IFC Academic Affairs Committee - Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 24th from 11a-1p in UL 2115J

Members Present: Buelow; Devine; Phillabaum (Substitute for Hassell); Lupton; Marrs; Orme; Walker; Watt; and Wright (Chair)

11:00-11:05   Welcome and Introductions. The Chair called the meeting to order and introduced Trudy W. Banta, Professor of Higher Education and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation. The chair invited members to introduce themselves. The Chair then asked for members to make any corrections to the notes from the January meeting.

11:05-11:10 - Presentation on IUPUI's Reaccreditation in 2012 by the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission. Dr. Banta was invited to discuss the reaccreditation process and the PUL outcome assessment process. Before beginning her presentation, she distributed copies of *IUPUI 2012 Reaccreditation Review*. She went on to explain that IUPUI is for reaccreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools or the Higher Learning Commission or the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. This body is part of a national system of accreditation, and the U.S. Department of Education relies on this and other regional accrediting bodies to accredit universities. This accreditation/reaccreditation is necessary for U.S. colleges and universities to be eligible to receive federal student financial aid and some federal education grants. Losing our accredited status would be very damaging to the campus' reputation and ability to operate, she cautioned. If they find a problem and recommend a correction, they might require a second visit to evaluate our progress.

Dr. Banta explained further that the reviewers are coming to see how the whole institution is working together. They will be particularly interested in our efforts in general education because of our pioneering work in defining the undergraduate principles of learning (PULs). This was under discussion when they were here in 1992, and they had concerns then about our ability to identify and evaluate the PULs. IUPUI pledged to continue to work on these issues. Now, over 80% of colleges and universities across the nation have some type of central principles of learning and are working to evaluate their knowledge. Most are using standardized test to evaluate, but research on the results suggest they are highly correlated with what students already know upon admission. An alternative is to propose a strategy, which is what we are trying to do at IUPUI. Initially, the assessment focus was on evaluating student learning of the PULs in the "capstone courses." Most students did not understand the PULs. Now, we have asked all faculty who teach undergraduate courses to identify at least one PUL per course and to give a supplemental evaluation of their performance vis a vis the PUL that is the major focus of the course (e.g., "major emphasis"). Faculty also can identify PULs that may identify up to two other PULs that are "minor emphases". Because students' overall performance in a course may reflect other factors,

the additional PUL assessment is necessary to evaluate student achievement across all courses and across all six PULs. Faculty are being asked to rate students' effectiveness on the PULs. The definition of effectiveness has not been standardized to accommodate significant disciplinary differences; however, this has raised concerns among many faculty. Trudy explained that this was a first step and that, as we learn more, IUPUI will likely refine the measurement process and tools.

To date, the assessment effort has been centered in the schools and their faculties which have been working identifying the PULs that are a major/minor emphasis in each of the courses and how to assess student effectiveness. Schools are implementing this assessment differently. Some are asking only for faculty interested in participating to volunteer. Other schools are assessing all courses, and some schools are only doing a subset of courses (e.g., 100 level courses this year, 200 level courses next year). The overarching goal is to have some assessment on all courses at least once every five years. As a result, we will not have "complete" data for five years. Dr. Banta mentioned that ALL programs are going to be required to identify and measure student learning outcomes.

Members shared some concerns about the process Dr. Banta, specifically mentioning the following:

1) Faculty expressed concerned about the level of precision in the overall measurement strategy. In particular, faculty noted that the summary statistics for each individual PUL probably do not full capture the variability in the extent that faculty actually emphasized the PUL or in student mastery. Dr. Banta agreed, noting that trying to identify a common set of learning out comes for the PULs across 21 schools is invariably going to be a challenge and fail to capture some important disciplinary differences.
2) Committee members recommended that the data be broken down by school and possibly by department or even course. Dr. Banta explained that this was possible, but only at the school level. The approved IRB protocol does not allow for sharing of identifiable data at levels lower than the school-level.
3) A committee member asked about how far schools had gotten in developing graduate learning outcomes that parallel the PULs. Dr. Banta indicated that some are working on this, and all have been requested to identify and measure student learning outcomes for all graduate degree and certificate programs.

11:40-12:00 - Discussion of Strategies for Increasing Faculty Engagement in the Measurement of the PUL's

As requested by the 2012 Committee, the Committee was asked to discuss how we could increase faculty engagement in the PULs. Dr. Banta explained that Deans have received instructions about the process and aggregate data for the courses that are reported on each semester. Committee members discussed the extent that various schools are actually encouraging faculty to report and participate in the process, and faculty representatives shared their schools' experiences. It was noted that the primary focus remains working through the deans' offices and that more faculty engagement would probably enhance the process.

Based on this discussion, the committee recommended that the Deans do the following:

1. Deans should make every effort to share the data directly with the faculty to encourage reflection and incorporating these learning outcomes into faculty documentation of their individual effectiveness as instructors. This suggestion was made during the early roll out, but many faculty were uncomfortable, and the IRB approved protocol only allows for Dr. Banta's office to aggregate data school-level. The School of Engineering and Technology, however, has sought and received IRB permission to share their data with individual faculty at the course level, and this does appear to be promoting more engagement. Committee members agreed that this would be a good strategy for other schools to pursue.

2. Deans should establish a process for sending a formal "thank you" email to individual faculty for participating in the evaluation. Dr. Banta's office will need to generate a list by faculty name to help make this happen, but the Committee agreed that this might help to encourage more faculty participation.

3. Deans should encourage faculty to share their PUL assessments with students so that they become more aware of general education process and so they can review their development. Dr. Banta noted that this is currently being built into the Electronic Portfolio; however, members of the committee noted that this effort should be expanded. Specifically, committee members recommended that further consideration be given to adding the PULs assessments by course to student transcripts as an additional measure of student learning.

12:00-12:10 Report/Update from the Campus Undergraduate Admissions Committee (Marquita Walker). Marquita announced that the Campus Undergraduate Admissions Committee meeting has been scheduled for March 1st; consequently, she did not have anything to report but should have a report for the meeting on March 24th.

12:10-1:00   Discussion of the IUPUI Policy for UG Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement (Proposed Policy Available at: http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/probation-dismissal-reinstatement.htm). A request was submitted to the chair to review the IUPUI policy on undergraduate probation, dismissal and reinstatement, specifically General Provision #6, because of a clarification offered by Mary Beth Myers, the IUPUI Registrar, that the calculation of the IUPUI specific GPA was not possible within the current computing system available to the Registrar's Office. Apparently, this has been a source of some confusion at the School level because they cannot rely on SIS to provide this information and instead must do a hand calculation to follow the policy. The consensus of the committee was that the provision was a sound one, as requires that IUPUI students be evaluated for probation, dismissal, or reinstatement solely based on their IUPUI record. The committee was in agreement that an additional statement should be added to clarify what the individual academic units must do to implement the policy. By unanimous consent, the IFC Academic Affairs Committee recommends the following:

Provision #6 of the General Provisions of the IUPUI Policy for Undergraduate Probation, Dismissal, and Reinstatement should be amended to include the following statement: "Calculation of the IUPUI GPA will need to be done manually in each academic unit."

The chair thanked the members for the thoughtful discussion and announced that the topics for March Meeting would be: 1) a discussion of the New University College Policy on Withdrawals (Guest Gayle Williams), and 2) a follow-up meeting with Dean Jane Luzar from the IUPUI Honors College.

The meeting was adjourned at 1pm.

Future Meetings:

3/24/2011 Thu	11:00 AM	1:00 PM	UL 2115G Meeting Room
4/28/2011 Thu	11:00 AM	1:00 PM	UL 2115J Meeting Room