Program Review and Assessment Committee
September 12, 2013, 2:00 – 3:30 p.m., CE 307
Minutes

Present: K. Wills (Chair), R. Aaron, K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, E. Ardemagni, T. Banta, K. Black, T. Freeman, C. Gentle-Genitty, S. Graunke, B. Gushrowski, M. Hansen, L. Houser, S. Johnson, S. Kahn, M. Kolb, J. Lee, S. Weber Lupton, K. MacDorman, K. Marrs, E. Metzler, H. Mzumara, C. Nielsen, K. Norris, W. Orme, G. Pike, I. Queiro-Tajalli, S. Rice, T. Roberson, L. Ruch, S. Scott, E. Sickels, C. Walcott, S. Weeden, W. Worley

1. **August meeting minutes:** approved unanimously as circulated

2. **Chair's Welcome**
    *   K. Wills called for reports from the subcommittees.
        o   On behalf of the grants subcommittee, L. Houser encouraged proposal submissions by October 15.
        o   G. Pike thanked all who volunteered to serve on the performance indicators subcommittee, which will meet in January once the campus strategic plan is completed.
        o   K. Alfrey reported that review of 2012-13 PRAC reports will begin in late October or early November. The review subcommittee could use a few more volunteers.
    *   The Chair also asked for further suggestions for agenda topics this year. Volunteers should contact her directly.

3. **Social Media and Program Assessment**
    *   T. Banta introduced Steven Graunke of IMIR and Eric Sickels of University College for a quick tutorial on social media and connecting with alumni. Reaching alumni for assessment and program review has become more challenging than ever. Graunke and Sickels have prepared a "quick tips" handout to be provided to all program chairs preparing for program review.
    *   Sickels described a project for which University College, Admissions, and Student Involvement worked with a consultant to understand and use social media effectively. (See presentation materials circulated with these minutes.) Key recommendations include:
        o   Choose platforms actually used by your audience.
        o   Stay focused on your goals, not simply the tools.
        o   Start as students graduate rather than delaying contact (for example, request secondary personal email addresses that will continue after graduation).

4. **Announcements**
    *   T. Banta reinforced Houser's encouragement on pursuing PRAC grants, with the reminder that PRAC members themselves should not be the first proposer on a project.
    *   Registration information for the Assessment Institute has now been sent to deans.

5. **Critical Thinking Assessment in the PULs**
   - Referring to committee discussion at the August meeting, T. Banta thanked members for the many interesting suggestions for agenda topics this year. She, Wills, and Altenburger will work from that list and use PRAC reports to identify those doing good work on recommended topics. The subject chose for today is assessment of the PUL on critical thinking, with presentations by Karen Alfrey of the School of Engineering and Technology, Eric Metzler of the Kelley School of Business, and Rob Aaron of the Division of Student Affairs.
   - K. Alfrey highlighted reasons that faculty in Engineering and Technology became concerned about student perceptions of their critical thinking ability. She described activities the faculty identified to foster development of critical thinking as well as some approaches to assessing student learning in this area. She shared copies of a rubric that she and Elaine Cooney developed, which the E&T Assessment Committee subsequently approved for use throughout the school. (Presentation materials were circulated separately following the meeting.)
   - E. Metzler, an instructional consultant at Kelley for both Indianapolis and Bloomington, echoed some of Alfrey's points about the varied understandings of "critical thinking." He explained that in the business disciplines, it most often relates to students' ability to apply processes they have learned in class to business situations and to back up their recommendations with solid analysis. Kelley faculty conducted eight critical thinking projects in 2010-11 that provided useful data about students' development of critical thinking skills (and also surfaced other faculty concerns to be pursued in future). Review of the projects' results helped faculty identify support students need, including more practice and clear expectations. T. Roberson added comments about the impact of this work on his own teaching.
   - R. Aaron discussed how critical thinking is applied in the context of co-curricular learning. He reviewed the process used by the Division of Student Affairs to determine how its units understand the PULs and PGPLs and how it has developed assessment plans. One result is a translation into PCLs: Principles of Co-Curricular Learning, applied at both graduate and undergraduate levels. He shared examples of past division assessment and plans for assessment in the coming year.

6. **Adjournment at 3:00 p.m.**

Minutes recorded by S. Scott and respectfully submitted by P. Altenburger, 2013 Vice Chair