

## Ensuring Student Learning of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning

### Background

The Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) have an almost-20-year history at IUPUI. In 1990 faculty were challenged to develop a campus-wide approach to general education. Throughout the 1990s, over 400 faculty, staff, and students discussed and debated what this would look like. **The outcome of this effort, a document articulating the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs)**, was approved by the Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC) in 1998, then revised and reaffirmed in 2007. The approach to general education **embodying the PULs** was **new and** based on the fundamental premise that no longer would students simply take a prescribed set of courses to fill general education requirements. **Instead** one or more PULs **are** emphasized in **every** undergraduate course so that students have multiple opportunities to practice the knowledge and skills identified in the PULs as they advance through their chosen curriculum at IUPUI. When, in 2007, all IU campuses were asked to describe their general education programs, members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee at IUPUI **presented** a matrix demonstrating how one or more of the PULs was being taught in each of 80 introductory courses identified by the Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee.

The version of the PULs approved in 2007 **included the provision that** the IFC **would assume** the responsibility for overseeing implementation of the PULs. In 2008, the IFC Executive Committee delegated some of this responsibility to the Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee (UCAC) **established in 2008**.

### A Matter of Some Urgency

When IUPUI was visited by reaccreditation teams from the North Central Association (NCA) in 1992 and 2002, **IUPUI faculty** indicated that we were working on a new approach to general education (1992) and developing strategies to demonstrate that students were encountering and learning the knowledge and skills **articulated in** the PULs (2002). When the next reaccreditation visit occurs in 2012, **faculty leaders must** be able to **show concrete evidence that the PULs are being taught and that students are developing and mastering the knowledge and skills the PULs embody**.

Accordingly, Chancellor Bantz and EVC Sukhatme have appointed the “2012 Committee” to develop plans for ensuring student learning of the **knowledge and skills articulated in the** PULs. The Committee is co-led by Associate VC Mary Fisher and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor Trudy Banta. Members include representatives of the IFC Executive Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee, the UCAC, the Center for Teaching and Learning, Enrollment Services, the Graduate Office (where a statement of learning principles for graduate and professional students similar to the PULs is being developed), the Program Review and Assessment Committee, Planning and Institutional Improvement, and University College. A list of members appears on page 4 of this document.

## A Plan for Ensuring Learning

2012 Committee members have insisted that the plan for implementing the PULs and ensuring student learning be as simple as possible so that faculty will not be burdened by a time-consuming process. The process we propose incorporates both *direct* measures of what students know and can do (e.g., classroom assignments, exams, projects) and *indirect* measures (e.g., questionnaires, focus groups) that provide students' perceptions of their experiences with the PULs. The *combination* of direct and indirect measures will both demonstrate students' levels of learning and provide evidence that can assist faculty in making warranted improvements in instruction, curriculum design, and student services such as advising. Assistance in approaching the tasks described below will be available from the Center on Teaching and Learning and other sources; please contact Trudy Banta or Mary Fisher.

### A. *Direct Evidence of Learning*

The PULs are intended to permeate the undergraduate curriculum. That is, general education at IUPUI does not end with introductory courses, but extends from freshman year to graduation. All students should have multiple opportunities to learn and practice the knowledge and skills embodied in each PUL and should attain increasing levels of competence as they progress toward graduation. To ensure that this happens, every undergraduate course, beginning at the introductory level, should engage students with one or more of the PULs. **The 1, 2, or 3 PULs emphasized in a given course will be identified by the academic unit responsible for it** and those PULs will be listed with that course in **a special course listing as of Fall 2009**. This information will assist (1) faculty responsible for courses in a major to ensure that students have multiple opportunities to practice the knowledge and skills identified in the PULs in courses across the curriculum, (2) students to identify courses that will enable them to strengthen the skills they need, and (3) faculty in other disciplines to see which PULs are emphasized in each course so that they can recommend appropriate courses to their own majors for completion of general education requirements.

