

Program Review and Assessment Committee

March Meeting 2017: Thursday, March 9, 1:30-3:00 pm, AD 1006

Attending: K. Alfrey, K., P. Altenburger, J. Barbee, R. Bentley, L. Bozeman, F. Cafaro, L. Easterling, T. Freeman, S. Graneke, T. Hahn, M. Hansen, S. Hundley, D. Jerolimov, C. Kacius, S. Kahn, M. Kolb, J. Lee, X. Liu, S. Lowe, D. Malik, A. Mitchell, H. Mzumara, K. Norris, E. Ramos, C. Schuck, S. Scott, K. Sheeler, M. Urtel, S. Weeden.

Guests: Jennifer Thorington Springer, RISE Initiative; Joe Hayes, Student Affairs

Thanks for Susan Scott for assisting with the taking of these minutes.

Meeting called to order at 1:31 pm

1. Welcome and Review/Approval of Minutes
 - a. Motion seconded and passed to approve minutes.

2. Program Review Panel and Discussion — Tyrone Freeman – Lilly Family School of Philanthropic Studies; Mark Urtel – School of Physical Education and Tourism Management; Jennifer Thorington Springer – School of Liberal Arts, RISE Initiative; and Joe Hayes – Student Affairs
 - a. Hundley explained that IUPUI's Program Review process is periodic and conceived not as **punitive**, but rather for improvement. It contributes to the campus' accountability for regional accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission, but differs from the compliance model often associated with specialized accreditation. Programs (including administrative as well as academic) prepare a self-study that incorporates specific questions about which the programs solicit specific advice. The staff of Institutional Research and Decision Support provide extensive supporting data for the self-study, which should also involve many stakeholders in the department. A team of external and internal reviewers (usually five, with two from peer programs at other institutions, one external community member, one from another unit within the IUPUI school or division, and one from another IUPUI school) reviews the self-study report in advance of a 2 ½ day visit. During the vision, reviewers talk with a range of stakeholders, ending with a closing meeting that includes executive administrators. Within thirty days the team sends a written report, which the department discusses to articulate next steps. The unit dean and PAII convene a follow-up meeting six months afterward to discuss progress.
 - b. Each panelist described his or her experience with program review:
 - i. Freeman participated in one review, particularly as director of undergraduate studies, and described the experience as helpful.

- ii. Urtel recently chaired the third review since his arrival at IUPUI and expressed his appreciation that for the latest review there was so much data already available for use early in the process.
 - iii. Thorington Springer has been active with two program reviews and has also served as a reviewer. She noted that although the process requires considerable work, it is quite rewarding, particularly in learning more about the context of the whole campus.
 - iv. Hayes has also served in both capacities and has appreciated the opportunity program review provides to step back for a holistic view of one's own program.
 - v. Hundley has also been involved with several program reviews from both sides of the process.
- c. How did panelists prepare for program review?
- i. Thorington-Springer responded from the perspective of leadership as associate chair of a department. It was helpful to begin by looking at other departments' procedures: format, process, materials, and identification of needs and issues for feedback. She worked to engage all constituents in some way, creating a small team to manage the project and using regularly dedicated time in departmental meetings to discuss strategic concerns.
 - ii. Hayes relied on the College Union CAS standard self-assessment guide, with particular attention to shaping the self-study report as a narrative that could address the "Why" background questions to enable focusing more time during the visit on "How" to address identified challenges.
 - iii. Freeman based the most recent program review on the previous one, allowing time and space to address the challenges associated this time with creation of a new and independent school. The school's administrative team shifted standing meetings to weekly meetings to check progress and stay on track.
 - iv. Urtel also leaned on the prior self-study but chose to create writing teams across the entire faculty such that all were required to participate in some way.
- d. Comments about the self-study itself:
- i. Hayes noted that having other examples was helpful in allowing them to make the report easy to read.
 - ii. Thorington Springer, responding as a reviewer, agreed that clear guidelines help people create readable reports; SWOT analyses are useful in helping readers keep their focus amid what can seem like a deluge of information.
 - iii. Urtel observed that as a reviewer, the driving questions provide very useful guidance.
 - iv. Freeman also pointed out that the reports are expected to pull together all aspects of a program (advising, support, facilities, etc.), not only faculty concerns.
- e. What has resulted from your program reviews?

