Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, December 11, 2003
1:30 to 3:00 p.m., UL 1126
Karen Johnson, Acting Chair
Susan Kahn, Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of November Minutes ............................................................ K. Johnson
2. Assessment Overview ........................................................................... T. Banta
3. Golden Books ..................................................................................... C. Yokomoto
4. Faculty and Student Responses to NSSE ............................................. S. Kahn
5. PRAC Assessment Grants Discussion ............................................... K. Johnson
6. Program Review—Mechanical Engineering .................................... Hasan Akay
7. PRAC Subcommittee Reports for January ..................................... K. Johnson
8. Adjournment .................................................................................... K. Johnson

MINUTES –


Guests: H. Akay and M. Wince

Approval of November Minutes

The November minutes were approved as written.

Assessment Overview

T. Banta passed out a PowerPoint presentation, “Outcomes Assessment: An Introduction for Members of the Program Review and Assessment Committee.” She explained that the presentation provides an overview of assessment and invited PRAC members to make use of it to introduce their colleagues to assessment. She briefly reviewed the presentation, stressing that outcomes assessment takes a “second look,” once individual students’ work has been evaluated, across entire classes, programs, or departments to analyze larger patterns. Assessors ask questions about what is being learned and what is not in order to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of a curriculum. Assessment is a form of action research, a form of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
Banta also noted that PRAC members should be aware of two state-wide plans for education:

- The Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE) has released a higher education plan for the state that has been a year in the making. Over 30 drafts of the plan were developed in order to incorporate the suggestions of representatives from Indiana’s higher education institutions.

- The Governor’s Roundtable has issued a P-16 Plan. The Roundtable was chaired by Stan Jones of ICHE and Suellen Reed of the State Department of Education. It also included community representatives and representatives from P-16 institutions.

Banta said she would send both plans to PRAC members by e-mail and asked that they read and consider the implications of the plans for IUPUI. Discussion of these implications will occur at the January PRAC meeting.

Golden Books

C. Yokomoto provided a presentation on the “Golden Books” developed by faculty in the School of Engineering and Technology. These annual volumes include all assessment documents produced by the school for a given year, including the annual PRAC report, thus allowing faculty to access the documents easily. Every time a department or committee vote on an assessment issue is taken, Yokomoto writes a memorandum recording the vote for inclusion in the current Golden Book. The books have been used for ABET accreditation as documentation of assessment processes and findings, although this was not their original purpose. An examination of the books over the past six years reveals that while earlier volumes focus on development of assessment processes, later ones include more specific information and outcomes, including research on assessment by E & T faculty members.

S. Milosevich asked about how E & T is able to get employers to respond to questions about the skills they need from graduating students. Yokomoto replied that this is always very difficult. Banta recommended inviting employers to focus breakfasts or other occasions where they meet in person for discussion since it is very difficult to get an acceptable response rate to paper surveys.

Yokomoto also noted that E & T will soon have an updated assessment web site.

Program Review—Mechanical Engineering

H. Akay, chair of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, reported on the impact of a program review conducted in 1998. The review of Mechanical Engineering was combined with a review of Electrical and Computer Engineering and took place in the same year as an ABET visit, with similar results; ABET typically looks only at
undergraduate programs, however, and the program review covered graduate offerings as well.

The program review team included two representatives from other universities, one industry representative, and two representatives of other IUPUI schools/departments. Recommendations included:

- Developing recruitment and promotion strategies to increase enrollment, especially from local high schools. The department has followed up on this.
- Creating a new advising system, which the department has since done.
- Tracking alumni activity and employment. The department now tries to communicate more frequently with its graduates.
- Giving more attention to developing students’ communication skills, both written and oral.
- Systematically documenting student learning processes and outcomes, which is now underway.
- Providing more support for teaching—e.g., using teaching assistants and graders—so faculty would have more time for research. The department is still struggling with this issue.

Overall, the team found that the department was doing a good job, considering its small size. Team members were surprised by the lean operation of the department, commenting that faculty members needed more support staff and that their salaries were below national averages. They noted that the department was not large enough to sustain a major graduate program, a pre-requisite to national recognition. The department is just now beginning to work on establishing a Ph.D. program in collaboration with Purdue-West Lafayette.

Since the review, the department has strengthened its research function and developed a combined five-year B.S.-M.S. program, which should help attract more students. Akay noted that, in retrospect, the department should have done more at the time to capitalize on the recommendations of the review team by bringing them to the attention of upper administrators more frequently and persistently.

