Program Review and Assessment Committee
September 15, 2011, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m., UL 1126
Minutes


1. August Meeting Minutes: approved as circulated

2. Updates
   • T. Banta provided updates on progress with reaffirmation of accreditation preparations.
     o The writing team has begun work to coordinate overlapping information in the criterion team reports and hopes to have draft chapters back to the teams in October for review.
     o A revised draft will be made available to the campus community on the web in preparation for discussion at town hall meetings in early spring.
   • T. Banta also reviewed work of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).
     o Formed in 2008 to assist institutions with adoption of good practices in assessment of college student learning outcomes, the organization has received operating funds from several major foundations. Its web site has become a valuable resource for those interested in learning more about learning assessment.
     o NILOA has conducted two major surveys of academic leaders and commissioned several useful occasional papers about good assessment practice. A new graphic representation known as the transparency framework seeks to help institutions make assessment information simpler to locate on their web sites. G. Pike described how IUPUI adapted the transparency graphic on the Planning and Institutional Improvement web site to help visitors find relevant institutional data and reports.
     o T. Banta encouraged PRAC members to explore the numerous NILOA resources now available at http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org.
   • K. Alfrey reminded PRAC members that the IUPUI Assessment Institute provides one free registration per school; others are eligible for a special IUPUI discounted registration fee. Registration is still open, and the IUPUI discount continues to apply beyond the early registration date.

3. Assessing and Improving Information Literacy at IUPUI
   • K. Alfrey reminded members of the discussion in August regarding apparent student weaknesses with respect to information literacy as compared to their overall performance on other PULs. An active discussion followed about whether PRAC members have observed this and how it might be addressed.
• K. Wendeln noted that information literacy may not always receive major or moderate emphasis in particular courses and therefore may not be assessed to the same extent as other PULs. B. Gushrowski added that the School of Dentistry teaches information literacy purposefully throughout its curriculum.

• B. Orme reported that a small Community of Practice has been addressing information literacy using a model similar to writing across the curriculum and will present a workshop in October through the Center for Teaching and Learning. He added that university librarians have developed a rubric for information literacy mapped to standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

• H. Mzumara noted that the Testing Center can help faculty identify testing resources available for assessing information literacy.

4. Strategies for Assessing and Improving SLOs

• T. Banta noted that assigning PULs to courses and evaluating student learning of those are two major achievements. Are we now ready to discuss other steps that could be taken using the available information about student achievement?

• K. Alfrey then asked committee members to gather in small groups to discuss the following topics:
  o Should program faculty work on standardized definitions of competences, perhaps developing and using rubrics?
  o Should PUL assessments be used to provide targeted feedback to individual students about their skill strengths and weaknesses?
  o Can faculty begin talking with each other about assessment findings in their own courses/programs?

5. PRAC Subcommittees for 2011-12

• K. Alfrey reported that since faculty governance has taken over responsibilities for course evaluation, that subcommittee will be discontinued. In addition, the ePortfolio Subcommittee will no longer be convened to allow a broader base for advice to that initiative.

• New this year will be a PRAC Report Review Subcommittee, which expects to begin work in November so that PRAC members can receive feedback before spring break to be useful in preparing next year’s report. M. Yard added that the subcommittee will need all reports by the end of October.

• Vice-Chair M. Yard will serve as clearinghouse for subcommittee interest. Members should notify him of their interests before the next PRAC meeting. Those interested in serving on or chairing the PRAC Assessment Grant Review Subcommittee should step forward by the end of September as the deadline for new proposals is Friday, October 21.

6. Adjournment at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes recorded by S. Scott and respectfully submitted by M. Yard, Vice Chair