

**Program Review and Assessment Committee**  
**September 20, 2012, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., CE 409**  
**Minutes**

**Present:** M. Yard (Chair), R. Aaron, K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, E. Ardemagni, T. Banta, R. Bennett, R. Bentley, R. Betts, K. Black, K. Cranfill, D. Drew, S. Graunke, M. Hansen, C. Hayes, J. Lee, S. Weber Lupton, K. Norris, B. Orme, J. Pease, G. Pike, I. Queiro-Tajalli, B. Reese, T. Ribera, L. Ruch, S. Scott, J. Singh, A. Teemant, C. Toledo, K. Wendeln, K. Wills, W. Worley

**1. August Meeting Minutes:** approved unanimously as circulated.

**2. Updates**

- T. Banta announced that the Higher Learning Commission has not yet identified a full complement of team members for the reaffirmation visit in November. All parties hope to avoid postponing the visit.
- She introduced Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Mary Fisher, an experienced HLC evaluation-team consultant, to help committee members understand what we may expect when the team does visit IUPUI.

**3. Higher Learning Commission Reviewer Lessons**

- M. Fisher stated that because of our size and complexity, there will likely be between eleven and fifteen members, each of whom will have particular assignments on which to focus in terms of self-study report chapters and groups to meet while here. She added that the full report and Executive Summary will be posted on the IUPUI web site very soon. The team chair directs team assignments and the agenda for the visit; Karen Black of PAII will handle schedule logistics. The team will have a resource room for its work, both in reviewing documentation and in consulting as a group to determine its report.
- Fisher explained that the team members will want to see evidence that IUPUI fulfills the criteria for accreditation and will seek to validate and clarify the report claims. When meeting with PRAC, they will be interested in the committee's role with the campus and with how we use assessment for improvement. They will look for examples of efforts to improve and evidence that we are improving.
- Committee members asked about what issues came up at the last visit that might still be of concern. Banta and Fisher indicated that at that time we had developed the PULs but had no plan to assess them; we have certainly worked to accomplish that, and PRAC reports constitute part of the evidence. The team is also likely to be interested in the state's general education curriculum mandate and our planning to address it. They will also be interested in discussing facilities and maintenance plans with other groups.
- Responding to a question about how schools and departments can make ready, K. Black explained that units should be prepared to respond quickly if asked for reports from specialized accreditors or for documents such as school curriculum committee minutes. Deans have been alerted to provide copies of the most recent accreditation letters for the resource room and to be ready with the full reports on request.

- Fisher also described the final stages of the visit. The team will provide an oral exit summary for campus executives about what they expect to report, including any general concerns or noteworthy strengths. They will write their report over the next several weeks and submit it to the Higher Learning Commission for staff review. IUPUI will have an opportunity to review and correct any errors of fact before the final report goes to the HLC Board of Directors for final action.
- T. Banta added that she and Fisher will prepare each group the team decides to meet and will also circulate information about the team members and their schedule as that information becomes available.

#### **4. NSSE Survey Update**

- S. Graunke provided a summary analysis of results from the spring administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (see presentation slides circulated separately with these minutes). He noted that most of the comparisons are with the group of public research institutions because too few of our peers participated in this cohort for meaningful comparison.
- The report clusters responses of particular interest into four categories: opportunities for improvement, issues to be mindful of, assets to protect, and areas of strength. For example, in the NSSE category of Supportive Campus Environment, for both first-year and senior students, “interpersonal environment” represents an asset to protect, while “support for student success” is an issue to be mindful of. On the other hand, under Student-Faculty Interaction, “out-of-class interaction” is an area of strength for first-year students but an issue to be mindful of for seniors.
- He added that the IUPUI response rate was just under our target of 30 percent, though that was somewhat better than the rate at other institutions. Our response rate was higher for seniors than for first-year students.
- He referred committee members to the [IMIR web site](#) for further information and analysis.

#### **5. PRAC Grant Report**

- B. Orme provided a progress report on the PRAC assessment grant awarded to University Library in Spring 2012. The purpose of the project is to enhance library self-evaluation and guide improvement of library service and student learning, especially of the PUL related to information literacy. The project leader, Rhonda Huisman, has asked librarians to provide information about courses they work with, and a faculty community of practice on information literacy is participating. The environmental scan is guided by “Analyzing Your Instruction Environment: A Workbook,” published by the Association of College and Research Libraries.
- The desired project outcome is to set goals for standard approaches to infusing information literacy across the curriculum. As test cases, University College is working with the grant project team on ways to strengthen information literacy in First-Year Seminars, and the School of Education is working with the project to expand material on

information literacy in the Oncourse sites for its courses. The project report is due May 2013.

#### **6. Subcommittee Updates**

- R. Aaron will be the new chair for the Advanced Practitioners Subcommittee; he encouraged additional PRAC members to participate in the subcommittee's monthly exchanges.
- C. Hayes reported that one grant report, from the 2009-10 cycle, remains to be presented at a future PRAC meeting. The subcommittee has released a new Request for Proposals, with support from the Center for Teaching and Learning.
- G. Pike announced that the Performance Indicators for Teaching and Learning Subcommittee would welcome new members. The group works once a year, in late October, to evaluate progress for reporting in the annual IUPUI performance report.
- K. Alfrey also called for new members for the PRAC Reports Review Subcommittee, which will begin its work on 2011-12 reports in November.
- K. Black indicated that, having completed revision of guidelines, the Program Review Subcommittee might focus in future on providing feedback to units on their self studies with a focus on student learning outcomes assessment.

#### **7. Adjournment at 3:00 p.m.**

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