- i. Urtel reported that the department had made some curriculum changes, adding that the recommendations often reinforced some earlier ideas. The recommendations have also led to consideration of new programs.
 - ii. Thorington Springer stated that reviewer suggestions helped the department develop a strategic plan, contributing ideas about how to make the case for new hires, streamlining program tracks, and adding new minors. The department also adjusted faculty loads to create an advising position to address student concerns about access to advising.
 - iii. Freeman reported that the dean had convened a retreat to discuss the report, which led to creating curriculum task forces for the BA and MA programs, developing a new joint degree program with the McKinney School of Law (now in the approval process), adding several new courses, and working with donors for endowed chairs to attract a wider faculty candidate pool.
 - iv. Hayes mentioned several outcomes from the recommendations, including changing the organizational structure to frame a more holistic “student union” model for the Campus Center, merging some departments, and creating a larger housing operation consistent with the rapid expansion of campus housing.
- f. What one piece of advice would you offer to those just getting started?
 - i. Hayes: give reviewers permission to focus by clarifying advice requested and remove distractions from staff to allow their participation in the visit.
 - ii. Thorington Springer: encourage collaboration among all faculty and staff.
 - iii. Urtel: start early and delegate responsibility.
 - iv. Freeman: leverage the results to get recommendations accepted.
- g. Hundley called on Kristy Sheeler for comments as a participant in several review-team exit meetings. She noted that participants frequently express appreciation for the value of obtaining external perspectives and hearing about new ways of addressing challenges or sustaining good work. She added that recommendations are sometimes not limited to specific unit-level questions (for example, suggestions for new collaborations like creating a center for public scholarship).
- h. During the open questions, Kristin Norris asked about non-academic reviews and what is their focus in the absence of student learning outcomes. Hundley replied that approximately 30% of reviews are for administrative units. Hayes pointed out that program or unit goals and challenges provide a focus for such units.
- i. Thanking all the panelists, Hundley added that the deans have recommended making student learning more central to program review and have considered the extent to which alignment with the IUPUI strategic plan should affect both unit questions and self-studies. They have also discussed how we might leverage program reviews to strengthen innovation and improvement and how best we can take advantage of increased data resources.

3. IRDS Presentation — Anne Mitchell, Director of Survey Research, Institutional Research and Data Support — Cliff Marsiglio, Management Analyst for Program Review
 - a. Mitchell noted that the IRDS approach to Program Review has shifted in recent years from just providing information to working in iterative manner with units to identify and meet data needs.
 - b. Data Sources: Most information comes from SIS; data systems have been combined using TABLEAU which provides rich information.
 - c. Information about students, employees, academic analytics (i.e., faculty publications, grants) and environmental scanning is available.
 - d. Data not currently in systems can be collected via surveys and focus groups.
 - e. Program Review often leads programs to think about developing structured mechanisms for gathering information from students (i.e., first year survey, senior survey, alumni survey). IRDS can advise units on development of such instruments and can help set up processes so units can administer continuously.
 - f. IRDS has observed that data provided is now more regularly being used in reporting documents to help tell the story and being embedded in texts rather than appended to them.
 - g. IRDS support is available to all units regardless of program review status.

4. Report on AAC&U in Phoenix — Stephen Hundley, School of Engineering and Technology, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement; Kristy Sheeler, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, School of Liberal Arts; Susan Kahn, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, ePortfolio Initiative; and David Malik, Special Advisor to Academic Affairs and Planning and Institutional Improvement
(10 minutes)
 - a. Several representatives attended this event and reported on their experiences.
 - b. Malik noted the value of a learning science session that may benefit general education instructors.
 - a. He wanted to know how to do general education review better, but did not find many sessions focused on this topic.
 - b. There were sessions on first year seminars, general education, and high impact practices.
 - c. Sheeler noted she is working with faculty doing general education reviews.
 - a. She attended the Multi-State Collaborative session, which highlighted other sources of information that can help IUPUI faculty make general education comparisons nationally.
 - b. The “It Takes A Village” session discussed faculty buy-in for assessment and provided concrete examples for showcasing work, celebrating faculty, providing recognitions and rewards to promote and demonstrate the value of this work.
 - d. Kahn noted that there was not much offered on curriculum, learning outcomes, and other matters of assessment. She viewed the conference as being more focused on pedagogy.

- a. Kahn quoted Natasha Jankowski: “Students’ sense of learning experiences as being unrelated to one another mirrors the way our institutions are organized.” We need to organize ourselves better around student learning experiences as they progress through their undergraduate education.
- b. Kahn noted that metacognition was emphasized as being about controlling and directing thought processes.
- c. Kahn noted the session’s use of unscripted problems to aid student learning; promotion of sharing learning outcomes with students; and rethinking reward systems for students that prioritize learning, improvement, and trajectories of development.
- d. Carol Schuck (Ivy Tech)
 - i. Schuck attended sessions on interdisciplinary ways of problem-solving.
 - ii. A particularly good session focused on how to assess students’ visual literacy. What do students need to know in order to understand, interpret and use visual data?
- e. Hundley noted that the assessment of general education is a struggle for institutions across the country.
 - i. Hundley reported that interested faculty may attend AAC&U’s General Education 2018 conference in Philadelphia, PA.
 - ii. Hundley noted that a report from the meeting entitled, “On Solid Ground” is available via the AAC&U website.

5. Announcements

- a. Preparation of reports from PRAC sub-committees in May (an alert to chairs)
- b. Other announcements

6. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, April 6 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall (AD) 1006

Thursday, May 11 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall (AD) 1006