

Program Review and Assessment Committee

March Meeting 2018: Thursday, March 8, 1:30-3:00 pm, AD 1006

Minutes

Attending: K. Alfrey; J. Barbee; L. Bozeman; D. DeMeester; G. Durham; L. Easterling; T. Freeman; J. Gladden; S. Graunke; T. Hahn; M. Hansen; S. Hundley; C. Kacius/K. Rinker; C. Marsiglio; K. Murtadha; H. Mzumara; K. Norris; E. Ramos; K. Sheeler; A. Rao; M. Urtel; S. Weeden; J. Yan

1. Welcome and Review/Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
 - a. T. Freeman called the meeting to order at 1:30pm
 - b. Motion made, seconded and passed to approve Feb. minutes.
2. Overview of the RISE Taxonomies — Jennifer Thorington Springer, Director of IUPUI RISE Program and Associate Professor of English; Brian Benedict, Assistant Director for Internships, DUE; Amy Powell, Director of Themed Learning Communities, DUE; Morgan Studer, Director of Faculty and Community Resources, DUE. (40 minutes)
 - a. T. Freeman welcomed guests and highlighted the recently published AACU article regarding the taxonomies.
 - b. **J. Thorington-Springer** IUPUI has gained recognition for RISE (HIPs), but there are challenges:
 - i. Fidelity – are the faculty adhering to the RISE criteria as initially intended?
 - ii. Course tags – either missing the tag, even though it was taught as such; or, tagged as RISE, but no longer taught as such
 - c. Taxonomies were created to look at quality and implementation – Created/Informed by the literature, VALUE Rubrics, how it is being implemented currently, characteristics of HIPs done well.
 - d. Intended benefits of taxonomies- quality course/program development, fidelity, assessment, resource (e.g., faculty going up on excellence in teaching, reviewing grants or courses)
 - e. Challenges of this initiative:
 - i. Instructor suspicion (e.g., fear of using this to evaluate faculty teaching). Instead, they are grounded in student success, valued as a resource/tool, facilitate a process for input
 - ii. Incentives
 - iii. Taxonomy vs rubric (rubric appears to be judgmental, so stuck with taxonomy), low/medium/high descriptors --- now high, higher, highest (to avoid “not doing it well enough”)
 - f. **M. Studer** – multiple definitions of SL and the taxonomy helps to clarify what we mean. Informed by the literature. Benefit – it illustrates what SL “looks like.” Feedback from faculty – “now I know what you want”, disproved assumptions and makes faculty feel like they are/can do SL. We use it in faculty development, a faculty learning community, national conferences – also to get

feedback so that it's useful. The 6 attributes are not all of the attributes associated with SL, but are what they narrowed down to as the core.

- g. FLC on SL Taxonomy (see objectives on slides). RISE Community of Practice also informed changes to the taxonomies as well as the support for using these.
- h. **B. Benedict** – internships taxonomy was created by looking at what others include in their course. A quick search resulted in 9 courses, only 2 of which included reflection. Discovered that there is a lot that can be done to improve the quality of internship experiences. And, there are some great practices we can consider. Relied upon 4 professional organizations for guidance (see citations – AACU, Cooperative Education and Internship Association, NACE, CAS)
- i. Starting point – every internship has value. Then, using the high/higher/highest mentality to work from there. Unique feature/challenge – you can't just hand it to people and expect them to go do it. Most like to look at examples, so we decided to create an example of our own to illustrate the levels.
- j. **A. Powell** – TLCs = a First year seminar paired with 2 gen ed courses that uses an overall theme. The TLC advisory board used the literature – “what makes a TLC different than if they just took these 3 courses by themselves?” Identified 5 attributes (see slide – these also became the rows of the taxonomy). Timeline – highlights the evolution that resulted in the current version (includes who was involved in the initial design, when feedback was given, pilot tested, revisions, finalized).
- k. To do this, support structures are really important. This spring is the “Big Wahooie” – a combined event of gateways, TLCs, FYE, Summer Bridge – this spring (Register [HERE](#)). Aligning the taxonomy with the TLC planning document. Encouraging teams to do at least one activity outside the classroom – we handle the logistics, the instructors dream it.
- l. Changes – increase the quality of TLC team plans – because we've more clearly defined what we are asking for in the plans. Increase in the # of out-of-class activities (2015=34; 2016=100; 2017=123). Teams want to do this, especially when they have the support from our office. Seen an increase in SL- study 2 years ago showed that students in an SL TLC had higher success rates and sharing those findings has resulted in an increase. The direct measures of integrative learning assessment (VALUE Rubric) improved the way that faculty wrote their assignment the following year. Working with Steve Graunke to bring this to scale.
- m. J. Thorington-Springer – what we can do moving forward...how we've gotten faculty to use this. What's the impact? S. Graunke – Idea - look at the relationship between the score on the taxonomy to a score on the rubric (ideal). If anyone is interested in doing that type of work, please let us know..great SoTL project.
- n. J. Gladden – the taxonomies are great – thanks to everyone who has contributed. The impact of these is only as good as how much they are used. The goal is to get widespread utilization, especially when scholarship comes out of it. We encourage you share – promote their availability, usability, and potential impact.
- o. T. Freeman -What have you learned about applying them in working with faculty?