I. Queiro-Tajalli asked how the department is preparing for its next accreditation visit in 2005. Akay responded that the department’s Assessment and Accreditation Committee is doing most of the work on the self-study.
Faculty and Student Responses to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

S. Kahn, with help from M. Wince, Manager of Survey Research for the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR), reported on the results of the 2002 administration of the NSSE at IUPUI and related items on the 2002 Faculty Survey. (To understand how well students’ perceptions of their learning behaviors and experiences match faculty perceptions of what and how they are teaching, IMIR selected NSSE items and developed related questions for faculty on the 2002 Faculty Survey.) Kahn passed out a draft research brief on "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement in Learning at IUPUI," along with comparisons of responses of IUPUI freshmen and faculty to NSSE items, comparisons of responses of seniors and faculty, and comparisons of responses of freshmen and seniors. She explained that the NSSE asks freshmen and seniors about their involvement in “engaging” educational activities—i.e., activities that research has shown are likely to lead to positive learning outcomes. Survey items ask students about their own learning behaviors, such as how much time they spend preparing for classes, as well as about the pedagogical approaches they have encountered.

Survey responses overall suggest that students perceive themselves to be working harder than faculty perceive them to be; faculty believe that students are more frequently involved in “engaging” educational experiences than students report that they are; students report spending more time memorizing than faculty believe they are asking them to do; and seniors report greater involvement in engaging educational experiences than freshmen do. Kahn offered several possible reasons for these disparities, including “attribution bias” and different interpretations of key terms and ideas by faculty and students. These ideas may not fully explain all of the differences between students and faculty, however,

D. Appleby offered several comments on the school-specific results for the School of Science. He found some of the differences between student and faculty responses troubling, and he noted that students' responses are based on what they do, while faculty responses depend on inferences about what students do based on their responses in class and on assignments. The finding that 66 percent of SOS seniors say they frequently memorize material for the purpose of repeating it on assignments in basically the same form, while only 27 percent of SOS faculty say that they ask students to memorize was especially noteworthy. He suggested that we may be evaluating how well students remember what we say more often than we think we are; for example, we may be asking students to repeat our critical thinking, rather than requiring them to think critically on their own. Appleby passed out a recent article he wrote, “Three Degrees of Separation from Original Knowledge That Challenge Psychology Students as They Enter and Progress Through Undergraduate Studies,” which details the kinds of skills students need to acquire in order to progress beyond memorization.

Banta suggested that faculty, departments, or schools might analyze their tests to determine what levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy are represented in test questions.
PRAC Grants

K. Johnson noted that we have not received any proposals for PRAC grants this year and asked members to think about how we might encourage colleagues to submit proposals.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:30.

Next Meeting: January 22, 1:30-3:00, UL 1126
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Vice Chancellor
Planning and Institutional Improvement
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Outcomes Assessment

The process of providing credible evidence of the outcomes of higher education undertaken for the purpose of improving programs and services within the institution.

Banta, T. W.
ASSESSMENT . . .

“a rich conversation about student learning informed by data.”

-- Ted Marchese --
AAHE
Assessment of Individual Student Development

- **Assessment of basic skills for use in advising**
  - Placement
  - Counseling
- **Periodic review of performance with detailed feedback**
- **End-of-program certification of competence**
  - Licensing exams
  - External examiners
Key Results of Individual Assessment

- Faculty can assign grades
- Students learn their own strengths and weaknesses
- Students become self-assessors
A Second Look

- Across students
- Across sections
- Across courses
Where is learning satisfactory?

What needs to be retaught?

Which approaches produce the most learning for which students?
Group Assessment Activities

- Classroom assignments, test, projects
- Questionnaires for students, graduates, employers
- Interviews, focus groups
- Program completion and placement
- Awards/recognition for graduates
- Monitoring of success in graduate school
- Monitoring of success on the job
Use of Results of Group Assessment

- Program improvement
- Institutional and / or state peer review
- Regional and / or national accreditation
Some Purposes of Assessment

1. Students learn content
2. Students assess own strengths
3. Faculty improve instruction
4. Institutions improve programs/services
5. Institutions demonstrate accountability
Some external impetus is necessary to initiate outcomes assessment in higher education.
Outcomes Assessment Requires Collaboration

- In setting expected program outcomes
- In developing sequence of learning experiences (curriculum)
- In choosing measures
- In interpreting assessment findings
- In making responsive improvements
Barriers to Collaboration in the Academy

1. Graduate schools prepare specialists
2. Departments hire specialists
3. Much of our scholarship is conducted alone
4. Promotion and tenure favor individual achievements -- interdisciplinary work is harder to evaluate
Campus Interest in Assessment

WHAT WORKS in….
- increasing student retention?
- general education?
- use of technology in instruction?
- curriculum in the major?
Some Evaluative Questions

If we undertake a new approach:

- Is instruction more effective?
- Are students learning more?
- Are students more satisfied?
- Are faculty more satisfied?
- Do outcomes justify costs?
Good assessment is good research . . .

