

**IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee**  
**May 15, 2014, 1:30-3:00pm, CE 409**  
**Minutes**

**Attendance:** K. Alfrey; P. Altenburger; T. Banta; K. Black; C. Gentile-Gennity; S. Graunke; M. Hansen; S. Hendricks; L. Houser; S. Hundley; K. Johnson; S. Johnson; S. Kahn; M. Kolb; J. Lee; K. MacDorman; L. Maxwell; H. Mzumara; B. Neal-Beliveau; C. Nielson; M. Rust; S. Scott; A. Teemant; C. Toledo; C. Walcott; S. Weeden; K. Wills  
*Guests:* A. Buchenot; J. Gosney; C. Tandy; R. Vernon

**Minutes:** approved as circulated

**PRAC Grant Report:**

- Assessing Student Interviewing Competencies through Second Life
  - Project collaborators: Robert Vernon, Director of MSW Direct, online program ([rvernon@iupui.edu](mailto:rvernon@iupui.edu)), Darlene Lynch, and Cindy Tandy from Valdosta State University (joined via video)
  - Standardized Client Project:
    - Artificial client is created and programmed to teach students right and wrong ways of doing an interview and to assess student behavior/learning and benchmark; the project collaborators created “Jenny,” an artificial client in Second Life
- Steps:
  - Create scenario basics and draft initial script
  - Paper test
  - Program chatbot in Second Life
  - Test with students
- Scenario and initial script
  - First step was drafting an initial script, including logic tree/branching program to present a stimulus and give the student a variety of choices/responses
  - Case of a middle aged woman; married; caring for infirmed mother-in-law
  - Client response informs student choices, and a decision tree yields a resolution
  - Faculty generated scenario with branching parts; challenging-yet-realistic interview typical of an experience a BSW/MSW student would encounter
- Paper test
  - Materials are put on 3x5 cards to pilot the concept/language/etc. prior to programming
  - “Walk through” paper cards used to validate script/simulation
- Program chatbot in Second Life
  - Program avatar (“Jenny”) – looks and behaves like a person

- Students enter the simulation, get a notecard of instructions, and produce a ‘head’s up display’ to start the interview
- Second Life is a virtual world; looks like a game, but it is not; it is the ‘game’ you want to make
- Testing with students:
  - Cindy tested the concept with students (Valdosta)
  - Oriented the students through written directions and video tutorial
  - Instructed to try out several attempts to make the client happy; helpful/unhelpful responses
  - Completed a reflective report that captured:
    - Experience/feelings of what they learned
    - Experience was like in navigating Second Life
  - Students thought it was a valuable experience; enjoyed the work
  - Students initially had some performance anxiety
  - Students could interact in Second Life without observation; thus, students could play with responses, make mistakes, etc. not affecting real-life client or another student
  - Students could see the results of a misplaced response
  - Students learned that they could control the process to create a successful/unsuccessful interview
- Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  - How did the students respond? Did they learn something from this experience? How were data gathered?
    - Quasi focus-group was conducted
    - Students were learning how to give good and better feedback/responses
    - As they gave responses, they could see client responses
  - Were you able to track how many students completed the interaction successfully vs. having the client ‘walk away’ from the student?
    - No information on this; relied on student self-report
  - What are the next steps?
    - Don’t yet know, as project directors have taken on administrative roles
    - Could be used at both macro- and micro-levels (organizations; individuals)
  - Is there a link to a demonstration?
    - No

### **Canvas Learning Management System (LMS) Outcomes Tool:**

- John Gosney, Faculty Liaison, Learning Technologies, UITS ([jgosney@iu.edu](mailto:jgosney@iu.edu))
  - To learn more: <http://next.iu.edu> (click on the Canvas tab)
- IU is moving to a new LMS called Canvas
  - All IU courses will be provided in Canvas for fall, in addition to being in Oncourse
  - In many respects, Canvas is similar to Oncourse

- Example rubrics with aligned outcome
  - This is something new in Canvas that Oncourse did not have
  - Create at a course-, department-, and institutional-level rubrics to accompany outcomes
  - Once outcomes are created/configured, they can be imported and linked to individual courses
  - Assignments can be linked to a specific outcome and rubric
  - Can be efficient to review an assignment based on a specific outcome and add comments and record a grade
  - Learning can be assigned for credit or not within a specific course (example: evaluating PULs within and across courses without any impact on the course grade)
  - Sample reports can be generated to capture information on outcomes by student/course
  
- Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  - Does the individual instructor have the ability to modify rubrics? Not for higher-level (beyond course) rubrics
    - Can reports be aggregated across an entire course, program, etc.?
    - Will depend on where rubrics are created and what permissions are granted
  - Information being input into Canvas integrated into SIS?
    - Potentially rich data feed that can be integrated; some pilots are underway
    - What is exported out of Canvas is open
  - Where do the data reside?
    - Canvas is not hosted at IU; hosted in the cloud
  - Information being used in conjunction with FLAGS?
    - Natural next step conversation to determine what should occur
  - When do we switch altogether to Canvas?
    - Oncourse will be available at least through the end of summer 2016
    - Goal is to have everyone actively teaching in Canvas by fall 2016
  - Course migration?
    - Hope is that we will have some type of basic migration tool to assist in this effort
  - Combine rosters in one section?
    - Yes, this can occur; works a bit differently in Canvas than in Oncourse
  - ePortfolio platform on Canvas?
    - Limited; an RFP is out now to examine a new ePortfolio platform

### **PRAC Grant Report:**

- Writing Assessment in the Age of the Digital Archive
  - Andy Buchenot, School of Liberal Arts – Department of English  
([buchenot@iupui.edu](mailto:buchenot@iupui.edu))

- Department has an interest in creating a departmental community in order to better understand what is happening in various courses (communication, coordination, alignment)
  - Also wants to determine what kind of writing is happening
- 2 significant gaps were identified, which informed basis for project:
  - Need within department to coordinate/standardize/understand what is occurring in each course
  - Role that computer technology can play in nuanced ways; we are not asking the kinds of questions that we could be doing related to computer technology, assessment, and databases (storing and accessing student work)
- Process:
  - Address gaps in current research on writing assessment by developing a database to store and sort student writing over multiple semesters
  - Develop strategies to begin analyzing student writing qualitatively and quantitatively using the database
  - Collect documents in Oncourse
  - Use Microsoft Access to create database with flexible, searchable records
  - Develop “meta-tagging” system
  - PRAC grant supported opportunity to hire research assistant to work on database design and programming
- Numbers:
  - 3 semesters
  - 53 courses
  - 482 students
  - 1,547 student texts
- Essay types:
  - 51% critical essay
  - 25% creative essay
  - 21% reflective essay
  - 3% other essay
- PULs the department feels are most important:
  - 65% critical thinking
  - 45% core communication
    - Within critical thinking:
      - 46% thought analysis – knowledge, procedures, etc. – was most important outcome
      - Applying and creating knowledge are also highly valued
- Next steps:
  - Now that we have a database that is searchable, we can produce answers to various research questions
  - Bodies of student texts that are targeted to a course or delivery method

- Use digital texts to do broad analysis of texts themselves
- Dissemination:
  - Presented at 2013 Assessment Institute in Indianapolis
  - Presented at 2013 Thomas R. Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition
  - Manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Teaching Writing*
- Future plans:
  - Examine “raw” computer scoring (Word Count, Word Smith, Cometrrix)
  - Begin identifying quantitative traits
  - Develop qualitative research groups (W131 first, English department soon)
  - Continue building partnerships
- Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  - Is database accessible to other departments?
    - Happy to share how to build database, but access cannot be granted due to presence of student identifiers
  - What would have happened if you had received a lot of assignments that were non-textual essays? Could database house them suitably?
    - Have to come up with another set of codes
    - Yes, database can handle these types of assignments
    - Analysis would need to be re-thought based on type of essay
  - Any movement toward multi-modal work in English Department or elsewhere?
    - Little pockets of this exist; in Writing program, long history of introducing students to visual text and then having students respond to the text
  - How do you assess multi-modal documents?
    - Universities have been slow in reliance on differing types of student work
    - Among W131 instructors, there is interest in multi-modal assessment, but there is some uncertainty related to comfort level in this to occur; waiting for a catalyst

### **PRAC Grant Subcommittee**

- Received one proposal for spring semester; recommended for funding
  - Sent by Dr. Cheryl Warner at IUPUC
  - Developing a Comprehensive Assessment System in New Graduate Program in Mental Health Counseling
- PRAC voted to approve and fund this project

### **Trudy Banta:**

- We have had quite a year of PUL discussion:
  - In 2014, we are in Year 5 of PUL evaluation
  - PRAC meetings have discussed some next steps, including what we have learned about what is working, not working, etc.

- Questions remain about how long the cycle should be (3-years; 5-years)
- Ratings of effectiveness in student advising
- Opportunities within Canvas to tag assignments to outcomes
- More workshops will be planned to help with this process
- More work to do related to policy
  
- AAC&U Summer Institute in Vermont
  - Group of faculty and administrators will lead the group in thinking about general education/PULs and recommendations for PRAC

**Stephen Hundley:**

- SHEEO/ AAC&U Multi-state Collaborative
  - IU/IUPUI is participating; more information will be shared at August meeting regarding faculty participation and assignments sought

**Peter Altenburger:**

- Thank you for great work this spring – lot of great strides
- See you all in August!

**Meeting adjourned**