

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, May 12, 2022

1:30 – 3:00pm

Meeting Minutes and [Video Recording](#)

Attendees: Daday, Jerry; Broeker, Camy; Williams, Jane; Babich, Sue; Alfrey, Karen; Morris, Pamela; Weeden, Scott; Hahn, Tom; Davis, Julie; Graunke, Steven; Ninon, Sonia; Montalbano; Studer, Morgan; Scaggs, Emily; Macy, Katharine; Wager, Elizabeth; Zheng, Lin Lee, Jennifer; Keith, Caleb; Hansen, Michele; Giddings, Anita; Marsiglio, Clif; Brehl, Nicholas; Pierce, Barbara; Griffith, Dan; Purkayastha, Saptarshi; Easterling, Lauren; Silvia C Garcia; Helling, William; Houser, Linda; Keith, Caleb, Hassell, John.

1. Welcome, review and approve previous meeting minutes (5 minutes) – Caleb Keith

Approved

2. Program Review Panel (40 minutes) – Caleb Keith, David Hoegberg (English), Kristine Karnick (Communication Studies), Julie Lash (CAPS), and Brian Krohn (TESM)

We invited folks to share their experience with program review, in the spirit of highlighting program review within PRAC. Caleb asked each member of the panel to introduce themselves and highlight the program review process.

- David Hoegberg, Chair of English Dept. Program review conducted in Spring 2021, virtual meetings with review team. Received review late spring in 2021 and completed written response in October 2021. David will be stepping down as chair at end of June, so he will not oversee the strategic planning process in his department.
- Kristine Karnick, Chair of Communication Studies. Director of Applied Theatre, Film and Television, which is a product of our last program review. Site visit was in March 2021, and they had a wrap up meeting this semester.
- Julie Lash, CAPS. A more student support services unit. Highlighted student support services. Virtual visit in April 2021. Responses provided in September. Stepping down, last day at IUPUI is May 27.
- Brian Krohn, Chair of Department of Tourism, Event and Sport Management. April 2021 site visit with response provided a few weeks ago.

Caleb mentioned that the program review process has a large umbrella that goes beyond academic programs.

Caleb asked each presenter how they and colleagues prepared for the program review process:

- David: email from Stephen Hundley's office triggered the process. Email gave information on how the process worked. Told early in the process that they would be part of a cohort going under a new format of external review. For faculty who had been in the department for a while, they recognized the change. They were encouraged

to know that the process had been streamlined a little, and they would be the first group to participate in this process. Provided guidelines for their self-review. Stephen attended an early department meeting to help with the self-study. The entire department was involved in different pieces. English is large department with 5 unique concentrations. A big part of the self-study was done by the program directors, each submitting their sections of the self-study. The new format advised department to stick to 20-25 pages, which was appreciated. But it was also challenging for a large department to tell a story in 20-25 pages (plus appendices). The process involved months-long process of preparing the document; preparing for the site visit; visit itself; response to written review.

- Kristine: this was the 4th program review that has occurred since she has been a faculty member; but this is the first one she has been involved in. She wanted to make sure all her faculty were involved in the entire process. She outlined a process similar to David. She also said the challenge was to keep it to 20-25 pages (this one was 25 pages, with 100 pages of appendices, where they backed up what they were saying). Liked that everyone felt an ownership of what was coming out of the process.
- Julie: echoed challenge of keeping this to 20-25 pages. Monopolized on the opportunities to include appendices so reviewers could dig into the data if needed. The new process did streamline things. CAPS has many pieces (business operations, clinical services, education, interpersonal violence prevention, training). Did a SWOT analysis and looked at the data in each of these pieces and tried to identify what is working and what is not working. People from each of the operational areas came together to write the report. The thing they didn't do (which was a good thing) is prep people, including stakeholders, for the review (they didn't do any rehearsal), which was good. They found out they needed to clean up their messaging internally and externally.
- Brian: similar process as others have shared. Used MS Teams so that all documentation was shared, and everyone can contribute to the documents. Every faculty member had a writing portion of the document. It was challenging shortening what faculty wrote to 20-25 pages. Once the document was completed, they generated a companion website using Google Sites – and the google site provides links to attachments/reference materials (<https://sites.google.com/iu.edu/tesm-external-review/home>). This has proved to be valuable as a repository for information.

Caleb: Can you share some of the lessons learned from the process?

- Kristine: felt that the department could control the narrative of the review. They were able to identify what they needed help with and used the program review process to receive help and guidance in the review process. No surprises and very helpful.
- Julie: positive review, and no real surprises. One of the most affirming pieces was the reviewers saying that CAPS was doing a lot with the resources it has. One piece that was bigger than realized was the misinformation about what CAPS provided; learned they needed to communicate expectations to the campus community. Need to clarify the scope of our clinical services, and clarify clearly and directly what campus can expect from CAPS (what CAPS can do, and what it cannot)
- Brian: program is very tied to industry. The review happened when society was coming out of the pandemic, which impacted the event, tourism, and sports management industry greatly. This impacted their department, their work, and their students. Pandemic showed how closely the department is tied to the labor market, so their students can be well prepared. The biggest lesson learned was that we lost sight of our own internal assessment process in the midst of this, as they were trying to re-

envision for an industry that was going through some difficult times. The review showed they did a nice job looking externally, but also needed to look internally too, which was not a surprise to Brian. Programs within the department are learning from each other on scaffolding student learning within the different majors.

