

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, February 21, 2019, 1:30-3:00 pm, AD 1006

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: K. Alfrey, P. Altenburger, J. Barbee, N. Brehl, A. Chase, D. DeMeester, G. Durham, T. Hahn, Hansen, L. Houser, S. Hundley, C. Kacius, S. Kahn, C. Keith, J. Lee, S. Lowe, C. Marsiglio, P. Morris, K. Murtadha, H. Mzumara, S. Ninon, K. Norris, K. Sheeler, N. VanAndel, S. Weeden, J. Williams, J. Yan, D. Zahl

1. Welcome, Review & Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
2. Equitable Approaches to Assessment – Gianina Baker, Assistant Director, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) (30 minutes)
3. Student Employee Outcomes – Wendy Lin, Assistant Director, Institutional Research and Decision Support (20 minutes)
4. Higher Learning Commission #4 - Stephen Hundley, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor & Susan Kahn, Director of Planning and Institutional Improvement Initiatives (25 minutes)
5. Announcements and Adjournment (10 minutes)

1. Welcome, Review and Approval of Minutes

- a. K. Norris called the meeting to order at 1:30pm. She acknowledged new PRAC members, Dave Zahl and Ina McBean.
- b. Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve January 2019 meeting minutes

Kristin introduced our guest speaker, Gianina Baker, Assistant Director, NILOA.

Stephen Hundley thanked Gianina for joining us and noted that NILOA is a strong supporter of the IUPUI Assessment Institute.

2. Equitable Approaches to Assessment - Gianina Baker, Assistant Director, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)

Gianina Baker: The conversation around equitable approaches to assessment is very important. It kicked off a few years ago. Items to consider included: Thinking about how to apply these principles in your program. Thinking about how it might apply in our roles. How would it affect students?

NILOA was established in 2008 and is co-located at Indiana University and the University of Illinois. The mission of NILOA is to discover and disseminate ways that academic programs and institutions can productively use assessment data internally to inform and strengthen undergraduate education, and externally to communicate with policy makers, families and other stakeholders.

What do equity and assessment look like? What does culturally responsible assessment look like?

Gianina discussed case studies of minorities at various institutions (e.g., North Carolina A&T, Texas A&M, University of Minnesota- Rochester). Campuses were examining the concept of equity and the shift to be more student focused.

A 2015 report examined assessment at minority serving institutions. The assessment approaches were different. They looked at the context of who they served in their mission.

“Assessment continues to be driven by both compliance and improvement with an emphasis on equity.”

Equity is about fairness and judgement. Equality is about sameness.

Gianina Baker: How consequential can assessment approaches be when your assessment approaches are not inclusive of diverse learners? She recommended that we read the NILOA occasional paper 29 (January 2017) on Equity and Assessment.

Students need to demonstrate their learning specifically. What other ways could students demonstrate their learning (besides writing)?

Assessment if not done with equity in mind can reinforce within students the false notion that they do not belong in higher education. While learners may take multiple paths to and through learning, they must demonstrate their knowledge and skills in the same way. However, there are other ways to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. For example, a student from Clemson University recently rapped his entire dissertation and received great reviews.

Gianina discussed being culturally responsive and mindful of the student population being served. There are tools appropriate for different students.

The new Comprehensive Learner Record captures learning when it happens both inside and outside the classroom. It opens up places that were not previously considered.

There are pathways and hidden pieces that we think students know, but they may not. We should be intentional in telling students what they should know.

She recommended the AAC&U Campus Guide, *Committing to Equity and Inclusive Excellence: Campus-Based Strategies for Student Success*.

Questions to consider: What comes to mind as you reflect on your program review process in relation to culturally responsive assessment? How does assessment promote equity, if at all? What resources/tools do you need to do so? It is a lot to wrap your head around.

Questions? We can email Gibaker 44@illinois.edu

Kristin Norris: Have you seen any campuses with community partners as co-educators that external audience assesses student learning?

Gianina Baker: Definitely. There are examples in pockets but not yet widespread. In the next year, we will have more examples.

Stephen Hundley: Perhaps PRAC should have a subcommittee on equity and assessment. You have given us a lot of tools, especially as we implement the IUPUI+.

Kristi Sheeler: This aligns with the work that the Institute for Engaged Learning is doing. The curricular and co-curricular.

Kristin mentioned the recent webinar on assessing pathways. Beyond the gate. Community-engaged SL: Assessing the Campuses mission. Kristin will put this into the Box folder

3. Student Employee Outcomes – Wendy Lin, Assistant Director, Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS)

Kristin introduced Wendy Lin from IRDS

Wendy Lin: I conducted analysis with Janna McDonald on student employment and retention outcomes. IRDS completes this report annually. The question the report examines is *does working on campus increase one-year retention among student workers?*

The report was very time intensive. It took Wendy and Rick Morgan over a month.

