Program Review and Assessment Committee
February 14, 2012, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., UL 1126
Minutes


1. January Meeting Minutes: accepted as circulated. Members noted that the link to K. Alfrey’s presentation did not work; S. Scott will check and recirculate a corrected version as needed.

2. Updates
   • T. Banta distributed sample communications materials to promote awareness of the next series of Town Hall meetings for IUPUI’s self study for reaffirmation of accreditation. Information, including copies of report chapter drafts, will be posted on a special web site (http://www.iupui.edu/2012) to allow community members to add comments and suggestions there as well as at the Town Halls.

3. Alumni Survey Results
   • G. Pike reported on results of the recent alumni survey. Not only was this the first such survey for several years, but it was also conducted online for the first time, and (thanks to good record-keeping of the Alumni Affairs office) it included graduate and professional alumni. IMIR plans to repeat this survey on a three-year cycle, alternating with other major surveys of students, faculty, and staff. Summary reports will be circulated in the next two weeks for campus- and school-level results.
   • S. Graunke described a research brief prepared for a subset of alumni survey questions developed in cooperation with the Center for Service and Learning. The CSL directors were interested in beginning longitudinal outcomes of the impact of CSL’s “civic-minded graduate” learning outcomes. Results from the additional survey questions are not included in the baseline survey reports, though there may be more general interest to the extent that the community-service questions overlap some PULs. Graunke stated that CSL will be conducting further analysis of the results.
   • PRAC members requested that they be sent copies of the survey reports, including the research brief. In response to a question about how to deal with small response numbers at the unit level, Pike noted the value of these data as a point of triangulation with other information available to the schools.

4. Evaluating PUL-related Learning
   • M. Yard directed members to form small groups to discuss their units’ experiences with evaluating the PULs, both positive and negative. Following a lively twenty-minute discussion period, Yard asked for reports or observations from the groups.
• K. Alfrey noted that people see value in having considerable latitude in rating, but concerns persist that so much latitude can lead to consistently positive results with no perceived need to make improvements. G. Pike responded that the evidence speaks to some exercise of judgment, as the scores are not all 3s and 4s. Alfrey offered that as Engineering and Technology is seeing some improvements, some faculty are now wondering if they should set the bar higher.

• K. Wills noted hearing several faculty complaints about the multiple reports being required. She wondered how reports might be streamlined so that one report can serve several purposes.

• S. Kahn added that she would appreciate hearing about examples of how disciplinary and PUL outcomes are being aligned, for purposes of inclusion in Chapter 4 of the self-study report.

5. Subcommittee Discussion and Updates
• Members met in subcommittees for approximately fifteen minutes to catch up on their respective work.

6. New Business
• M. Yard reviewed the agenda planned for the next PRAC meeting, on March 22, including one or more reports from prior PRAC grant recipients as well as one or two representatives of departments that have recently completed program review.

7. Adjournment at 4:30 p.m.

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