- David: learned about strengths that they felt they already had, such as collegiality in department and the department's focus on students. Feeling of overwork and exhaustion. The department did not approach the process from a pass/fail perspective; instead, department focused on the process and identified what were their strengths and what they could build on. Surprises: some of the strengths did not come through in the self-study. For example, the research profile, scholarship, and grants did not come through. If these strengths didn't come through the review team, they are not coming through to students. The review team said it was important for the department to stop thinking of hiring as a way to solve some of the problems, which is different from previous program reviews. Financial realities will not allow for large staffing changes. This was a productive surprise.

Caleb: How is the feedback received being used for future planning?

- Julie: cleaned up website so students could get exactly what they needed. Interpersonal violence prevention and response person has historically been staffed with one individual trying to do the advocacy and training work. External reviewers said that this work was not sustainable at 1 FTE. CAPS now using existing positions from clinicians to support additional staffing for international violence prevention and response. The review committee did say more resources needed to increase clinical staff and define their scope of services. The reviewers offered some recommendations on what the scope should be; Julie offered a response in areas where she did not agree (e.g., limiting the number of counseling sessions for a student).
- Brian: learned that the industry is looking for graduates who see tourism, events, and sports management as essential to personal well-being – so these businesses can help their clients/customers with this. The pandemic hit the industries related to their programs very hard. This has impacted their student credit hours (difficult for student recruitment in industries that were hit by the pandemic). They have an excellent industry advisory council that is helping with their curricular efforts.
- David: feedback received is informing planning moving forward. Decided not to rush through a strategic plan; new chair will do this in the fall semester. Feedback received has been source of much discussion in the department, such as: building more career readiness into the curriculum; complex curriculum in the department (some pushback in the department) – review team recommended offering more shared courses across the programs as a curricular revision/innovation, so that a smaller faculty can serve students across programs. Looking for ways to make work more efficient. Review team also offered recommendations on building stronger alumni relations.
- Kristine: departmental retreat started the formal review process; another departmental retreat (beginning of this year) involved going through the report, and systematically taking each recommendation, talk about the recommendations, establish what they do first, and identify what might not be able to be addressed immediately. Developed a list of action steps. It was challenging to address recommendations that listed the need for more resources when there are financial restrictions. Faculty meetings throughout the year have been allocated to addressing recommendations and information presented in the report because they see great value in this work.

What advice do you have for programs going through the review process next year?

- Brian: we had the opportunity to develop a great narrative/story of the work happening in the department. Let colleagues know the great work that is happening across the department. Use this as an opportunity to celebrate internally. Transparency also made the process easier and better (use of Teams to collaborate). The companion website in Google Sites has been wonderful to house the information for this review.
<https://sites.google.com/iu.edu/tesm-external-review/home>
- David: reiterated what Brian said. Start early. Ask a lot of questions. Get the whole department involved. Any department starting the program review process now can look at this group as examples. Try to get examples of written reports, review team reports, and departmental responses to the review team. Try to make review team visits in person if possible (if financially possible). There are important side visits and hallway conversations that can happen with an in-person visit versus an online visit.
- Kristine: See some benefit to in-person. But Zoom also kept this very business focused. Getting all the faculty involved was crucial. Keeping the recommendations as a living document is important, to inform how we move forward.
- Julie: echo other comments. The reporting process within the Division of Student Affairs helped them more easily gather data for the self-study. Keeping a strategic plan going, and integrating these pieces, is important. For the next review, the groundwork is in place and not starting from scratch.

3. Program Review for Programs with Specialized Accreditation (10 minutes) – HLC Writing Team and PRAC members

Caleb: Planning to adapt the program review process to acknowledge the accreditation that happens within departments/programs. Getting some feedback from groups on campus. Intent is to pilot this in the coming year. Caleb will report back on this in the fall.

4. Report out from PRAC Reporting and Recognition Subcommittee (10 minutes) – Karen Alfrey and Caleb Keith

Karen: Advantage of having new members of committee, who observed process with fresh eyes. On average, programs are good at knowing what their outcomes are and measuring them. Programs might not be as good at closing the loop. There is a diversity of approaches in writing the PRAC annual report, which grows out of a diversity of our programs (which includes a diversity of accreditation bodies). There may be room in our own process in communicating expectations and how we communicate our own program review process. We may explore a different model for providing more helpful feedback to units on their self-studies.

5. Endorsement of Sonia Ninon as Chair-Elect for PRAC 2022–2023 (5 minutes) – Caleb Keith

6. Needs Assessment for PRAC 2022–2023 (10 minutes) – Jerry Daday

If you would like to provide input on content for next year's PRAC meetings, please complete this short, anonymous, and voluntary survey: <https://go.iu.edu/4q4B>

7. 2022 Assessment Institute (5 minutes) – Caleb Keith

October 9-11 in person. Institute takes the place of the PRAC meeting in October. Members of PRAC get complimentary registration. More on that soon.

8. Announcements (5 minutes) – PRAC members

- The Profiles Retreat – Friday, August 26, 2022