

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, May 14, 2020

Zoom Meeting Recording [Link](#)

1:30 – 3:00pm

Agenda/Minutes

Attendees: Karen Alfrey, Marta Antón, Richard Bentley, Leslie Bozeman, Nicholas Brehl, Jerry Daday, Julie Davis, Lynn Dombrowski, David Farber, Tom Hahn, Michele Hansen, Stephen Hundley, Susan Kahn, Rachel Kartz, Caleb J. Keith, Jennifer Lee, Sara Lowe, Katharine Macy, Clif Marsiglio, Pamela Morris, Howard Mzumara, Sonia Ninon, Kristin Norris, Anusha S Rao, Kristy Sheeler, Morgan Studer, Annela Teemant, Elizabeth Wager, Crystal Walcott, Scott Weeden, Jane Williams

1. Welcome, review, and approve meeting minutes from April 2020 meeting (5 minutes)
Tom Hahn: Welcomed attendees and called the meeting to order at 1:30.

Thanks to everyone attending by Zoom. We had record attendance last month; hopefully, we can do that again this month. Susan Kahn made a motion to approve the minutes from the April PRAC meeting; Scott Weeden seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the minutes were approved.

2. *State of Assessment at IUPUI: Summary of Findings* – Susan Kahn, Director, Planning and Institutional Improvement Initiatives, IUPUI Division of Planning and Institutional Improvement (15 minutes)
Summary documents are available in the [PRAC folder on Box](#).

Susan Kahn: Most of you are familiar with this because Shawn and I interviewed most of you. Very briefly, we wanted to take a look at the state of assessment across IUPUI. This is partially preparation for our 2022 accreditation review for HLC. It's also part of the improvement initiative we are doing for the 2022 review.

We interviewed 45 people in 24 units. Sometimes we interviewed individuals from different parts of units. Units were counted as the largest entity to which a department or program belonged. For example, DUE and the Medical School were counted as a single unit.

The bullets represent comments that were the most frequent. Accreditation was rarely cited as the only reason for assessment, although there were several instances in which this was the case. However, when this occurred there were often comments about assessment being about improvement.

Assessment is often seen as being about improvement, but occasionally about accountability. I also heard a lot of units that teach a lot of undergraduate general education courses about the general education profiles. This has helped some skeptics become enthusiasts about, or at least understanding of, assessment.

There has been an interest in building capacity around a culture of evidence. Co-curricular units indicated performing assessment to provide value of the institution's commitment to this learning. Only one person indicated their school/unit has a passion for teaching and learning.

There were a number of comments about the value of The Record. This emerged as being of important to a number of units.

Only one or two people said they perform assessment solely for the PRAC report.

About organizational structure, schools with state licensure requirements and multiple accrediting bodies have strongest administrative and committee infrastructures. These units tend to have a staff member dedicated to assessment; perhaps an associate dean. In a few cases, there was no school-wide structure for assessment; in these cases, it was left up to program directors.

The most frequently cited resource was the CTL. PRAC grants were also noted as being important. Other resource cited a lot were: IRDS, PRAC (including PRAC Grants), UAC, IEL, Assessment Institute (many schools said they sent multiple people), The Record. Some schools said they have no internal resources and cited the previous resources. Many schools have funding to support professional development.

When asked about learning outcomes and teaching to outcomes, often the outcomes are defined by the accrediting body. For those instances where there was no accrediting body, the learning outcomes often come from national associations. Only one school indicated their accreditor requiring surveys of graduating seniors and recent graduates.

Many schools have assignments mapped to course and program outcomes. Some schools have outcomes mapped to specific assignments. Some schools (health-related) are looking at dispositions (empathy, compassion, etc.); however, there was occasionally pushback that some of these items cannot be quantified. This might be indicative of misunderstanding about assessment; not all things can (or should be quantified).

Regarding the Profiles, in this year's PRAC reports, the vast majority of schools discussed their work on the PRAC reports. Many have submitted documentation mapping courses to profiles.

Majors that do not have direct admits or get students as first years find mapping to the profiles to be a bit more difficult. Many co-curricular programs are mapped to the profiles.

The Record, focus groups, surveys, and informal student feedback are common methods.

Disaggregation by characteristics is not common. Many schools seem to not be aware that IRDS can assist with this.

Lack of a formal reward system and/or recognition was often cited as a factor that discouraged assessment in units. There is wide variety in the level of a culture of assessment/improvement across the units.

