

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

March 10, 2005

1:30 – 3:00 p.m., UL1126

Joyce MacKinnon, Chair

Martel Plummer, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of February 10, 2005 Minutes..... Mac Kinnon
2. Program Review Report from Continuing StudiesA. Helman
3. IRB Approval Process J. Smith
4. Progress on PULs and ePort.....S. Hamilton
5. Hesburgh Award ApplicationS. Hamilton
6. Adjournment..... Mac Kinnon

MINUTES –

Members present: D. Appleby, R. Applegate, K. Baird, S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, P. Boruff-Jones, C. Dobbs, A. Gavrín, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen, A. Helman, L. Houser, E. Jones, S. Kahn, J. Mac Kinnon, K. Morrow, M. Plummer, K. Rennels, Joshua Smith, C. Souch, R. Vertner, C. Yokomoto, and N. Young

Minutes of the February 10 meeting were approved.

Hesburgh Award – Sharon Hamilton suggested nominating the Principles for Undergraduate Learning for the Hesburgh Award. The PULs meet all the criteria. Help from PRAC will be needed to provide “evidence of systemic change in teaching effectiveness and sustained faculty commitment...” and “objective, hard data documenting improvements in undergraduate learning outcomes and student advancement.” This is just the kind of evidence we hope to find in the PRAC reports each year. October 1st is the deadline for nominations. The award amount is \$25,000.

General Studies Program Review – Amanda Helman reported on the recent program review of General Studies (see handout).

Background - Overall it was a positive process that provided good information and direction for the future. General Studies is a regular academic program, with the largest number of majors at IUPUI, and it is interdisciplinary with no faculty of its own. It is the largest general studies program in Indiana. Each school has a faculty representative on the General Studies advisory committee. For admission, the program requires life and work experience.

Reviewers gave feedback based on the CAEL (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning) principles. Recommendations were made related to:

- outreach to the community
- life/career planning
- financing
- assessment of learning outcomes
- teaching and learning process
- student support systems
- technology
- strategic partnerships

Currently three groups of faculty and staff are preparing action plans related to the report. During the PRAC discussion, it was suggested that they also look at what various graduate programs are requiring in terms of competence in technology.

IRB Process – Josh Smith provided an overview of the IRB approval process. (See handout) The IRB office is located in the Union Building, 6th Floor. Staff there are very helpful. If you have any questions, simply call them for guidance.

The purpose of the IRB process is to protect people, animals, and us. There are three types of review: exempt, expedited, and full. When the level of risk is minimal and no one from a protected class is involved, one would apply for exempt or expedited review. In the case of a full IRB review, turn-around time is about 3-4 weeks. The review involves a 20-item certification assessment.

When there must be amendments to the approved IRB documents, an update is submitted. The staff will contact you if there is a problem – usually with a quick turn around.

Sometimes you will need to request IRB consent after data have already been collected. If the data are only being used internally, particularly to improve a program, the exempt approval is usually given quickly.

If a project is to involve multiple countries and multiple researchers, the other researchers will be protected by what we do with IRB. Usually letters of support would be requested from the others involved and/or from the institutions from which data are being collected (e.g., headmasters, school administration).

In the case of university course research projects (e.g., students conducting surveys) exempt IRB status can be requested with the faculty member serving as the PI. This should be requested each semester. If students are conducting research among themselves in a course, IRB approval is not needed. Pilot studies may also be exempt.

PUL Update – Sharon Hamilton reported that she had presented the proposed changes to the PULs to the IUPUI Academic Affairs Committee. The discussion was very positive with only slight modifications recommended. These should be on the agenda for the April meeting of Faculty Council.

e-Port – Sharon Hamilton reported that the e-Port PUL matrix will be released this fall for first year students in the 2-3 largest gateway courses, targeting the professional school learning communities. Faculty will be able to pilot use of the matrix and determine whether and how it meets their needs and the needs of their students, how it works for assessing their academic goals, and what else needs to be done. Support will be provided to those faculty members who wish to use the ePort. Sharon and her committee will continue to develop other aspects of the e-Port as the matrix is piloted. In fall 2006, they hope to release the matrix for use by all students. The General Studies program plans to pilot a course that will utilize the e-Port.

The PRAC subcommittee on the PULs has generated a list of things students and faculty will need to know right up front next fall in order to use the matrix. The e-Port Core Committee is preparing the listing. At the next meeting of the PRAC subcommittee, they will deal with issues of “reflections.” PRAC’s overall role will be advisory and to provide feedback. (See handout)


The next PRAC **meeting** will be on Thursday, April 14, 2005 in UL1126.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martel Plummer, Vice Chair and Recorder

The General Studies Degree Program Review



Presented to PRAC

March 10, 2005

Amanda Helman

General Studies

What is it?

- Adult Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Degree
- Formed in 1974 to meet the needs of adult learners
- Governed by the GSFAC
- Largest single major at IUPUI

Who are the students?