A curriculum map showing the degree of focus (3, 2, or 1) given to each PUL emphasized in each course (see Figure A) can assist faculty responsible for a given program in spotting gaps and ultimately in ascertaining that each PUL is represented several times and at various levels in a student's program. Using the methods described below, **faculty in each academic program, or student major, will develop a multi-year plan for assessing student learning of each of the six PULs every year**, preferably in multiple courses at multiple levels (100, 400, etc.). Over a period of three years, assessment of learning as described below will take place at least once in every course offered by the program faculty.

When a course, or course section, is scheduled for assessment, **the instructor** (with assistance from lab or recitation section supervisors where appropriate) **will determine the effectiveness of each student** in demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with only the major 1 or 2 PULs (those rated 3 or 2 in terms of focus) emphasized in her/his course. The evidence of effectiveness may come from part of a single assignment or from multiple assignments, including tests and projects. **Members of the 2012 Committee** are working **with UITS personnel**

on a solution that will enable faculty to enter a rating in Oncourse (but not included in calculating the course grade) for each student on each PUL emphasized in that course (see Figure B). The levels of effectiveness ratings to be entered for each student include:

- 3 = Very Effective
- 2 = Effective
- 1 = Somewhat Effective
- 0 = Not Effective

Ideally, faculty responsible for a given course, and even similar courses in a discipline, will develop their own definitions for the ratings of Very Effective, Effective, etc.

The data for these ratings of student effectiveness can be aggregated across freshman courses, across sophomore courses, across junior courses, and across senior courses to provide evidence of students' strengths and of weaknesses that should be addressed. **Data aggregated across courses at the senior level can be reported publicly** to demonstrate our accountability for student learning of **the knowledge and skills articulated in the PULs.**

#### ***B. Indirect Evidence of Learning***

We are currently developing a questionnaire (see Figure C) that will give **students** an opportunity **to rate the effectiveness of a given course** in helping them develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with the PULs emphasized in that course. Levels of effectiveness include:

- 3 = Very Effective
- 2 = Effective
- 1 = Somewhat Effective
- 0 = Not Effective

Student responses to this questionnaire may be aggregated across students in a course to provide evidence of class strengths and weaknesses related to the PULs. **This evidence can be used by faculty teaching the course to suggest improvements in instruction.** Groups of faculty will be interested in studying the data from sections of the same course, from courses across the major, and from courses across the campus.

Use of this student questionnaire is strongly recommended, but is not required at this time. Faculty may elect to use it to collect student perceptions of the effectiveness of a course in furthering student learning of the PULs emphasized in the course. While these data are most valuable when shared among faculty teaching different sections of the same course or different courses in a major field, initially the data may be viewed only by the instructor and used only to provide direction for improving the instructor's course. Faculty may elect to use the entire questionnaire or just the questions that relate to the PULs emphasized in the course.

Access to information derived from both direct and indirect measures will enable faculty to improve instruction, curricula, and student services. The data also provide evidence of our accountability for student learning that we expect to be convincing to NCA visitors in 2012.

## Summary

**Program directors** and **program faculty** are asked to do the following:

1. Identify one, two, or three PULs to emphasize in each course offered by program faculty. For each PUL, indicate whether it has a Major emphasis (3), a Moderate emphasis (2), or **Minor** emphasis (1). *Complete by April 30, 2009.*
2. Create a PUL X Course map showing the PUL emphasis in each course using the 3, 2, or 1 designation given above. (See Figure A.) *Complete by May 15, 2009.*
3. Grade assignments and exams related to each of the PULs emphasized in the course and assign a rating to each student for PULs emphasized at the major (3) and moderate (2) levels. (See Figure B.) *Complete by the end of the Fall 2009 semester.*
4. If desired, ask students to respond to survey items related to the PULs emphasized in the course. (See Figure C.) *Complete by the end of classes, Fall 2009 semester.*