Almost everyone said PRAC is valuable. It is helpful to know what is going on across the campus. It helps to keep people abreast of the field. External speakers are good. PRAC is

considered to be good for the university. Some comments indicated PRAC is too big. One comment indicated more attention could be given to online learning.

TH: I was excited to see mentions of the Record. We now have 215 experiences as part of the Record and had a recent article in Jag News.

3. *PRAC Report Feedback* – Susan Kahn and Karen Alfrey, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs and Programs, Purdue School of Engineering & Technology (20 minutes)

SK: IN 2008, we developed the process for the review of these reports. It's a collegial review process; in fact, you were all invited to be part of the subcommittee.

The forms you receive should have your reviewers' names on them and you should feel free to contact your reviewer if something is unclear. If you are not the report writer, please share the feedback with the report writer.

The purpose of the reports is to demonstrate a commitment to internal and external stakeholders about assessment and improvement and that the institution is systematically carrying out that commitment.

The reports provide source material for various campus-wide reports, including accreditation self-studies and the mid-cycle review for HLC. The overall quality is continuing to improve. The committee is seeing fewer "bad" reports; often backsliding takes place when a new report writer is involved.

More reports mention improvement. We are seeing clearer connections between assessment findings and steps for improvement. Lack of alignment is still something we see.

The committee singled-out the School of Law as one that has improved dramatically in recent years.

Karen Alfrey: We are asking programs about learning outcomes, measures, findings, and subsequent actions. We're finding the strongest statements we are seeing are about the learning outcomes. However, processes and measures are still in development for many units on campus.

There are cases where programs might report improvement, but there may not be a clear link to what data led to those changes. There are some cases where a program or unit is not clearly involved in all steps of the cycle. Sometimes measures are described in depth, but no emphasis on findings.

We are trying to simplify and clarify guidelines moving forward. We want to clarify things for reviews. We also want the reports more closely linked with, and aligned to, the Profiles. We've discussed separate criteria for undergraduate and graduate programs.

There is a strong suggestion to limit the number of pages for the reports. However, we think it might make more sense to have page limits per program, as opposed to a limit on the number of pages for the entire report.

Some of the things we thought might be important to focus on in the coming year would be undergraduate programs. Now might be a good time to discuss and report on progress to aligning with the profiles. It might also be a good idea to reflect on the abrupt changes.

As some of you are aware, if you are involved with UAC, this year we have been asked to map one program to the Profiles. Then there is a need to see how those plans might map to or lead to a plan for assessment.

4. Discussion: *How Assessment Practices have been changed or adapted to the COVID-19 Pandemic*, Tom Hahn, Susan Kahn, Caleb Keith and other PRAC members (20 min)

TH: Susan, Caleb, and I are writing an article about how the institution is responding to COVID, as it pertains to assessment. We'd like to use this time to get your input and inform our writing on that. Feel free to include a response in the chat. Otherwise, I will open the floor. I know Michele had something we talked about the other day, regarding changes they had made. Michele, do you want to talk about that?

Michele Hansen: Unlike many institutions across the country, we continued to administer course evaluations and collect student feedback. We have made a commitment that instructors will be the only ones to receive specific information so they can improve their courses in the future. The information from course evaluations will not be used in P&T decisions. We left them open longer than usual and after the longer period, we had 6,000 students respond. So, as a means of formative assessment for students, that is one thing we did.

SK: We won't be able to see those evaluations, right?

MH: The instructor will get a feedback report. Chairs will not receive any information about individual instructors. Aggregated information can be shared with schools and departments, but we will not share instructor-specific information. We will, however, share information from student and faculty surveys with schools so they can gain insights about instructor and student needs.

Jane Williams: Michele, who owns the data? In the past, when we used paper, this appears to have been owned by the schools, but it sounds like maybe the campus owns it. Can you clarify?

MH: It's my understanding that faculty own their individual, faculty-specific information. Schools and the campus may have access to the aggregated data.

TH: I can speak to IEL in terms of how we performed our assessment. We implemented a new assessment workgroup and I found that the shutdown has helped with the meeting and it has been fairly seamless thus far. Being remote has helped us get organized.

SK: We may need to develop some questions or prompts to send to PRAC members to solicit input so we will have a little more material, especially because we will not have PRAC reports by the time we will be writing the article.

Pamela Morris: I was curious about the timeframe, because I think this spring we were all scrambling to get it done. And, I think the people I know haven't taken the time at all to think about what that means for assessment and what that will mean in the fall.

SK: It may be that assessment was deemphasized and after the semester ends there may be time for reflection about what could be done and planning for the future. So, we would like to capture what happened during the crisis and learn from it. This may not be the last time we have to teach online or even the last global crisis during our lifetime. I think we want to get a sense of how we reacted in a very difficult time and what might we do to prepare for another such possible disruption.

