

**2012 Committee**  
**~ Meeting Summary ~**  
**May 25, 2010**

**Present:** S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, M. Fisher, M. Hansen, R. Jackson, S. Kahn, M. Kubitschek, B. Porter, K. Marrs, D. Sorrells

**Guests:** Steve Graunke and Gary Pike, IMIR; Mona Kheiry, CTL

1. Steve Graunke presented tables summarizing data on the PUL items that are part of the **Continuing Student Survey**. These responses are self reports on perceived effectiveness and thus represent our indirect measure of student competence related to the knowledge and skills embodied in the PULs. (The direct measures are the faculty ratings of student performance on class assignments.) The campus means show no declines in perceived effectiveness between the first two years and the last two years of work here, but most of the differences between these two groups are small. The item showing the biggest difference suggests that IUPUI students perceive the most growth in their effectiveness in writing a final report. The smallest differences occur on items related to quantitative skills. (This may be explained by the fact that most students take their math early in their careers, and then if they don't use it, they lose these skills.)
2. Mary reported that about 35 people attended the **April 28 Town Hall meeting** on our reaccreditation and the PUL evaluation process. At that event Mary gave an overview of the self study requirements promulgated by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. Trudy provided background and description of the PUL student evaluation process, and Sarah gave examples of the process in action. We were a bit disappointed that the number of people in the audience was not greater, but Mary observed that the audience size was typical of the town hall meetings held during the spring semester. Another series is planned for spring 2011, and it was suggested that new faculty receive special invitations to attend the town hall events. In addition, student leaders should be invited to encourage attendance by students.
3. Kathy reported on School of Science **faculty experiences in recording student evaluations**. Thirty SOS faculty volunteered to evaluate their students during the spring semester, so Kathy asked Sarah Ling and Jennifer Beasley from the Center on Teaching and Learning to provide a workshop for these volunteers. The 90-minute workshop was very helpful, though more time would have been helpful. The workshop was appreciated by the participants, and the subsequent experience of recording student evaluations went smoothly.

2012 Committee  
May 25, 2010 Meeting Summary 2

Missy said that in general, Liberal Arts faculty found the evaluation process relatively easy. Nevertheless, a few problems were noted. During the recording process, timing out was a problem, and the Registrar said this was probably a function of too many people using the system simultaneously. More SLA faculty used Oncourse as opposed to OneStart. Some felt the PUL process was redundant since they were giving grades. Some students who had dropped the course were still on the roster. The biggest concern was that faculty had no way to indicate that they had obtained insufficient evidence from a given student to be able to assign a level of competence. In recording a grade, that student would have received an Incomplete, but there is no option in the PUL system for giving an Incomplete.

4. In discussing the concern about **ratings for students who have not turned in a sufficient number of assignments**, Becky observed that UITS would not be able to change the system for at least a year—they put aside too many other important projects to build this system, and now they need to get back to other priorities.

After much discussion, we decided that for the coming year, faculty should be instructed to leave the line blank if they have insufficient evidence for making a judgment about a particular student's level of competence.

5. Mary described "**New Directions in Learning**," an initiative announced by President McRobbie in his State of the University address. Each campus will appoint a committee of senior faculty and administrators to work during the 2010-11 academic year on new directions for learning, such as more on-line instruction, more active learning opportunities, use of electronic portfolios for faculty and students, enhancing general education experiences for students. A university-wide conference to share findings and recommendations will be held in spring 2011. Mary and Trudy are identifying the individuals who will be invited to sit on the IUPUI committee. We will make sure that there is appropriate interaction between the New Directions in Learning Committee and the closely related work that will be taking place simultaneously on the portions of the HLC self study that pertain to student learning.
6. Rick will send us the **Frequently Asked Questions** for which he needs responses. The questions and the answers will go on the FAQ portion of the PUL Web site.
7. Mary and Trudy asked for names of faculty who might co-chair the four **HLC Criterion committees** whose work will begin next fall. Cliff Goodwin, Bob Bringle, and Drew Appleby were suggested. Mary has met with Amy Warner and others in External Affairs and will give them the Purdue and University of Cincinnati self studies, which provide good examples of campus-wide communication about the self study process. We need to inform as many faculty, staff, and students as possible about our reaccreditation and its importance to the campus. Rick mentioned that he is making plans for an email newsletter that will provide brief messages about the process from time to time.