- An important question
- An approach to answer the question
- Data collection
- Analysis
- Report

To Foster Collaboration

- Name interdisciplinary committees
- Read and discuss current literature on learning/assessment
- Attend conferences together
- Bring experts to campus
- Share good practices
- Work together on learning communities
Most Faculty Are Not Trained as Teachers

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Can Help Instructors:

- Write clear objectives for student learning in courses and curricula
- Individualize instruction using a variety of methods and materials
- Ask questions that make students active learners
- Develop assessment tools that test higher order intellectual skills
## Organizing for Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find Information</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Taxonomy of Educational Objectives
(Bloom and Others, 1956)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive domain categories</th>
<th>Sample verbs for outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Identifies, defines, describes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Explains, summarizes, classifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Demonstrates, computes, solves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Differentiates, diagrams, estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Creates, formulates, revises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Criticizes, compares, concludes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some General Education Objectives

- Differentiate between fact and opinion
- Gather, analyze, and interpret data
- Apply ethical principles to local, national, global issues
- Communicate ideas in writing effectively
Critical Assessment Questions

1. What should a major know and be able to do?
2. What curriculum experiences promote student attainment of This knowledge? These skills?
3. Are these experiences taking place?
4. How do we know students are attaining The knowledge? The skills?
In each course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Of Competence</th>
<th>Teaching/Learning Strategy</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>Written Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning for Learning and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What general outcome are you seeking?</td>
<td>How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it? (What will the student know or be able to do?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it? (What will the student know or be able to do?)</td>
<td>How will you help students learn it? (in class or out of class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How will you help students learn it? (in class or out of class)</td>
<td>How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?</td>
<td>What are the assessment findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the assessment findings?</td>
<td>What improvements might be based on assessment findings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Direct Measures of Learning
Assignments, exams, projects, papers

Indirect Measures
Questionnaires, inventories, interviews
- Did the course cover these objectives?
- How much did your knowledge increase?
- Did the teaching method(s) help you learn?
- Did the assignments help you learn?
Start with Measures You Have

- Assignments in courses
- Course exams
- Work performance
- Records of progress through the curriculum
Organizational Levels for Assessment

- National
- Regional
- State
- Campus
- College
- Discipline
- Classroom
- Student
Fast Feedback
(at end of every class)

- Most important thing learned
- Muddiest point
- Helpfulness of advance reading assignments for day’s work in class
- Suggestions for improving class / assignments

Bateman & Roberts
Graduate School of Business
University of Chicago
Student Suggestions for Improvement

- Install a portable microphone
- Increase type size on transparencies
- Leave lights on when using projector
- Don’t cover assigned reading in detail
- Provide more examples in class
Student Learning Oriented Course Evaluation

1. Learners held high expectations for one another
2. Learners interacted frequently with others
3. Learners participated in learning teams
4. Learners respected diverse talents and ways of learning

-Cournoyer

Advances in Social Work – Fall 2001
Primary Trait Scoring

Assigns scores to attributes (traits) of a task

**STEPS**

- Identify traits necessary for success in assignment
- Compose scale or rubric giving clear definition to each point
- Grade using the rubric
Can Develop a Research Paper

1. Narrows and defines topic
2. Produces bibliography
3. Develops outline
4. Produces first draft
5. Produces final draft
6. Presents oral defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrows and defines</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces bibliography</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops outline</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces first draft</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces final draft</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents oral defense</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

**Outstanding** – References current, appropriately cited, representative, relevant

**Acceptable** – References mostly current, few citation errors, coverage adequate, mostly relevant

**Unacceptable** – No references or containing many errors in citation format, inadequate coverage or irrelevant
## Mapping Course Outcomes to Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear conceptual understanding, consistent notation, logical formulation, complete solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate understanding, careless errors, some logic missing, incomplete solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequate understanding, procedural errors, logical steps missing, poor or no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Problem not attempted or conceptual understanding totally lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ball State University
Assessment in Sociology and Anthropology