Kristin Norris (via chat): I am not teaching, but am curious about anyone who went to pass/fail in their course.

Caleb Keith: One thing I would add is that I would encourage folks not to dismiss some of the responses or feels of “we were just getting through this.” I think that is something that is really helpful for us as we think about how the institution responded. So, I hope folks don’t shy away from sharing if that is the experience. That is a helpful finding.

TH: Thanks everyone who shared. We will be putting together a brief survey with the open-ended items and will be getting that out.

5. *Needs Assessment for Future PRAC Meetings* Stephen Hundley, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement at IUPUI. (20 minutes)

Stephen Hundley: Thank you to Susan and Shawn and everyone who participated in the interviews. Susan mentioned this is part of an activity we are doing for the Higher Learning Commission, part of a broader initiative focused on the Profiles. We don’t always like to talk about doing work just for the accreditation process, but in this particular instance not only is this helpful for PRAC and our units, but it also serves to assist in our accreditation needs with the HLC.

Thanks also to Susan and Karen for the summary of what is working well and areas for improvement around the PRAC reports. Certainly what I am hearing is a greater focus on improvement and what people are doing with assessment findings. This is helpful for us. This will be helpful for us in the coming years as we think about how we connect to the Profiles. And, as Tom mentioned, linking to the Record is also important to show up in the PRAC report.

As Tom, Susan, and Caleb mentioned, we are doing a special report of *Assessment Update* devoted to rapid changes in response to this past semester. IUPUI will be one of five institutions represented in the issue and we will devote space online (on the Assessment Institute website) for any additional submissions. The deadline for that is in mid- to late-August.

At the last PRAC meeting, I mentioned we had just launched a number of task forces related to scenario planning at IUPUI. I have posted a [link](#) in the chat function about where you can find more information. Reports are due Friday, May 15th, at which point we will inventory responses to potential scenarios for the next academic year. That site is where we will share additional information, but also pay attention to email for more updates. Stay tuned for more.

What I am hearing is that people enjoy the guest speakers and we want to keep that as a function of PRAC. Moving forward, we will continue to leverage the relationship we have with colleagues who are connected to, and contribute to, the assessment institute. So, if you have recommendations for people, please send them our way.

I would also like to encourage us to piggyback on the survey Tom, Susan, and Caleb will send with a needs assessment for PRAC for next year.

Are there any topics folks would like to see covered next year?

SK: Assessing online learning.

Annela Teemant: I'd add inequity elements of online learning.

Elizabeth Wager (via chat): student readiness for online learning. Rubrics for assessment of profiles as people develop those would also be good to share.

KA: assessing the Profiles at the institution and program levels.

Leslie Bozeman: Stephen, perhaps assessment of global learning in the content of virtual exchange.

SH: All PRAC meetings next year will be available via Zoom.

6. *The Assessment Institute in 2020*, Stephen Hundley (5 minutes)

SH: We will be moving the 2020 Assessment Institute online. I ask folks to keep this in confidence for now. We are fortunate that the Marriott hotel is being a good partner and is not charging us. We will be moving the Assessment Institute to a virtual environment. We are in the midst of communicating with stakeholders before we communicate publicly. We will shorten each day, but will be adding a day to the conference. The aim is to make this possible and accessible across time zones.

We are able to offer the Assessment Institute free of charge this year, because our cost structure is greatly reduced. When the time is right, we would like your help in pushing this out to your networks to drive attendance. We hope to have more than 1,000 attendees. We have nearly 250 sessions ready to go.

More to come on that. Thanks for all each of you do to support the Assessment Institute. If you are still interested in presenting, send me a quick email. We'd love to include you in the program. We have capacity to add some more sessions now that we are not constrained by the number of rooms. The deadline will be mid-June.

7. Announcements (5 minutes)

Tom wished everyone a wonderful summer and adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.

AY 2020-21 PRAC Meeting Dates (Dates are subject to change)

Note that ALL meetings for the year will be available via Zoom. We have scheduled University Hall for the second semester, but please know that ALL dates and venues are subject to change.

- Thursday, September 10, 1:30—3:00 pm
- October – No meeting
 - October 25 - 28, PRAC members invited to attend Assessment Institute
- Thursday, November 19, 1:30—3:00 pm

- Thursday, December 10, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, January 14, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, February 18, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, March 11, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, April 8, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, May 13, 1:30—3:00 pm