

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, December 8, 2005

UL1126

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Interim Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of November Minutes K. Johnson
2. Assessment Strategies Presentations C. Souch and J. Smith
3. Subcommittee Reports
 - Grants Subcommittee..... L. Houser
 - Performance Indicators Subcommittee S. Kahn
4. Report:UFC Discussion of General Education and IFC Consideration of Revising the Principles of Undergraduate Learning..... K. Johnson
5. Faculty Outreach Project Report..... K. Johnson and J. Smith
6. Election of Officers for 2006..... T. Banta
7. AdjournmentK. Johnson

MINUTES –

Members Present: William Agbor-Baiyee, Drew Appleby, Rachel Applegate, Kate Baird, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Donna Boland, Katie Busby, William Crabtree, Yao-Yi Fu, Andrew Gavrin, Michele Hansen, Linda Houser, Karen Johnson, Susan Kahn, Allison Martin, Howard Mzumara, William Potter, Ingrid Ritchie, Katherine Schilling, Joshua Smith, Sloane Thompson, Russell Vertner, Gail Whitchurch, Debra Winikates and Charles Yokomoto

Guests Present: Amy Abell

Minutes of the November 3rd meeting were approved without correction.

Assessment Strategies Presentation

J. Smith presented a School of Education (SOE) assessment strategy. The SOE is conducting a pilot study using the video case method for programmatic assessment in the secondary teacher education program. The SOE assesses Principles of Teacher Education, which are aligned with PULs. A pilot study was conducted this summer with English/Language Art students. Although not widely used in the past, the case study method is becoming more popular in teacher education. Students complete the assessment in a computer lab using Windows Media Player and headphones to prevent distractions. Students have 2 hours to view video clips and respond to a series of questions in a Word document about the video. Following the pilot study experience, students provided feedback on the quality of the video and the questions used to

prompt their responses. Students generally felt that the task allowed them to articulate what they learned in the Teacher Education program. The video case method is more standardized than videotaping a student presenting a lesson in the field. The next steps including finalizing the scoring rubrics, developing protocols for other content areas (e.g., social studies, math, science, etc.), and continuing work on the Integrative Department Grant that assists the SOE in moving its assessment work into ePort. J. Smith responded to questions from PRAC members about issues of scoring, reliability, and other issues related to the administration of the video case method.

K. Johnson reported for C. Souch on additional assessment strategies. A new procedure to elicit participation in the “Graduating Student Survey” was designed to counter an “appalling” response rate on previous survey administrations. Liberal Arts (LA) looked at the School of Science’s process because their response rate was much better. LA faculty decided that collection and analysis of longitudinal data were not possible under the current system. The survey involves a series of Likert-type items and a reflective essay describing how students’ experience in the School of Liberal Arts helped them achieve mastery in a particular PUL. Data concerning demographic data, exposure to and mastery of PULs, mentors (faculty whose courses they have taken), and academic advisors are also collected in the survey. The response rate dramatically increased when the survey was included with applications for graduation. The students may believe that they have to fill it out as a requirement of graduation, and/or they may feel as though the data will be used in the future. Johnson discussed the students’ assessment of advising experiences and faculty evaluation of the PUL reflective essays (a specific rubric is used: strong positive, positive, negative, strong negative, and N/A). Johnson also discussed the evaluation of reflective essays, and the possibility that the high number of positive ratings may reflect the fact that the higher achieving students are more motivated to turn in their surveys. Johnson wants to work harder on this part of the tool, possibly using the ePortfolio. Major findings from the previous administration were presented. The data will be used for school level reporting, feedback for faculty and departments, improvements in advising, changes in school requirements/attention to quality of learning experiences, and attention to experiences such as undergraduate research, honors, and internships. Future changes include working with the Center for Survey Research to put the survey online and using survey data to inform faculty on a more regular basis.

T. Banta thanked K. Johnson for presenting so well for C. Souch. She also welcomed Sloane Thompson, Acting Director of the IUPUI Internship Office, to the PRAC committee. Banta asked Thompson to speak about her role with the **Internship Council**. She reported that the council is working on identifying “Best Practices” and that her seat on PRAC will further her outreach regarding assessment. She also described an emerging software system that facilitates communication between employers and students interested in internship experiences.