Focus groups of graduating students

- Given a scenario appropriate to the discipline, a faculty facilitator asks questions related to outcomes faculty have identified in 3 areas: concepts, theory, methods.
- 2 faculty observers use 0-3 scale to rate each student on each question
- GROUP scores are discussed by all faculty

- Murphy & Goreham
  North Dakota State University
Assessment of Group Interaction

The Student Participant:
* Listened to others
* Actively contributed to discussion
* Challenged others effectively
* Was willing to alter own opinion
* Effectively explained concepts/insights
* Summarized/proposed solutions

5=Consistently excellent
3=Generally satisfactory
1=Inconsistent and/or inappropriate
Capstone Course in Business

Comprehensive case study analysis
Graded using scoring rubric covering

- writing skills
- knowledge of historic and current theories and practice
- ability to integrate tools and techniques from business specialties in analyzing the case

Olney & Menger
St. Mary’s University
Internships in Social Work

 Evaluated against specific criteria by

• Students
• Faculty
• Field-based supervisors
Student Advisory Council at Montevallo
A way to provide continuous student assessment

Student Recommendations

1. *Develop a statement of expected ethical behaviors for students*
2. *Add a second research course with lab*
3. *Increase comparative psychology*
4. *Add terminals for statistics lab*
5. *Increase opportunities for research, writing, and speaking*
Assessing Student Growth

The Portfolio - Some Examples of Content

- Course assignments
- Research papers
- Materials from group projects
- Artistic productions
- Self-reflective essays (self-assessment)
- Correspondence
- Taped presentations
Student Electronic Portfolio

- Students take responsibility for demonstrating core skills
- Unique individual skills and achievements can be emphasized
- Multi-media opportunities extend possibilities
- Metacognitive thinking is enhanced through reflection on contents

- Sharon J. Hamilton
  IUPUI
Northern State University

1. Focus breakfasts with employers
2. Evaluations from internship sponsors
3. Alumni surveys

Identified weaknesses:
- communication skills
- computer skills
- real-world experiences
- interview skills
- international experiences
Responsive Changes

- Early assessment and remediation of communication skills
- New intensive writing course
- More practice in courses and proficiency test in use of technology
- More credit for internships
- More preparation for interviews
- More career exploration
- More international experiences
Authentic Assessment
at
Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville

- Business - Case Study Analysis with Memo
- Education - Professional Portfolio
- Psychology - Poster on Research Project
- Engineering - Senior Design Project
- Nursing - Plan of Care for Patient
Responses to Assessment at Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville

- Business – More case studies and research
- Education – More practice in classroom management
- Psychology – Curriculum change in statistics
- Engineering – More practice in writing and speaking
- Nursing – Simulation lab with computerized patients
Select or Design Assessment Methods

1. Match with goals
2. Use multiple methods
3. Combine direct and indirect measures
4. Combine qualitative and quantitative measures
5. Consider pre - post design to assess gains
6. Use built-in points of contact with students
The Future

- Need for evidence of accountability will increase
- More faculty will recognize benefits of assessment
- More electronic assessment methods will be developed
- More sharing of assessment methods will take place
- Faculty will learn more about learning and student learning will improve
Research Brief on Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement in Learning at IUPUI
Draft 12/11/03

The Surveys

In Spring 2002, the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR) sponsored the campus’s second participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which queries freshmen and seniors about their involvement in “engaging” educational experiences—that is, experiences that research on learning connects to academic and intellectual growth in college. During the same semester, the biannual Faculty Survey included a new section on “the classroom” that asked faculty about their own teaching practices and their perceptions of student learning behavior. Items in this section of the Faculty Survey were designed to mirror selected items on the NSSE, so that student and faculty perspectives on student engagement in learning could be compared. Faculty who taught freshman-level or advanced-level courses were asked to respond to the items with a particular class in mind, so that their responses could be compared with either the freshman or senior sample groups.

The Issue

Do IUPUI students experience the curriculum the way faculty members intend them to do so? Peter Ewell distinguishes between the “designed” curriculum—the curriculum as planned by the faculty—and the “experienced” curriculum—the curriculum that consists of “what students actually do.” The best assessment systems, according to Ewell, are “especially configured to detect discontinuities” between what faculty plan and what students experience (Ewell, 1997). IMIR’s pairing of the NSSE and the Faculty Survey is intended to detect exactly such discontinuities, in order to help faculty members and departments better align curriculum and teaching with what and how they wish students to learn.