- p. M. Studer – I’m surprised as to how much faculty like them. One faculty said “I only want to stay in level 1”. What that triggered for me – we know what we need to talk about. I’m not trying to push you in a direction you aren’t interested in going into. Guides faculty development and how to best work with them.
- q. T. Hahn – in our FLC we did a survey for the taxonomy – faculty were excited about hearing from the student perspective compared to how the faculty member designed the experience (see surveys).
- r. B. Benedict – my colleague always wanted to implement this, but couldn’t bring it to scale. They developed peer reflection into the course based upon the taxonomy best practices.
- s. J. Gladden – this is great for faculty overseeing internships – focus on teaching and learning. It is a pretty significant way to bring them to a HIP.
- t. M. Studer – this protects our community partners because it illustrates how faculty should be working with partners to co-design the experience. Promotes mutually-beneficial and reciprocal partnerships.
- u. T. Freeman – research and international taxonomies? J. Thorington-Springer – The community of practice will continue this. We have also received other requests (i.e., ePortfolios). Patti Clayton will be here to give feedback on the others as part of the CoP.
- v. A. Rao – will there be a 4th column that emerges based upon the scholarship that is developed? J. Thorington-Springer – these are living documents, so we hope that these continue to grow and evolve as additional ideas emerge.

3. Discussion about New York Times Op-Ed, “The Misguided Drive to Measure ‘Learning Outcomes,’” by Molly Worthen – Stephen Hundley (40 minutes). Please read the piece prior to the PRAC meeting to prepare for discussion:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/23/opinion/sunday/colleges-measure-learning-outcomes.html>

S. Hundley – Many of you are on the ASSESS List-serve (for advanced practitioners, but many of you would benefit from joining the group). We partner with them in a variety of ways (Assessment Institute, their June conference, on-going topic-based conversations). The Chronicle had this, but the New York Times piece really got a lot of attention. While challenging, it does accurately represent some perceptions of academics. The comments illustrate a great deal of agreement as well. We thought it might be interesting to look at it as it relates to our work as PRAC and the work of assessment at IUPUI.

Group discussions - see handout. Identify a scribe and spokesperson.

1. Agreements/disagreements – we could recognize many of the things described – poorly conceived assessment as it is currently practiced in some places. Assessment done well is hard. DENT - lots of coursework and it all boils down to passing a test. To get beyond that requires a great deal of time and \$.
2. Colleagues would agree with a lot of it, but assessment done well does have value.
3. The example provided – who came up with that? Assessment should be meaningful as opposed to coming from above. Critiques the whole industry using one example.

4. The author is an Asst. professor and many Ph.Ds are not taught assessment in grad school. This also conflicts with her idea of what she thought she would be doing.
5. We aren't talking about poorly prepared students and how we should handle this. How do we talk about that amongst our colleagues? And does assessment push them through or help us address their needs?
6. Can we send her an invitation to the Assessment Institute? HA!
7. Tried to understand the writers perspective--- 3 themes: Measurement, Use, Value
 - a. Measurement – it's really hard to measure these complex constructs
 - b. Use – collect all of this – does it improve student learning?
 - c. Value – this is a lot of time and money – does it really make a difference?
 Meta – level assessment --- should we evaluate our assessment processes (effectiveness, ROI, is the juice worth the squeeze)
8. Capitalist quote – what's the value of an education.
9. Tensions – need to use it, but also want to build it so that it can be part of SoTL.
10. How do we ensure assessment is meaningful...ensure we document the assessment – goals, processes, outcomes (when possible), changes that are made.
11. We agree that the volume of work is a huge. We appreciate the inequity raised and not sure if assessment is the space for that. But also inequity across colleges/departments. Also inequities as to how we assess.
12. Disagreed that assessment is dumbing down the university. It does serve to make the institution better.
13. Agree –people that care the most about quality of education gravitate towards assessment roles and therefore, perhaps has contributed to the increased time, resources, attention.
14. How can students who graduate sustain the skills they have? – sustaining these throughout the workplace.
15. National board exams and the pass rates – why are people failing?
16. Is there a disconnect between the PRAC reports? Are we contributing to the notions raised in this article?

4. Announcements (5 minutes)

L. Bozeman - March 30th meeting of international affairs liaisons – representatives are coming to talk about the Global Learning module of NSSE from the perspective of the disciplines if you are interested. (about 30min from 1-3:00pm – more to come as to exact time).

K. Norris – IUPUI received the Engaged Campus Award from Indiana Campus Compact.

S. Hundley – priority deadline for A.I. is tomorrow.

K. Sheeler – a 3rd iteration of the PULs/PCLs was released Monday and the feedback process ends this month.

5. Adjournment Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, April 19 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall (AD) 1006

Thursday, May 10 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall (AD) 1006