- ❑ Over 1100 students enrolled
- ❑ 66% part-time
- ❑ 19% Minority
- ❑ 67% Female
- ❑ Average GPA 3.03
- ❑ 76% 25 years old or older
- ❑ Graduate School bound, Career Changers, Career builders, and/or Life Long Learners

How does it fit with the rest of IUPUI?

- ❑ Students take classes from every school at IUPUI
- ❑ Use Minors and Certificates from every school to build their degree
- ❑ Feed IUPUI graduate and professional programs

Why is it important to IUPUI?

- Helps meet the needs of the 250,000 undereducated adults in our service area
- Adds to the diversity of the campus
- Feeds graduate programs

Program Review

Who was on the team?

- Tom Flint-CAEL
- Terri Rhodes-Portland State University
- Mark Hollman-DWD
- Chuck Davis-Labor Studies
- Susan Marie Harrington-School of Liberal Arts

What did they say?

- “Jewel hidden in plain sight”
- Comments focused on CAEL’s Principles of Effectiveness
 - Recommendations were both institutional and programmatic in nature



Outreach to the Community

- ▣ Making more solid connections to business and industry

Life/Career Planning

- Should be university wide efforts in this area
 - Student advising
 - Workforce skill demand data

Financing

- What can we learn from other Adult Learner Focused Institutions (ALFI's)?

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

- Utilization of e-portfolio
- Increase opportunities for Prior Learning Assessment (PLA)

Teaching and Learning Process

- Faculty should become more familiar with adult friendly instructional approaches through the OPD
- Increase research opportunities and internships for adults

Student Support Systems

- Build capacity to provide career expanded advice to General Studies students- especially in relation to the economic clusters

Technology

- Rethink technology competency within the degree—does it match the real needs of students?

Strategic Partnerships

- Expand partnerships and alliances around economic clusters
- Engage employers

Action Plans

- ❑ Business and industry advisory board for the major
- ❑ Explore ways e-port can be used to facilitate reflection on experiential learning's relationship to the PULs.
- ❑ Strengthen the ways IUPUI approaches PLA
- ❑ Explore ways to expand faculty involvement



QUESTIONS?

PRAC
Institution Review Board (IRB)
March 10, 2005

We Are IRB, IRB is Us

Office of Sponsored Programs (Compliance-side)

-monitor and facilitate the IRB process

Faculty from around the campus

-review proposal, make recommendations, and approve

Be not afraid

-do not demonize IRB, or assessment for that matter

Types of Reviews (http://www.iupui.edu/%7Eeresgrad/spon/spon_menu2.htm)

Exempt studies

-checklist (see reverse for no-no's)

-protocol

Expedited studies

-checklist (more forms and boxes)

-protocol

Full-review

-everything

Minimal risks, HIPAA, Consent/Assent

Recommendations

Complete certification

-power point and multiple-choice questions (some not very well-constructed)

Identify exemplars in the department

-follow the rules; check boxes, use language provided

Graduate students

-help with logistics, recycle forms, submitting amendments

Questions; No Answers (sorry)

Progress Report on ePort
PRAC March 11, 2005
Sharon J. Hamilton

1. Release of ePort PUL Matrix to the following groups in fall of 2005:
 - a. All students in Themed Learning Communities
 - b. All students in UC 110 Learning Communities
 - c. Targeted gateway classes to be determined
 - d. Targeted professional school LCs to be determined
2. 2005-2006 General "Opportunity to Learn about ePort" Year to determine what faculty and students teaching major first year courses find most helpful and useful about the PUL Matrix part of ePort. We will continue to develop other aspects, such as the Learner Profile, customizable features, advising component, career component, and so on.
3. Spring 2006: General Studies will pilot a 3-credit ePort Course for students just declaring a General Studies major. This course will provide a prototype or general guide for an online ePort orientation for transfer students, and for any other department wishing to create an entry, capstone, or combination of approaches to including ePort in their curriculum.
4. PRAC ePort Sub-Committee
 - a. two meetings to define what ePort users (faculty and students) need to know by August 15, 2005 or earlier. That work is now being taken up by the ePort Core to write knowledge documents and other related materials;
 - b. next meetings will focus on policies and processes for reviewing reflections.
5. Current pilots:
 - a. First Year: We have 5 pilots in first year courses. Faculty have designed assignments related to the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, course concepts, and ePort. Technologically more comfortable with ePort. Faculty development and technological support provided by CTL.
 - b. Senior Year: Pilot of customizable matrix: Students are very technologically savvy – figured some things out before we did. Early comments: "I wish we'd had this when we were in first year;" "I love the opportunity to gather together all the work I've done." One still having tech difficulty.
6. Experiential Level: Frank Ross and David Schwartz are co-chairing a student committee developing examples, policy recommendations, and processes.
7. Role of PRAC: We see PRAC playing a key advisory and feedback role as we continue to develop ePort. The advisory role for the most part will be taken up by the PRAC ePort subcommittee. Additionally, as we draft policies, develop the infrastructure, and develop the rubrics of expectations for the PULs (via our Communities of Practice), we will look forward to feedback from PRAC similar to the kind of involvement with the PULs this past year.