The NSSE Sample

The 2002 NSSE survey was administered to a stratified random sample of 3,385 freshmen and seniors. Completed questionnaires were received from 1,314 respondents, including 458 (34.5 percent) freshmen and 856 (65.1 percent) seniors. The overall adjusted response rate for the 2002 NSSE was 39 percent. This rate was comparable to other Doctoral Intensive institutions (38 percent) and slightly better than other urban institutions (36 percent), but lower than the NSSE national average of 41 percent. Response rates varied by school, with the Columbus campus having the highest response rate (62 percent), and Herron having the lowest response rate (33.1 percent).

Like other student surveys of this type, the 2002 NSSE over-represented females and under-represented males. Among freshmen, women constitute 75 percent of the respondents, but only 59 percent of the population. Among seniors, 69 percent of respondents were women, who make up 60 percent of the population.

Ten percent of freshmen and 11 percent of senior respondents were African-American, percentages that are fairly representative of the total population. About three-quarters of
freshman respondents were nineteen and under, in line with the percentage of these students in the freshman population. One-third of senior respondents were between 20 and 30 and another third were over 31, making the senior sample slightly younger than the senior population. Because of these discrepancies between the sample and the total population, particularly in the case of gender, caution should be exercised in generalizing these results.

**Highlights of Findings**

Comparison of students’ responses to NSSE items with faculty responses to similar items on the Faculty Survey yields several patterns:

- For the most part, students perceive themselves to be working harder than faculty perceive them to be (see, for example, responses to “prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in” and “came to class without completing readings or assignments”). Nonetheless, on a question about time spent preparing for class, both freshmen and seniors report spending much less time than faculty say they expect. The gap is even wider between faculty and seniors than between faculty and freshmen: faculty members expect seniors to spend more than twice as much time preparing for class than seniors say they do.

- Faculty believe that students are more frequently involved in “engaging” educational activities than students report that they are (see, for example, responses to “discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside class” and “received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance”).

- Faculty and students responded similarly to items involving the use of technology for teaching and learning.

- Faculty and students responded similarly to items that asked about “mental activities” or types of assignments, except that students report spending much more time “memorizing facts, ideas, or methods” than faculty believe they are asking students to do.

- Seniors report more involvement in engaging educational experiences than freshmen on almost every item (e.g., asking questions in class, making class presentations, working on assignments with classmates outside class, using e-mail to communicate with instructors). The one exception is in the area of advising, which seniors rate more poorly than do freshmen.

**Interpretation**

How can we explain the differences in faculty and student responses? Possible causes might include:

- The “self-serving bias”—a type of what social psychologists call “attribution bias,” defined as the tendency most of us share “to take credit for positive behaviors or
outcomes but to blame negative ones on external causes” (Baron and Byrne, 1991).

- Different interpretations of key terms and ideas—e.g., what does it mean to “complete readings” or to “prepare two or more drafts of a paper”? Does “memorize” mean the same thing to a freshman that it does to a faculty member? Does “prompt feedback” mean the same thing?

It’s difficult to say, however, whether these factors or other differences in interpretation account for all of the disparities between student and faculty perceptions. For example, how can we explain the large gap between faculty and student ratings of advising? What explains the disparities between faculty and student responses to the question on time spent preparing for class?

**Suggested Follow-Up**

Individual school reports can provide a starting point for discussions among faculty or between faculty and students that may be helpful to both groups. Whether a school’s report varies from the campus-wide results or is largely consistent with them, a number of follow-up actions are possible:

- Individual faculty members may wish to discuss school- and campus-wide results with their own students and classes to clarify expectations and perceptions.
- Departments and schools might consider holding focus groups of students.
- Committees with assessment responsibilities at the school and department levels should examine school results carefully and attempt to implement improvements, when they appear to be warranted.

The combination of the NSSE and the Faculty Survey provides an opportunity to gain insight into differences between the “designed” and the “experienced” curriculum. We should take advantage of this opportunity and consider assessment methods that might build on this study to illuminate these differences even further.
E&T’S ASSESSMENT RESOURCE BOOK

A.K.A. E&T GOLDEN BOOK

Presentation made to the IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee
Dec. 11, 2003
What Is It?