## 2012 Committee Members

Sarah Baker – IFC Executive Committee

Trudy Banta – Co-Chair

Karen Black – Program Review

Scott Evenbeck – University College

Mary Fisher – Co-Chair

Michele Hansen – University College

Susan Kahn – Institutional Effectiveness

Kathy Marrs – SOS and Academic Affairs

Rebecca Porter – Enrollment Services

Sherry Queener – Graduate Office

Ingrid Ritchie – SPEA and UCAC

Josh Smith – Program Review and Assessment Committee

Pratibha Varma-Nelson – Center for Teaching and Learning

## Curriculum Map: PUL X Course Matrix for an Academic Program

**To Program Faculty:** For each course you offer in your program for student majors, please indicate the 1, 2, or 3 PULs emphasized in the course using the definitions provided below. Please note that these levels of emphasis should be assigned to each **course**, not differentially to sections of the same course. The assignment of PUL levels of emphasis are intended to be static descriptors, noted in the IUPUI course inventory, and considered stable across sections and across years.

- 3** to indicate a **major** emphasis: This PUL is prominent in at least one course objective; it is a focus of the course. Student learning of this PUL is assessed via at least one major assignment.
- 2** a **moderate** emphasis: The PUL is **explicitly** emphasized in the course. It is prominent in at least one course assignment and is assessed via that assignment.
- 1** **minor** emphasis: This PUL is identified in one or more assignments and is **implicitly** emphasized in the course.

To complete your course matrix, add the level(s) of PUL emphasis for each course, as shown in the example below:

Course	PUL(s) and Level of Emphasis							
	1A	1B	1C	2	3	4	5	6
101	3						2	
120		1		2		3		
203			2		3			
235	1			3			2	
305		1				2		3
316		3	2		1			1
407	3							2
465			3		2		1	

PULs are abbreviated as follows in the matrix above:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Core Communication and Quantitative Skills*               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking)</li> <li>B. Quantitative skills</li> <li>C. Information resources skills</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Critical Thinking</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Integration and Application of Knowledge</li> <li>4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness</li> <li>5. Understanding Society and Culture</li> <li>6. Values and Ethics</li> </ol> |
|---|---|

\* For PUL #1 there is no overall rating of emphasis. Please do indicate levels of emphasis for PULs 1A, 1B, and/or 1C.

**Course Rating Form**

**To Program Faculty:** *Using Oncourse, assign an overall rating to each student for the **one or two PULs emphasized most** in your course using the following scale:*

- 3 (VE)** = *Very Effective*
- 2 (E)** = *Effective*
- 1 (SE)** = *Somewhat Effective*
- 0 (NE)** = *Not Effective*

*In assigning this rating, you may use evidence from a single assignment or from multiple sources over the entire course (e.g., test items, oral presentations, projects). See example below:*

Student	Writing	Values and Ethics
1	0	1
2	1	2
3	1	3
4	2	2
5	2	1

An easy way for faculty to record these ratings in Oncourse is being devised.

**Ideally, faculty responsible for a given course, and even similar courses in a discipline, will develop their own definitions for the ratings of Very Effective, Effective, etc.**

**Figure C**

**To Program Faculty:** Please administer *just those items* in the list below that pertain to the **one** or **two** PULs you *emphasize most* in this course.

**To Students:** On the basis of your experience in this course, please indicate the effectiveness of the course in helping you develop each of the skills, abilities, and areas of knowledge listed below.

