

**Program Review and Assessment Committee**  
**March 22, 2012, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m., UL 1126**  
**Minutes**

**Present:** M. Yard (Chair), R. Aaron, K. Alfrey, T. Banta, K. Black, K. Cranfill, M. Ferguson, B. Gushrowski, S. Hundley, M. Irwin, S. Kahn, J. Lee, P. Mullins, H. Mzumara, J. Paine, S. Scott, S. Siddiki, C. K. Smith, K. Stanton-Nichols, R. Tezanos-Pinto, M. Urtel, K. Wendeln, E. Wood, N. Young

**1. February Meeting Minutes:** approved as circulated.

**2. Updates**

- T. Banta announced that some 70 people attended the Town Hall meeting on Chapter 3 of the self-study report. She added that authors will make changes in the chapter drafts to reflect comments and suggestions at the Town Halls.
- T. Banta also reported for Steve Graunke that NSSE response rates had been sent to schools to solicit further efforts to encourage students to respond. Direct contact from professors to first-year and senior students is recommended as the campus has reached the message limit established by the IRB.

**3. Program Review Process**

- Paul Mullins (Anthropology), Margaret Ferguson (Political Science), and Robert Aaron (Student Life) shared observations about the program review process as their departments recently experienced it.
- M. Ferguson described the 2011 Political Science review as overall a good experience. She worked to make it useful for her colleagues in the department. Though assessment has been a gap for the department, the process helped faculty recognize assessment they already conduct and prepare to think about how they can do more. Articulating some problems that faculty have noted in the capstone led to curriculum review to identify the source of those problems. Though the department may not be able to do everything recommended by the review team, the recommendations were informative.
- P. Mullins reported that the Anthropology Department had not conducted a formal review since 1985. Despite regular self-monitoring, faculty experienced challenges collecting information for the report, and greater structure might have been helpful. They also discovered it can be difficult to obtain department-level data where the default is data by school. Though the review recommendations were in several cases flattering and were undoubtedly well-intended, not all were realistic (the department is unlikely to be able to hire ten new faculty members). In retrospect, he wishes the department had begun work sooner or had the ability to do something as simple as pay for a retreat to facilitate planning. The process needs a stronger sense of faculty agency, including a perception that all the work can make a difference.
- R. Aaron reported for the 2010 review of the Campus Recreation department, which had until 2009 been part of the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management.

As much as anything, a primary goal of the review was to determine how to support the new department in conjunction with the administrative transitions in the Division of Student Life. The review committee, many of whose members had had similar experiences, was very helpful. In addition to focusing on how to raise student awareness of the department, the committee recommended using the transition as an opportunity to develop new partnerships (e.g., with the city parks department). Though somewhat overwhelming, the recommendations are proving helpful in developing a long-term strategy. While that planning is under way, the department is tackling short-term projects such as staff development and revising the fee structure.

#### **4. PRAC Grant Reports**

- Kathleen Stanton-Nichols of the Department of Physical Education reported on its 2009 PRAC grant to realign the Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) curriculum with new standards of its two accrediting bodies, the Indiana Professional Standards Board and National Association for Sport and Physical Education. Department faculty ended up conducting a major curriculum revision, placing it on the leading edge in the field. In addition to eliminating 18 hours' required course work and adding more diversity experiences throughout all course work to support ability to teach adaptive PE, faculty increased civic engagement plans to provide new learning opportunities and developed the framework for a student portfolio. The PRAC grant laid groundwork for a Course Enhancement Grant from the Center for Teaching and Learning.
- Rosa Tezanos-Pinto, Department of World Languages and Literatures, described a new course added to the WWL curriculum focused on race, to help minorities engage in international study. The course design was completed in 2007, and the 2008 PRAC grant purpose was to assess the intensive summer pilot. Students from several departments went to the Dominican Republic and Haiti, visiting two universities and several villages for lectures and service learning and administering questionnaires to both Dominicans and Haitians about the nature of racism on the island. Student response was highly positive.

#### **5. PRAC Report Review Update**

- Reporting for the PRAC Report Review Subcommittee, S. Kahn explained that reviews of 2010-11 PRAC Reports have been completed and would be sent to PRAC representatives following the meeting. With fifteen members representing as many units, the committee members were able to assure that each submitted report received two reviews. Since the subcommittee used a common rubric and conducted a norming exercise prior to the reviews, most of the review pairs were not widely different. Those writing reports are welcome to contact their reviewers for clarification, or to be in touch with Kahn, S. Scott, K. Alfrey, or M. Yard.
- Kahn added that if new members would like to see some particularly effective reports, they might look through reports from the Schools of Nursing and Library and Information Science as well as Kelley School of Business, posted on the [PRAC web site](#). Other suggestions based on reviewer notes:

- writers should consider the audience to be educated, but not disciplinary specialists, so acronyms and disciplinary terminology should be explained;
- readers find it helpful to have a brief introductory overview, including an indication of whether a cycle of program inclusion is followed (larger schools often do choose to spread individual program reports over a period of two or three years);
- summary statements such as “no improvement needed” should probably be used sparingly, since a primary purpose of assessment is to improve.

## **6. New Business**

- M. Yard reviewed the agenda planned for the April 13 PRAC meeting, including two more reports from prior PRAC grant recipients and a presentation by Sarah Baker about progress with the General Education Initiative.
- M. Ferguson added that the planning committee will hold a Town Hall meeting for open discussion of a General Education Common Core on March 30. Information is available at <http://gened.iupui.edu>.

## **7. Adjournment at 4:00 p.m.**

Minutes recorded by S. Scott and respectfully submitted by K. Wills, 2012 Vice Chair