Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, September 21, 2006
UL1126
3:00-4:30 PM
Karen Johnson, Chair
Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of the May Minutes ........................................................ K. Johnson
2. Introductions .................................................................................. K. Johnson
3. New IUPUI Undergraduate Curriculum Committee............................ T. Banta
5. Subcommittee Overview............................................................. K. Johnson
6. Subcommittee Breakout Meetings
   - Grants…………………………………...Linda Houser
   - Program Review………………………...Donna Boland
   - ePort……………………………………. Susan Kahn
   - Graduate Issues……………………..Rachel Applegate
   - Performance Indicators……………… Gary Pike
   - Advanced Practitioners……………… Josh Smith
6. Adjournment ................................................................................. K. Johnson

MINUTES –


New Members: Elaine Cooney, Crystal Garcia, Elizabeth Goering (not in attendance), Melissa Nemeth, Megan Palmer, Gary Pike, Elizabeth Rubens, Kathy Steinberg, Randi Stocker, and Mark Urtel.

Minutes from the May meeting were approved without correction.

New IUPUI Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Trudy Banta described the undergraduate curriculum committee (UCC) that has been appointed to advise Executive Vice Chancellor Sukhatme. Banta is the chair, and one purpose of the committee is to prepare a position in response to a call from the IU Trustees for a single general education program system-wide.
This body replaces the Council on Undergraduate Learning, which ceased to operate after the adoption of the PULs. PRAC assumed the responsibility for assessing, not directing, general education. In addition to creating a response to the Trustees regarding general education, the UCC will hear proposals about new academic programs. The UCC will act as a consultative body, rather than simply approving or denying curricular changes.

Banta also presented some material from the *Highlights of the Final Report of the Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education*. Page 23 of the report suggests that postsecondary education institutions measure and report meaningful outcomes (e.g., administering the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and/or other standardized instruments). Banta included an article that she had written that challenged the movement toward standardized testing of student learning in higher education. She encouraged PRAC members to read the article, provide feedback, and be prepared to engage in a battle against “No child left untested” that is moving into higher education.

Banta linked this broader conversation to the work of Drew Appleby and his senior seminar students. She encouraged members to contact Drew to help link to seniors across campus. The class is examining the extent to which items on the CLA reflect what students are learning, particularly the PULs. In a sense, Drew and his psychology students are engaged in a face validity study of sample CLA items. Banta indicated that the use of CLA as an objective measure of “value added” learning in college is backed by some college presidents. However, G. Pike found a strong positive correlation ($r = .90$) between SAT scores and CLA. This finding begs the question of why to use it at all if it just confirms SAT scores. The findings, along with the UCC position on general education, represent proactive steps toward answering questions if the IU trustees should decide to encourage IUPUI to use CLA.

**General Discussion of Priorities for 2006-07**

K. Johnson invited a discussion of institution-wide priorities. I. Ritchie is interested in evaluating teaching and learning via the end-of-semester course evaluations. In particular, she questioned how current instruments assess course rigor and departmental objectives. She suggested we revisit the end-of-semester course evaluations and intentionally include the assessment of PULs that are embedded in the course curriculum. Banta indicated that some items on the senior/alumni surveys address those issues and that the Testing Center can help modify course evaluations. I. Queiro-Tajalli brought up the issue of graduate courses that do not follow PULs. Pike pointed to the possibility of multiple forms with a common core. H. Mzumara described a previous committee charged to study end-of-semester course evaluations. Unfortunately the committee has been dissolved. One major recommendation from the group involved the need for different evaluation constructs to measure online versus face-to-face courses. E. Rubens discussed a process to combine existing instruments and the importance of central administration support for meaningful change.
M. Palmer talked about the progress of the student e-Port. In mid-October, the latest version of the tool will be ready and Jay Fern will be offering training to OPD staff. Some students in the learning communities are using some components of the portfolio. Palmer noted that the e-Port is not moving rapidly, partly because it is involved in a partnership with a national group. A more robust version will be ready this spring. A major original and continuing intent is that the e-Port will be a tool to support program evaluation. Palmer indicated that the goal was to support program evaluations of student learning outcomes, in particular the PULs.

Banta passed out copies of some recent issues of Assessment Update as well as brochures inviting members and their colleagues to attend the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis October 29-31. One complimentary registration is offered per unit and members are asked to encourage others to attend.

**Subcommittee Breakout Sessions**
K. Johnson introduced subcommittees and described the goals and activities. Members met in the subgroup of their interest, chairs collected names of subcommittee members, and meeting times were discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30PM.