<b>PUL/Survey Question</b>	<b>Very Effective (3)</b>	<b>Effective (2)</b>	<b>Somewhat Effective (1)</b>	<b>Not Effective (0)</b>
<b><i>1A - Language Skills</i></b>				
Reading and understanding books, articles, and instruction manuals				
Delivering a prepared presentation to a group				
Writing a final report on a project or other work assignment				
Contributing to a team to solve problems				
<b><i>1B - Quantitative Skills</i></b>				
Solving mathematical problems				
Using mathematics in everyday life				
Understanding a statistical report				
Preparing a report using quantitative data				
<b><i>1C - Information Resource Skills</i></b>				
Identifying the sources of information that are most appropriate for a project				
Using computer software for work (word processing, spreadsheet, graphics, etc.)				
Evaluating the quality and accuracy of information found on a web site				
Recognizing which ideas or material need to be fully acknowledged to avoid plagiarizing				
<b><i>2 - Critical Thinking</i></b>				
Analyzing other people's ideas and proposed solutions				
Systematically reviewing your own ideas about how to approach an issue				
Creatively thinking about new ideas or ways to improve things				
Discussing complex problems with co-workers to develop a better solution				
<b><i>3 - Integration and Application of Knowledge</i></b>				
Applying what you learned in college to issues and problems you face every day				
Gather information from a variety of sources when deciding what action to take				
Finding new ways to use what you have learned as you encounter new situations/problems				
Putting ideas together in new ways				

<b>PUL/Survey Question</b>	<b>Very Effective (3)</b>	<b>Effective (2)</b>	<b>Somewhat Effective (1)</b>	<b>Not Effective (0)</b>
<b><i>4 - Intellectual Depth, Breadth and Adaptiveness</i></b>				
Learning new approaches to work or to advanced studies				
Having an in-depth understanding of your major field of study				
Having a general understanding of subjects other than the one in which you majored				
Being able to modify how you approach a problem based on the requirements of the situation				
<b><i>5 - Understanding Society and Culture</i></b>				
Dealing with conflict among co-workers and friends				
Seeing the relationships between local, national, and global issues and problems				
Working effectively with people of different races, ethnicities, and religions				
Communicating effectively with people who see things differently than I do				
<b><i>6 - Values and Ethics</i></b>				
Exercising my responsibilities as a citizen (voting, staying current with community and political issues, etc.)				
Making informed judgments when faced with ethical dilemmas				
Recognizing the consequences of my actions when facing a conflict				
Understanding and appreciating the arts				

The next meeting of the 2012 Committee will take place in AO103 at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, March 30. In preparation for that meeting, please review the instructions for deans sent in a separate message and the latest version of our principal document. Now that I have received comments from several associate deans, I have made further changes in that document, and they are noted in red.

At our meeting on Monday, we have several very important issues to discuss. I will outline those below. First I have withdrawn my feeble attempt to define the levels of achievement (Very Effective, Effective...) outlined in the section on the direct measure of student learning. Nevertheless, since we have said that our next steps need to be to encourage faculty to develop curriculum maps and to designate some courses for assessment next year, we do need to define these terms using some examples. I am collecting rubrics that we can examine at our meeting on Monday.

The instructions for designating PULs we sent to the deans had an extremely top-down flavor☺. Is there any way that we might help faculty to see something of value in this process for them? What resources could we provide or suggest?

The curriculum map in Figure A was likened by one of our reviewers to “course of study maps recently requested by the Dean of Faculties.” Mary, could you fill us in on this? Are we duplicating effort? Could we integrate the two initiatives somehow?

There seems to be some dissatisfaction with the items for students listed in Figure C. How could we engage more faculty in developing those items? For instance, might we ask PRAC members to become involved? Then the question has been raised, “Can faculty select from the items listed, or could they add some of their own, or should they simply use all the items shown here for the given PUL they are emphasizing? Another reviewer has said that the questions look like typical course evaluation items designed to elicit student satisfaction with faculty. How do we make these items look different from typical course evaluations?

Here are some miscellaneous questions that have been raised:

- Should ALL SECTIONS of a course be evaluated over three years?
- Will we assess remedial courses?
- If undergraduate and graduate students are taking the same course, will only the undergraduates be evaluated, or complete the questionnaire, or will both undergraduates and graduates be evaluated?

