

2012 Committee

~ Meeting Summary and Subsequent Activities ~

September 7, 2010

At our September meeting we discussed the **Higher Learning Commission's Minimum Expectations document** (attached) and focused on the need to have stated learning outcomes for all our "programs, majors, and degrees." We agreed that the deans should have detailed instructions for distribution to chairs and program directors who must work with colleagues to develop the student learning outcomes **and** means for assessing the outcomes. We asked Michele Hansen and Josh Smith to work with the members of the Program Review and Assessment Committee Advanced Practice Subcommittee to develop a draft of these instructions in time to present them at the next meeting of Uday's deans group. Michele and Josh have agreed to provide a draft of the instructions by the end of September.

Mary Fisher attended Uday's September meeting with the deans to emphasize the need for them to make certain that their schools are in compliance with other components of the Minimum Expectations, such as faculty qualifications and evaluation requirements. Mary also asked the deans when they wanted to set the deadline for preparing Summary Planning Reports (see attachment) based on their annual reports submitted during the period 2001-2010 to (www.planning.iupui.edu/apbr/).

Mary and Trudy Banta have appointed **Chairs and Co-chairs of all the Criterion Teams** (see list below) that will outline sections of the self-study over the course of this academic year. Orientation for the co-chairs will take place on September 29 and we anticipate that the first meeting of each team will take place in October.

Criterion 1: Mission and Integrity – Karen Black

Criterion 2: Preparing for the Future – Dan Baldwin

Criterion 3: Student Learning and Effective Teaching – Kathy Johnson and Pratibha Varma-Nelson

Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge – Dominique Galli and Cliff Goodwin

Criterion 5: Engagement and Service – Bob Bringle and Karen Yoder

Data Resource Team – Gary Pike

At our September meeting Mary outlined for us the events we anticipate as we **launch the 2012 reaccreditation efforts** campus wide. These include:

1. September 29 – orientation for Criterion Team Co-chairs, including a demonstration by Amol Patki of the SharePoint site he has established for use by the teams
2. October – first meetings of Criterion Teams

3. November – kickoff event
4. Spring 2011 – town hall meetings (one for each of Criteria 2-4)
5. May 2011 – Criterion Team reports due

In June 2010 Gary Pike prepared the first **report for each school** on (1) faculty evaluations of student learning of PUL-related knowledge and skills given major and moderate emphasis in 400-level courses offered by that school and (2) student perceptions of their PUL-related abilities. 2012 Committee members provided suggestions for clarifying the meaning of these reports, the original versions of which are attached.

Most faculty concerns about using the SIS application to record their evaluations of student learning related to the PULs have been addressed by Registrar and UITs staff. Becky Porter checked on the possibility of recording PUL evaluations for ungraded lab sections, and reported that since there is no mechanism for recording grades for these sections, no mechanism for recording PUL evaluations is available either.

Next meeting: Wednesday, October 27 from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. in AO 103.

PUL Indirect Assessment Survey Methods

The IUPUI Student Satisfaction and Priorities Survey was originally commissioned in 1993 by the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement in order to collect representative data about undergraduate students' satisfaction with their experiences at IUPUI. Since its inception, the survey has grown to incorporate items addressing the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs). The survey was generated and administered by the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR) in collaboration with academic and administrative leaders across IUPUI.

In spring 2010, a stratified random sample of 6,140 undergraduate students who were enrolled in classes at the Indianapolis campus of IUPUI during both the fall 2009 and spring 2010 semesters was selected. Of those, 6,103 received an e-mail which included both an invitation to participate in the Student Satisfaction and Priorities Survey and an individual link to the survey itself. Reminder e-mails were sent to non-respondents two, four, and six weeks following the initial e-mail. A total of 1,365 students responded to the survey, for a response rate of 22%. Because many schools did not have a sufficient number of first-year or sophomore participants, only baccalaureate-seeking students of junior or senior standing were included in this analysis.

The following is a brief report derived from the Knowledge and Skills section of the Student Satisfaction and Priorities Survey. This section contains 33 items, each of which is presented as a skill. Students are asked to rate how effectively they can perform each skill on a four-point scale (1=Not at all effective, 2=Somewhat effective, 3=Effective, 4=Very effective). Each item is directly related to one of the PULs: Core Communication and Quantitative Skills; Critical Thinking; Integration and Application of Knowledge; Intellectual Breadth, Depth, and Adaptiveness; Understanding Society and Culture; and Values and Ethics. Mean scale scores were calculated for the items pertaining to each PUL. Because Core Communication and Quantitative Skills comprises a wide range of abilities, it was divided into three subscales: Language Skills, Quantitative Skills, and Information Resource Skills.