Subcommittee Reports

Grants Subcommittee

L. Houser discussed the five grant proposals submitted. A motion to accept the top three proposals for funding at levels somewhat lower than requested was seconded. A voice vote by attending PRAC members passed unanimously. Houser indicated that by limiting the funds for the current projects, there will be sufficient funds (\$5,000) for another call for proposals in Spring 2006.

Performance Indicators Subcommittee

S. Kahn distributed a list describing the current status of performance indicators of student learning and success. The subcommittee members met twice this semester, went through the goals and indicators, and decided on the type(s) of evidence necessary to make meaningful decisions on each performance indicator. The aim was to identify multiple sources of direct evidence that goals are being met. Kahn reported on the various subcommittees responsible for evaluating the separate indicators for diversity (Diversity Cabinet), Civic Engagement (CE Council subcommittee), Excellence in Teaching and Learning (APPC & RGC, PRAC PI subcommittee). A new set of indicators for "Best Practices" and the existing Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity indicators have not been evaluated at this point. The PI subcommittee will meet again next semester to reflect on ways to improve the process for the coming year. Johnson wanted to know what to do if a person had a question about the traffic light color choice for a particular category. Kahn said to email her as soon as possible.

ePortfolio Subcommittee

C. Yokomoto stated that this committee meets once per month, and this past meeting was about self-reflection statements. Members brainstormed why reflection is a good exercise for students. Coming up with ways to "sell" reflection to faculty members was discussed. Issues related to writing self-reflective statements and to motivating students and faculty to reflect were discussed. Various stages of reflection were also discussed (point of entry, 26 credit hour point, 56 hours point, capstone/exit level). At the next meeting members will draft items for prompts related to the pre-PUL survey for beginning students. There was a suggestion to write that survey in "generic" terms rather than PUL terms, so that students do not have to know what PULs are yet. Kahn talked about how important it is for students to be aware of how well they are doing at a task.

Program Review Committee

D. Boland reported that the committee's goal this year is to look at Program Review processes. The committee is looking for additional PRAC members to join. They want to host events that will allow an open dialogue session with programs that have recently completed Program Review with programs that are embarking on the process.

Report: UFC Discussion of General Education and IFC Consideration of Revising the Principles of Undergraduate Learning

W. Potter stated that the PULs were introduced at the faculty meeting, but conclusions were not provided. He expected that the issue will be raised during the January meeting. At the next PRAC meeting, Johnson will report a December 21st meeting where the topic of discussion is the form of general education at the IU system level.

Faculty Outreach Project Report

Johnson talked about the faculty outreach project. She and Smith proposed a process that would inform faculty members about PRAC and elicit their feedback about the Program Review and other assessment processes. The two will craft an e-mail asking PRAC members to “volunteer” their school or program. The idea is to hold a meeting with the Dean, PRAC members representing the school/program, and K. Johnson/J. Smith. Eventually Johnson and Smith could attend a Faculty Council meeting to further the conversation directly with faculty about PRAC and how PRAC can assist with assessment initiatives. Smith added that interested members should contact them directly rather than replying to the listserv. Johnson invited members to add their own input when approaching the dean and faculty in their school.

Election of Officers for 2006

T. Banta announced that K. Johnson and J. Smith were willing continue in their current positions as Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. There were no additional nominations and the two were elected with a voice vote.

Adjournment: The meeting ended at 2:45 p.m.



School of Liberal Arts Graduating Senior Survey

- Initiated in 2002 in collaboration with the School of Science
- Set of five questionnaires and forms, completed by students filing for graduation.
- Objective to obtain school-level longitudinal data on *student learning* (specifically related to the PULs) and *mentoring* and *advising* through *student self-assessment* and faculty evaluation of *reflective essays*.



Method

Five surveys which students complete as they file for graduation. Distributed by LIBA Student Affairs office.

1. **The students** - Demographic profile (age, sex, ethnicity); Major and minor; Plans upon graduation

2. **Exposure to and mastery of the PULs**

- **Self-assessment** by each student of their own abilities with respect to the PULs (5-point scale; 11 questions)

- **Short reflective essays** by students on how they have been exposed to the PULs through their undergraduate program. Evaluated by a faculty committee (Teaching and Advising).