*Trudy W. Banta*  
*Professor of Higher Education*  
*Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for*  
*Academic Planning and Evaluation*  
*Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis*  
*355 North Lansing Street - AO140*  
*Indianapolis IN 46202-2896*  
*317-274-4111*  
*Fax: 317-274-4651*  
*Email: [tbanta@iupui.edu](mailto:tbanta@iupui.edu)*  
*Web Site: [www.planning.iupui.edu](http://www.planning.iupui.edu)*

Josh, in going over my notes from the meeting of the 2012 Committee yesterday, it seems that we need assistance from PRAC members with at least the following:

1. Publicizing the need for assessment in ways that attract rather than repel faculty
2. Identifying individuals who are doing good work with PUL assessment and asking those individuals to provide help to others in some way—what ways would be best?
3. Development of rubrics that faculty and students might use to assess learning of the knowledge and skills embodied in the PULs.

Would you agree with this listing? Did you take away other ideas about involving PRAC members in the 2012 process?

*Trudy W. Banta*  
*Professor of Higher Education*  
*Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for*  
*Academic Planning and Evaluation*  
*Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis*  
*355 North Lansing Street - AO140*  
*Indianapolis IN 46202-2896*  
*317-274-4111*  
*Fax: 317-274-4651*  
*Email: [tbanta@iupui.edu](mailto:tbanta@iupui.edu)*  
*Web Site: [www.planning.iupui.edu](http://www.planning.iupui.edu)*

From: Banta, Trudy W.  
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2009 12:17 PM  
To: Wendeln, Ken  
Subject: RE: Next meeting Tuesday March 31, 10-noon, BS 3023

Thanks for sending your comments, Ken. Now I know that the "33 items" you were talking about refer to the suggested items for use by students in evaluating their course. Of course any given faculty member would only be using one or two sets of the 33 items (probably 10 items at most) depending on the one or two PULs emphasized in their course.

I am so sorry that the approach suggested here appears to be more complex than following the original PULs. Members of the 2012 Committee, several of whom chair Faculty Council academic affairs committees, thought we were simplifying the listing rather than making it more complex. In addition, by using a few words as shorthand, we thought more of the professional schools would be able to link them to their own principles.

I really am sorry that we have failed to meet your expectations here, Ken. I always appreciate your thoughtful responses.

I also regret deeply the fact that this is seen now as a top-down initiative. Sadly, we just haven't gotten very far by hoping that individual faculties would emphasize and assess the PULs on their own. I am very glad that KSB has done this, and hope it will make the exercise we must do now a little easier.

Trudy W. Banta  
Professor of Higher Education  
Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for  
Academic Planning and Evaluation  
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis  
355 North Lansing Street - AO 140  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-2896  
Phone: 317-274-4111  
Fax: 317-274-4651  
Email: [tbanta@iupui.edu](mailto:tbanta@iupui.edu)  
Website: [www.planning.iupui.edu](http://www.planning.iupui.edu)  
From: Wendeln, Ken  
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2009 4:16 PM  
To: Banta, Trudy W.  
Subject: Fwd: Next meeting Tuesday March 31, 10-noon, BS 3023

Trudy -

See below for my response to the March 16, 2009 draft of the 'Ensuring Student Learning of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning' which included a 'revised' interpretation of the PULs with a list of 8 items (with the subheads) and a rating form of 33 PUL/Survey Questions asking how each activity was performed. While these refer to the PULs, nowhere are the actual PULs stated or a reference given to look them up.

This is the link to what I believe is the latest list PULs as revised: <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/PULs.pdf>

Ken Wendeln

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ken Wendeln <kwendeln@iupui.edu>  
Date: March 31, 2009 9:13:08 AM GMT-04:00  
To: "Hassell, John M." <jhassell@iupui.edu>  
Cc: "Carow, Kenneth A." <kcarow@iupui.edu>, "Lambert, Jane L" <jlambert@iupui.edu>  
Subject: Re: Next meeting Tuesday March 31, 10-noon, BS 3023

John -

I participated in Ken Carow's UG Policy Committee meeting last week and shared many of my concerns regarding the proposed "Ensuring Student Learning" proposal, particularly as it applies to Kelley Indy.

