

2012 Committee

May 25, 2011

~ Meeting Summary ~

Members Present: S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, B. Bringle, C. Goodwin, R. Jackson, K. Johnson, B. Porter, S. Queener, I. Ritchie, J. Smith, M. Souza, R. Ward, D. Winikates, E. Wright

1. **Criterion Team chairs** and members reported that most of their data collection is complete and their meetings now are devoted to reviewing their evidence and identifying strengths, concerns, and recommendations for future developments. Team members are conferring to address areas of overlap among Criteria. Several mentioned the deans' 10-year reports as significant sources of information. S. Queener is adding information about graduate programs to each of the Criteria as appropriate. Data from the graduate survey to be administered in the coming academic year may be available in time to include in the final draft of the self study.

D. Winikates and M. Souza reported that colleagues at **IUPUC** are forming their own Criterion Teams, each of which includes the IUPUC representative serving on the corresponding IUPUI Criterion Team. The first town hall meeting at Columbus was well attended and served to inform the campus community of the general requirements for accreditation. Subsequent town hall meetings have attracted representatives from the various IUPUC divisions and have focused on each Criterion serially.

T. Banta reported that a representative of the School of Medicine for Criterion Team 3 will be named shortly. This will be an individual who is fully engaged in developing the new curriculum for MDs and also will be involved in evaluating it when it is in place.

2. Banta expressed some concern about evidence mounting in some schools that a notable number of faculty scheduled to record **evaluations of student achievement of PUL-related knowledge and skills** are not doing so. Comments and questions included the following:
 - a) Do we want to emphasize compliance? (Perhaps thanking those faculty who do comply will be a more positive approach.)
 - b) Is the PUL evaluation project designed principally to demonstrate institutional accountability, or to ensure that students are learning what faculty have deemed essential knowledge and skills? (Perhaps more needs to be said about *both* purposes so that more faculty will understand the importance of the evaluations.)
 - c) What can schools actually *do* with the data? (Faculty are not receiving much feedback after their evaluations are submitted, so school-wide discussions of the data are just beginning in a small number of schools. Gary Pike will be sending a list of suggestions with the school reports for spring 2011.)

Fisher and Banta should meet with associate deans in the fall to discuss points a-c above and develop solutions. C. Goodwin observed that course coordinators (who communicate with associate faculty) and even department secretaries should be briefed about the importance of the PUL evaluations.

3. The **newsletter** issues explaining the Criteria and the importance of the institutional accreditation conferred by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association were declared helpful. Distribution of the newsletter was not widespread, however. 2012 members agreed that the fall issues of the newsletter would be more interesting as pertinent points from drafts of the self study are offered, along with questions to be answered by readers. Circulation to all faculty, staff, and student leaders should occur then. Broader participation in **Town Hall Meetings** also should be encouraged via the newsletter issues. The PUL evaluation concern might be addressed in an issue. Another topic could be an explanation of the faculty role may be asked to play during the visit by reviewers in November 2012—what questions might they expect from reviewers visiting their school?