when North Central Association reaffirmation of accreditation planning was underway, a process to identify PULs and curricular maps were created for each degree program.
    - Matrix created of PULs and courses identified; could see that students were afforded multiple opportunities to learn the skills.
    - For top 2 PULs in each course, faculty were asked to evaluate effectiveness of student learning of PULs; mechanism created to capture the faculty rating of student PUL learning.
    - 5-year schedule was created to evaluate PULs in every course.
    - Feedback from units indicates highly variable approaches to the schedule across IUPUI.
    - IMIR summarizes data and provides to schools, and in some cases departments, of faculty rating of student performance relative to PULs.
    - 5-year cycle is concluding this year.
    - Different schools are looking at different parts in order to determine where natural strengths exist and where opportunities to improve exist.
    - PRAC members have provided answers to questions re: PUL schedules.
    - Now we have legislative mandate re: general education program; Kathy Johnson has been leading the discussion.

- Kathy Johnson updated PRAC members on Degree Maps at IUPUI:

- o Planning for Degree Maps has been underway for the last couple of years.
- o Degree Maps involve giving students a map to help students see what to take in each semester; this is an intentional sequencing of courses, including what courses should be taken together and which ones should not.
- o Degree maps exist on undergraduate website at UCOL. (http://uc.iupui.edu/UndergraduateEducation/DegreeMaps.aspx)
- o The goal is to hand all students a degree map when they enter the institution (e.g., orientation; when they meet with an academic advisor), revising automatically the individual student's updated degree map that reflects actual course-taking pattern.
- o Kathy noted that if we have a course on a degree map that a student cannot take (for an institutionally-defined reason), the institution either has to give the student a new degree map or the course for free.
- o Degree Maps should help create student-centered schedules, with an end result that will assist students to identify and complete critical courses in sequence.
- o Because Degree Maps are an IU-wide endeavor, including PULs on the Degree Maps is not yet possible, although there is a notion that competence would likely need to be captured on the Degree Map; Kathy noted that class descriptions within the Student Information System can be used as a venue to promote where PULs are addressed.

Small Group Discussions on PULs:

- PRAC members met in small groups to discuss and report-out on 4 questions related to PULs; the information from the discussions is captured below.

- Question 1: In your unit, what is the process for monitoring the submission of faculty ratings of student effectiveness in demonstrating the knowledge and skills associated with the PULs?
  - o We need to provide a formal purpose statement or rationale, for doing the PUL evaluation.
  - o A relationship needs to be established between the PUL evaluations and the General Education Core.
  - o Communicating the value of receiving data and its potential use needs to be developed more thoroughly.
  - o We need to provide examples of uses that departments have made of their PUL data. What has improved?
  - o We need a set of rubrics to show progress on each PUL over time.

- Question 2: How have faculty responded to the findings—the direct faculty ratings and students' perceptions of their own strength?
  - o Make the data more meaningful to faculty.
  - o Design rubrics for 100, 200, 300, 400 levels.
  - o Consider focusing PUL evaluation on foundation and capstone courses.
  - o Need better communication about PULs to new faculty.
  - o Sustainability of the assessment process and its value needs to be developed.
  - o Emphasize that PULs are cross-disciplinary skills.
  - o Eliminate any threat involved in making the results public and in suggesting needed improvements.

- o We need to improve faculty buy-in.
- o Need to reaffirm the importance of PULs in light of a new approach to general education.

- Question 3: In 2010, we adopted a 5-year cycle for having at least one set of PUL ratings for every course. How long should the next PUL reporting cycle last?
  - o A 5-year cycle was too long; the cycle should be at least 3 years, if not 2.
  - o Some courses that are critical should be evaluated more often.
  - o It was noted that Gateway and other general education courses are taught with a high number of adjunct faculty members, so attention to ensuring adherence to the schedule will be needed.
  - o As noted earlier, we need to reaffirm the importance of PULs in light of a new approach to general education.
  - o We need Introductory, Intermediate, and Mastery/Advanced levels defined for PULs.
  - o Grading process of PULs should be revisited to possibly enhance the value of data for faculty.
  - o Stagger the evaluation of PULs, concentrating on two in a given year
    - Ratings could be based upon the PUL category and not on a course. For example in year one of a three year cycle, all courses emphasizing communications and Critical thinking would be evaluated, year 2 = Integration and application of knowledge and Intellectual depth, year 3 – Society and culture, Values and ethics.

- Question 4: What could PRAC do to improve the PUL assessment process?
  - o PRAC members are ambassadors of assessment at IUPUI.
  - o We can generate departmental discussions, talk about signature assignments, and give the history of the PULs.
  - o Offer faculty development opportunities in support of PULs.