The urgency of the proposal is based on the upcoming IUPUI accreditation which is based on "Principle Based Learning" methods and assessment. At IUPUI that has generally meant the PULs or Principles of Undergraduate Learning. Many of the IUPUI professional oriented schools have their own 'principles' which tend to be in the language of the profession but can typically be mapped back to the PULs which are quite general.

Kelley, for its last AACSB accreditation adopted the PBLs Principles of Business Learning both here and in Bloomington and Ken Carow has done a very admirable job of getting key courses to adopt, use and assess to these PBLs - with the next step to expand the PBLs to all of KSBI's undergraduate courses and assuring (through a project project proposed by the KSBI Assessment Committee) that all syllabi would properly reflect the PBLs and provide "benchmark" and "best practices" information to instructors in using the PBLs. The PBLs are first introduced to students in their intro courses (eg x100) as well as at their KSBI orientation and is now included in most of the core course syllabi. The prior analysis of the PULs/PBLs was used to highlight gaps and was the catalyst for expanding/upgrading the KSBI UG Capstone curriculum with the addition of 3 courses, including J411. We also have several indirect measures of PBL/PUL usage through the

While the PULs have been around for some time, their generality (not specific to a discipline) and complexity (written by a committee) have made them difficult to easily communicate to both faculty and students (the words as presented are neither simple or memorable). The attached proposal expands the effective number of PULs to EIGHT (from 5) and has over 33 subactivities based on the proposed survey. While the attached document talks about simplifying - it actually drastically complicates the PULs by expanding them and then involving a variety of organizations (IFC, Executive Committee, UCAC, etc) in attempting to implement these at a course level and in an absolutely uniform way across all UG courses.

May I suggest a simpler way.

1. For schools that already have their own principle based curriculum and professional principles - to map these back to the PULs (the original and approved FIVE, not Eight), but be allowed to use their own professional principles (such as the PBLs) for doing both the direct and indirect assessment of their courses. KSBI is already well along on the PBL path and needs only expand to all KSBI UG courses and add methodology for assuring and collecting the assessment data and is already moving forward based on the AACSB assurance of learning requirements. These schools should be allowed to demonstrate assurance of learning using their current (or more robust if required) methods as long as they can map to the PULs and demonstrate direct and indirect learning assurance to the level needed. KSBI would fall into this category.
2. For schools that are dependent on the PULs as their principles - they would be required to

follow a procedure, but much simplified, to the one that is attached. However, before implementing such a procedure on a broad basis, committee members would be required to utilize and refine these procedures in their curriculum/courses to assure that the final procedures do in fact provide the intended results with minimal faculty effort. These could then be rolled out to those schools that opt for the PULs (or are unable to demonstrate their own principle based curriculum and assessment methods in a timely manner).

3. The PULs should be simplified (not made more complex) so that they can be easily understood and communicated. The original Five with fewer subactivities work ok and can be reasonably mapped with the PBLs.

4. Since time is of the essence, I'd suggest that schools that opt for option 1 (their own professional principles) need to demonstrate (and gain approval for) the mapping to PULs and assessment plan by the end of this semester for a phased in implementation beginning in the fall. A modified and simplified PUL procedure should be tested during the spring, summer, and fall semesters in selected classes and rolled out to all schools/courses no later than the spring 2010.

5. The IFC Executive PUL Committee would be responsible for not only coordination of the above, but also for assuring that the needed resources (Oncourse, surveys, mapping, accreditation summary reports) etc are available on a timely basis - and provided feedback that allows a "continuous improvement" of the Principles Curriculum within as well as across schools.

John, I have been using PBLs in my classes for 5 years, have mapped the PULs to the PBLs, and have developed the assurance of learning methodology for the J411 capstone course. But it takes understanding, buy-in and commitment from the instructors to be effective. An administrative mandate may get some degree of passive and minimal compliance - but has not and will not bring the true benefits of a principle based curriculum until there is school and instructor involvement and buy-in. I could see the eyes rolling at the KSBI UG Policy Committee meeting last week when this was first introduced and discussed.