3. **Mentoring**; Identify full-time faculty with 'remarkable and positive influence' on the student (description of influence)

4. **Academic Advisor Survey** - Frequency of meetings ; Quality of interaction; Characteristics most important



Examples of Results: **Self-assessment by students of proficiency** (Dec 2004; n= 223) (mean and mode reported):

Reading and understanding books, articles, and instruction materials	4.36	5
Efficient use of information technology	3.86	4
Writing clearly and effectively	4.42	5
Speaking clearly and effectively	4.28	5
Working as part of a team to solve problems	4.25	5
Thinking critically and analytically	4.39	5
Finding new ways to use skills, knowledge when encountering new situations	4.17	4
Having a general understanding of subjects other than the one in which I majored	4.13	4
Having an in-depth understanding of my major field of study	4.33	4
Communicating effectively with people who see things differently than I do	4.22	4



Examples of Results (2): **Advising Survey** December 2004, n=254

	Average Response
Provides me with helpful and accurate information about my major	4.36
Accurate information School's academic requirements and rules	4.33
Is knowledgeable about career opportunities	3.72
Refers me to appropriate individuals or resources when needed	4.19
Treats me with respect	4.57
Helps me set goals	3.79
Encourages me to make informed decisions	3.94
Is Creative in providing options when I encounter problems	3.87
Has motivated me to do my best	3.80
Knowledgeable extra-curricular/co-curricular opportunities	3.33
Is readily available and prompt in responding to inquiries	4.22



Example of Results (3): Evaluation of PULs

Review of short essays by Faculty Committee (Teaching and Advising) using the following rubric:

1. **Strong Positive:** Student provides a strong, positive response connecting one or more substantive personal examples of experiencing the principle.
2. **Positive:** Student discusses principle in a positive light and provides a personal example of experiencing the principle, but without much amplification.
3. **Negative:** Student discusses principle from a negative aspect and provides a personal example, but without much amplification.
4. **Strong Negative:** Student provides a strong, negative response and amplifies with one or more substantive personal examples.
5. **NA:** Student restates or philosophizes about the principle and provides little or no substantiation in terms of a personal example, or personal example may be superficial.



Evaluation of reflective essays on PULs

487 responses were noted – 437 were deemed classifiable, while 50 were NA

1. Principle 1 = 96 positive, 4 negative and 7 NA
2. Principle 2 = 87 positive, 1 negative and 14 NA
3. Principle 3 = 66 positive, 2 negative and 8 NA
4. Principle 4 = 29 positive, 1 negative and 3 NA
5. Principle 5 = 111 positive, 2 negative and 9 NA
6. Principle 6 = 34 positive, 4 negative and 9 NA

Six categories were analyzed, having a positive response between 89% and 99% of the time, and negative between 2% and 11% of the time – most feedback fell under the positive category in all areas

1. Principle 1 = 96% positive and 4% negative
2. Principle 2 = 99% positive and 1% negative
3. Principle 3 = 97% positive and 3% negative
4. Principle 4 = 97% positive and 3% negative
5. Principle 5 = 98% positive and 2% negative
6. Principle 6 = 89% positive and 11 % negative



Some interesting findings

- Results are remarkably consistent through time
- >90% of Graduating Seniors rate themselves as proficient in each of the PULs. Faculty evaluations of the reflective essays support this assertion.
- Graduating Seniors are more satisfied with teaching than advising, and are more satisfied with faculty and courses in their major than outside their major
- Graduating Seniors are least satisfied with opportunities for service learning/civic engagement, involvement in faculty research, and co-curricular activities
- Students perceive that advisors provide accurate information about the major, the school's requirements and are readily available, but they are much less knowledgeable about career opportunities and even less so about co-curricular activities



Use of Data

- **School level reporting – School Assessment Report; School Planning Report; Tied to Strategic Plan**
- **Feedback to individual faculty on advising/ mentoring (prompts self-improvement and provides information on impact for annual/P&T reviews)**
- **Improvements in Advising: Identification of key areas not well served and development of training programs/information for advisors: for example attention to information on careers, setting goals**
- **Changes in School Requirements/Attention to Quality of Learning Experiences: Faculty Committees discussing school requirements (Standards and Advising) and Student Learning (Teaching and Advising)**
- **Focused attention on experiences such as undergraduate research, Honors (new initiative) and internships**



Success factors

- Response rate: Tie to request to graduate
- Continuity: Involvement of Dean's office: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
- Use of data: Broad dissemination of results and faculty involvement in evaluation (further room for involvement)

Proposed Changes

- Work with Center for Survey Research (Jim Wolf) to put this online
- Faculty Committee: Teaching and Advising to review questions/responses and report to the faculty on a more regular basis