- Bound collection of documents produced during an academic year
- Appendix of useful documents not included in the main body of the golden book
Purpose of Producing the Book

- Assessment committee members can find documents easily in bound volumes.
- Documents can be carried around without having to find a connection to the Internet.
- Copies of the book have been used to demonstrate our assessment activities to visitors such as on accrediting visits.
- Copies have been given out to people outside the school.
- Cuts down on “My dog ate my copy of the handout.”
Contents of Vol. 1--1998

- E&T Annual Report to PRAC
- Review of Outcomes Assessment
- E&T Process and Definitions
- ABET’s Learning Outcomes
- IUPUI PULs
- Examples of Assessment Tools
Volume 2—1999

- E&T Annual Report
- Forms of Evidence by Department
- Samples of Assessment Tools by Department
- NCA Timelines
- Report on Continuing Students Survey data by David Bostwick
- Admissions, Graduation, and Retention report from IMIR
- Alumni and Industry Survey Instruments
- ECE Continuing Students Satisfaction Data
- Papers and Presentations by E&T Faculty
Examples of Titles from 1999

- Buchanan, W.W. and Bostwick, W.D. "How Assessment is Done in Engineering Technology Programs," *25th Annual Conference for Industry and Education Collaboration*.
Volume 3—2000

- E&T Annual Report
- Scholarship of Assessment
- Results from Marj Hovde’s Writing and Speaking Assessment Project
- Tutorial on Writing Scoring Rubrics
- The Reasonable Minimum
- Tutorial on Writing Measurable Outcomes
Volume 4—2001

- E&T Annual Report to PRAC
- Appendices
  - Alumni and Employer Survey Forms
  - Marj Hovde’s Scoring Rubrics for Writing and Speaking
  - Updated ABET “required” outcomes
  - ABET to PUL relational matrices
Volume 5—2002

- E&T Annual Report to PRAC
- Power Point slides of E&T and ME presentations to PRAC
- Appendices
Volume 6—2003

- E&T Annual Report to PRAC
- Updated Outcomes Pyramid
- Updated Definitions of Terms
- Appendices
- Document finder
The Outcomes Assessment Pyramid

1. Mission Statements
2. Department Goals (Broad)
3. Program Educational Objectives
4. Program Outcomes (Embraces ABET’s a-k)
5. MEASURABLE LEARNING OUTCOMES
6. Course Outcomes
7. Unit Instructional Objectives
Definitions of Terms Used in E&T

See handout
Concluding Remarks

- I don’t know how useful committee members have found the Golden Book, but I dig through mine very frequently.
- I find it much easier to pull out a bound volume than to find the right folder, paper or computer.
## FRESHMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic and Intellectual Experiences</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Often/Very Often</th>
<th>Sig*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td>CLQUEST</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>CLPRESEN</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td>REWROPAP</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
<td>INTEGRAT</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.</td>
<td>DIVCLASS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td>CLUNPREP</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>CLASSGRP</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>OCCGRP</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course</td>
<td>COMMPROJ</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Intellectual Experiences -cntd.</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Often/Very Often</td>
<td>Sig*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (list-serv, chat group, Internet, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td>ITACADEM</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACGRADE</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACPLANS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACIDEAS</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACFEED</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Activities</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Often/Very Often</td>
<td>Sigas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form</td>
<td>MEMORIZE</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td>ANALYZE</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>SYNTHEZ</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td>EVALUATE</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>APPLYING</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Advising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program)</td>
<td>ACADPR01</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STU</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Intellectual Experiences</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Often/Very Often</td>
<td>Sig*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td>CLQUEST</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>CLPRESEN</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td>REWROPAP</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
<td>INTEGRAT</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.</td>
<td>DIVCLASS</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td>CLUNPREP</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>CLASSGRP</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>OCCGRP</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course</td>
<td>COMMPROJ</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Intellectual Experiences -cntd.</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Sig*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (list-serv, chat group, Internet, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td>ITACADEM</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used email to communicate with an instructor</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>FACGRADE</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor</td>
<td>FACPLANS</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>FACIDEAS</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)</td>
<td>FACFEED</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Activities</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Sig*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form</td>
<td>MEMORIZE</td>
<td>SR 10%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR 7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td>ANALYZE</td>
<td>SR 2%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR 2%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>SYNTHESZ</td>
<td>SR 3%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR 4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td>EVALUATE</td>
<td>SR 7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR 9%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>APPLIYING</td>
<td>SR 3%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR 5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality of Advising

1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent

| Overall how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution? | ADVISE | SR 17% | 55% |
| | | FR 11% | 65% |

### Time Usage

*median hours per week*

| Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program) | ACADPR01 | SR 2.6 | |
| | | FR 2.5 | |