Regards,

Ken Wendeln

On Mar 26, 2009, at 10:10 AM, Hassell, John M. wrote:

All: see the attachment which is coming down the pike. I am on the AAC and we will be discussing this document next Tuesday. Please let me know any comments that you would like me to pass on. The campus will be going through this process, and we be expected to participate.

John

From: Marrs, Kathleen A

Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2009 12:01 AM

To: Marrs, Kathleen A

Cc: Zike, Sarah Tansy; Cho, Sopanis D; Hassell, John M.; Horton-Deutsch, Sara L; Janke, Karen L.; Kitchens, Bruce; Nickolson, Richard Emery; Bennett, Teresa Ann; Brothers, Linda R.; Molinder-Hogue, Teresa; Orme, William A; Workman, Jamie K; Evenbeck, Scott E

Subject: AAC: Next meeting Tuesday March 31, 10-noon, BS 3023

Hello AAC:

Hope you all are well. Just a reminder that we have a meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 31, 10-noon, BS 3023. Thanks John for reserving the room. We can try to keep time short, since we don't have a lot of pressing issues but we DO have a few items to discuss.

Agenda:

1. Brief Honors College Dean update
2. Fall Break - up for a vote at faculty council (I know you are thinking ...are we STILL talking about this!?) Should be up for a vote in April IFC meeting, although I know there are a few bumps in the road that will happen ... this is for us to discuss.
3. 2012 "Ensuring Student Learning" proposal... draft attached - please print out and read over before the meeting. This is in preparation for our campus 2012 accreditation visit.. Feedback requested!
4. UCAC - the Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee
5. Composition of AAC for next year.

Richard is on sabbatical (hope you are having a good time if you are reading this Richard). Tere - I know you will not be attending!  
Hope to see everyone else next week!  
Kathy

On Mar 3, 2009, at 12:07 AM, Kathleen Marrs wrote:

Hello AAC:

Three reminders / Updates!

1. Faculty Council tomorrow - Tuesday March 3, 2009, 3-5 pm in new location: IT 152. AAC, along with USG, will be presenting the Fall Break Resolution for discussion - with the aim of going up for a vote in April! Please see attached for the latest version; USG wrote up the preamble as we (AAC) discussed in our last meeting ~ this was truly a collaborative effort.

2. Honors College Dean Candidate Jane Luzar - Please try to make these events - and especially the Thursday 5:15 meeting! (See itinerary and CV below)  
=>Thurs. 3/5, 1:30-2:30 un UC 115 - Seminar for students and faculty  
=>Thurs. 3/5, 5:15-6:30 pm, UC3171 Reserved for faculty governance representatives (that means AAC!) to meet with Jane Luzar\*  
=> Fri 3/6, 9:30-11, LE 105 - Another seminar for faculty and staff  
\*Please remember that we specifically asked for time to meet with the Dean candidates, and Marianne very graciously added us to the itinerary - so please attend if at all possible! I'm available a little before the meeting ~5:00 - if anyone wants to come a bit early to UC 3171 and discuss ~! See you there!

3. Next AAC meeting - Tuesday March 31, 10 am-12 noon, BS 3023. Please let me know if you have a conflict!

\*\*\*\*\*

Questions for the Dean candidates:

(Note Dr. Luzar developed an honors program at Louisiana State, and is currently at the Univ of Fl Gainsville, where she was an associate dean of academic programs through 2006 = See CV below)

1. Tell us about your experience in working with honors students

2. Tell us about your experience in working with urban universities

3. Tell us about your experience in planning and constructing a budget

= What experience to you have in working in an RCM environment?

4. Tell us about your experience in coordinating curricular development for a school

= How do you propose to structure the Honors College when the schools retain the courses, hours, and tuition revenues?

5. Tell us about your experience in recruiting faculty to teach honors courses and serve on honors committees

= How are you going to identify, recruit, and provide incentives to recruit faculty to teach honors courses and serve on honors committees?

6. Tell us about your experience in fund-raising and alumni relations

7. If selected as the Dean of the Honors College at IUPUI, what are the 3 top challenges do you see as a dean?

= What are the top 3 opportunities?