In order to demonstrate the extent of the difference between the scale means of schools and the scale mean for all IUPUI baccalaureate-seeking respondents of junior or senior standing, effect sizes were generated. Effect sizes determine the number of standard deviation units between the sample and population means. In general, an effect size of less than 0.2 standard deviations is seen as “trivial”, between 0.2 and 0.49 standard deviations is “small”, between 0.5 and 0.79 is “medium” and larger than 0.8 is “large”. In this report, effect sizes that are greater than 0.2 (i.e. 0.2 of a standard deviation) are denoted with an asterisk. For further information please consult the Student Surveys section of the IMIR website, located at <http://imir.iupui.edu/surveys/student>.

Principles of Undergraduate Learning Scales by School (Undergraduate Student Perceptions)

School	Language Skills	Quantitative Skills	Information Resource Skills	Critical Thinking	Integration and Application of Knowledge	Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adapativeness	Understanding Society and Culture	Values and Ethics
IUPUI	3.41	2.95	3.39	3.34	3.24	3.23	3.40	3.41
Kelley School of Business	3.35	3.16 *	3.35	3.31	3.16	3.25	3.45	3.37
School of Education	3.36	2.85	3.38	3.26	3.20	3.29	3.36	3.37
School of Engineering and Technology	3.37	3.17 *	3.33	3.34	3.13	3.12	3.27 *	3.31
Herron School of Art	3.48	2.46 *	3.45	3.52 *	3.33	3.30	3.48	3.58 *
School of Informatics	3.42	2.83	3.59 *	3.29	3.19	3.09 *	3.34	3.50
School of Liberal Arts	3.52 *	2.79 *	3.44	3.38	3.29	3.22	3.45	3.49
School of Nursing	3.65 *	3.28 *	3.50 *	3.56 *	3.40 *	3.46 *	3.46	3.53 *
School of Physical Education and Tourism	3.39	2.80 *	3.30	3.38	3.19	3.33	3.39	3.26 *
School of Science	3.35	3.07	3.37	3.23	3.27	3.17	3.40	3.30
School of Continuing Studies	3.35	2.63 *	3.35	3.41	3.33	3.18	3.48	3.63 *
School of Public and Environmental Affairs	3.28 *	2.93	3.46	3.31	3.25	3.27	3.33	3.38

Scale: 1 = Not at all effective, 2=Somewhat effective, 3=Effective, 4=Very effective

* Effect Size between mean for this school and IUPUI is equal to or greater than 0.2.

**2010 Faculty Ratings of Student Performance on
Principles of Undergraduate Learning
~Report for All Respondents in 400 Level Courses~**

Office of Information Management and Institutional Research

June 2010

Faculty Ratings of Student Performance on PULs – Major Emphasis (All Campus, 400 level)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1A. Written, Oral, & Visual Communication Skills	182 3.49	1 .5%	27 14.8%	36 19.8%	118 64.8%	182 100.0%
1B. Quantitative Skills	112 3.30	10 8.9%	8 7.1%	32 28.6%	62 55.4%	112 100.0%
1C. Information Resource Skills	27 3.48	2 7.4%	0 .0%	8 29.6%	17 63.0%	27 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	373 3.17	25 6.7%	54 14.5%	125 33.5%	169 45.3%	373 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	893 3.37	28 3.1%	64 7.2%	347 38.9%	454 50.8%	893 100.0%
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness	165 3.50	3 1.8%	14 8.5%	46 27.9%	102 61.8%	165 100.0%
5. Understanding Society and Culture	271 3.47	10 3.7%	22 8.1%	69 25.5%	170 62.7%	271 100.0%
6. Values and Ethics	19 3.84	0 .0%	1 5.3%	1 5.3%	17 89.5%	19 100.0%
Total	2042 3.37	79 3.9%	190 9.3%	664 32.5%	1109 54.3%	2042 100.0%

N= Combined number of student ratings in all courses sampled in Spring 2010

Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Faculty Ratings of Student Performance on PULs – Moderate Emphasis (All Campus, 400 level)

PUL – Moderate Emphasis	Mean	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1A. Written, Oral, & Visual Communication Skills	235 3.20	16 6.8%	28 11.9%	84 35.7%	107 45.5%	235 100.0%
1B. Quantitative Skills	42 3.24	3 7.1%	7 16.7%	9 21.4%	23 54.8%	42 100.0%
1C. Information Resource Skills	136 3.90	2 1.5%	4 2.9%	0 0.0%	130 95.6%	136 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	165 3.38	4 2.4%	13 7.9%	65 39.6%	83 50.3%	165 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	144 3.29	0 0.0%	21 14.6%	60 41.7%	63 43.8%	144 100.0%
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness	67 3.43	3 4.5%	6 9.0%	17 25.4%	41 61.2%	67 100.0%
5. Understanding Society and Culture	294 3.45	0 0.0%	12 4.1%	139 47.3%	143 48.6%	294 100.0%
6. Values and Ethics	109 3.23	1 0.9%	9 8.3%	63 57.8%	36 33.0%	109 100.0%
Total	1192 3.39	29 2.4%	100 8.4%	437 36.7%	626 52.5%	1192 100.0%

N= Combined number of student ratings in all courses sampled in Spring 2010

Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"