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Hello Marianne ,

Thank you for your e-mail. I have looked over the CVs and tentative agendas of the Dean candidates, and we discussed them at yesterday's AAC (academic affairs) committee meeting.

We noticed that at present there is plenty of space available in each of the candidate agendas - am I right in thinking that these slots will be filled in as the dates get closer? I imagine that there will be a time for the candidates to meet with Deans and chairs of Science and Liberal Arts, for instance, not as a potential member of a 'home' department but as a way to discuss how the honors faculty will be identified and selected, and how the honors curriculum might be structured.

AAC is very interested in meeting as a group with each of the Dean candidates. At our meeting, we wondered if we could ask you to schedule a time for the candidates to meet with the committee chairs and perhaps 1-2 other committee members from:  
= AAC (since the honors curriculum will be further developed and formalized with the new dean),  
= Budgetary affairs (since the honors college involves allocation of IUPUI financial resources that have bearing on academic programs)  
= Faculty Affairs (since honors faculty will need to be identified and recruited by the new dean)

I don't know if the chairs of the other committees would agree, but AAC felt very strongly that we could like some time to sit and talk with the candidates, not at a

dinner, but in a more structured meeting. Andre de Tienne is chair of FAC (adetienn@iupui.edu), and Ben Boukai (bboukai@iupui.edu) and John Hassell are co-chairs of Budgetary affairs (John is also a member of AAC). One meeting would suffice, if there was some way to get us all together at once. Otherwise, a meeting with each committee could be arranged, if you felt that was appropriate.

Ted's interview came up too quickly for us to coordinate this, but we were thinking that we might ask for the same meeting after his interview - hopefully before the time the March 5th candidate comes in.

Thanks Marianne!

Kathy Marris

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Wokeck, Marianne S." <mwokeck@iupui.edu>  
Date: March 2, 2009 6:01:06 PM EST  
To: "Atkinson, Simon J." <satkinso@iupui.edu>, "Watt, Jeffery X." <jwatt@iupui.edu>, "Marris, Kathleen A" <kmarris@iupui.edu>, "De Tienne, Andre" <adetienn@iupui.edu>, "Hassell, John M." <jhassell@iupui.edu>, "Windsor, L. Jack" <lwindso@iupui.edu>  
Subject: campus visit of candidate for deanship of Honors College

Dear Colleagues,

Dr. Jane Luzar is visiting the campus and Thursday, 5 March 2009, 5:15-6:30 pm, UC3171, has been reserved for faculty governance representatives to meet with the candidate for dean of the Honors College. Please spread the word and also be reminded that, if you, or your colleagues cannot make the presentations and the designated meeting time, there is room for conversation over meals (the itinerary is attached). For colleagues who want to be added to designated meal times, please let me know (so that existing reservations can be adjusted).

Thank you for your help and input, Marianne

Marianne S. Wokeck  
Professor of History  
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs  
IU School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI  
425 University Blvd.  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46202-5140  
Phone: (317) 274.5820  
Fax: (317) 278.2525  
E-Mail: mwokeck@iupui.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, contains information from Indiana University, which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by "reply to sender only" message and destroy all electronic and hard copies of the communication,

including attachments.

? Please consider the environment before printing this email.

What is the charge of our committee? "This committee shall make recommendations to the Council on matters relating to general, not school specific, educational curriculum matters, establishing and revising academic calendars, degree formats, graduation requirements, the academic structure of IUPUI, and other related matters (Bylaw III.B.1)."

Assistant Director of UCASE  
IUPUI Department of Biology  
723 W. Michigan St  
Indianapolis IN 46202  
Fax: (317) 274-2846  
Biology: <http://www.biology.iupui.edu/faculty/cv/>  
UCASE: <http://www.iupui.edu/ucase>  
GK-12: <http://www.biology.iupui.edu/gk-12/>

<Ensuring Student Learning of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning---3-16-09.doc><ATT00001.htm>