Wendy provided a description of IUPUI student workers and the methodology of the study. The study examined undergraduate students who were enrolled at fall, 2017 who held any type of student hourly or contract position on campus between Aug, 2017 and April, 2018. The types of on-campus employment include resident hall managers, research assistants, orientation leaders, and Federal Work Study.

Majority of student workers are female more so than overall student population. They are more likely to be a Pell recipient but have lower levels of unmet needs. They are more academically prepared.

Campus employment is difficult to obtain. Janna has seen job postings with 90 applicants for one job.

The majority of student workers worked 1- 10 hours per week. Seniors worked more hours. Science and nursing pay their students more.

There is a pay rate gap. The average wage for African American students is lower than other groups. The average wage for female students is lower than males.

The one-year retention for fall 2017 first-time, full-and part-time students was approximately 16 percentage points higher than their IUPUI employees who were not employed. For undergraduates only, this rate was 14 percentage points higher.

Students who work on campus are younger students and better students. How much of being a better student is due to employment?

How do we minimize selection bias and confounding factors?

In an observational study sometimes it is not possible to have a comparison group.

To imply causal inferences in this study, Wendy employed Propensity Score Matching (PSM). PSM allow causal inferences from non-experimental (observational) studies. It minimizes selection bias and other confounding factors such as gender, race and socioeconomic status.

The process for PSM includes the following steps:

- 1) Identify appropriate data set (> 200 students).
- 2) Define treatment and control group and outcome.
- 3) Select covariates of interest based on literature or past studies: Gender, race/ethnicity, unmet financial need, high school GPA
- 4) Run algorithms to estimate a *propensity score* for each student.
- 5) Students with exact or similar scores will be matched against each other.
- 6) Run statistical analysis to compare retention rates between the matched groups

Controlling for demographics and other characteristics, the PSM analysis found that retention was still higher for students employed on campus. There was a 7.1 percentage point increase in fall-to-fall retention at IUPUI as a result of working on campus. This difference is statistically significant.

What's next?

- 1) On-campus employment could be an important retention strategy.
- 2) Study results can be used in internal marketing campaigns aimed at incentivizing on-campus employment for students.
- 3) Creating a better data infrastructure that reduces manual clean-up time on the data side.
- 4) Type of position or job responsibilities could be better documented for student workers.
- 5) Creating an institutional culture that promotes the success of working students

- 6) Further examine salary inequities that currently disadvantage female students and students of color.
- 7) What are we doing for students whose financial needs can only be met by working off-campus?
- 8) How do retention/GPA look for off-campus student employees
- 9) Aligning on-campus work positions with IUPUI+

Jane Williams: What about work study eligible students? Were these students work study?

Wendy Lin: This group was a mix. A small percentage were work study.

Wendy Lin: We should look into providing these jobs to more disadvantaged students and encourage them to apply.

4. Higher Learning Commission #4 - Stephen Hundley, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor & Susan Kahn, Director of Planning and Institutional Improvement Initiatives

Stephen Hundley: We will look at Criterion #4 today.

Susan Kahn: There are two criteria that deal with teaching and learning. #4 is more about outcomes.

Should focus on improvement and meeting benchmarks.

Our regional accreditor has a focus on continuous improvement. This is very central to what accreditation is about.

Institutions often get dinged on this issue of improvement. We need to show evidence.

How do we treat credits from other institutions? Credit from experiential courses?

Accreditors want to make sure that we are not a fly by night organization. Ensure that we are a rigorous higher education institution committed to ensuring quality.

The criteria also asks about resources and seeks to ensure that students can access a library and appropriate technologies.

It then looks at learning outcomes assessment. PRAC reports are a major source of evidence for this criterion. An accrediting team might look at this report, especially if you are in a school that does not have specialized accreditation.

Some of our recent speakers have suggested that linking assessment to improvement is not as easy as it seems.

Links between assessment findings and improvement should be clear. This is very important to regional accreditors. They also want to know about our methodologies and that they reflect good practice.

It is a short criterion, but we are generally expected to provide a lot of evidence.

Question: Where does the data for questions 4A#6 come from?

Michele Hansen: We do alumni surveys. We also incorporate in program reviews, First destination survey – students report on employment outcomes

HLC does not prescribe methods.

Kristi Sheeler: Increasing number of students who come in with dual credit. Have do you demonstrate that given the ever increasing number of dual credits are students bring?

Michele Hansen: This applies when we are administering the dual credit. We just have SPAN. We don't have authority over high schools offering dual credit. The entity awarding dual credit has to assure the quality.

Stephen Hundley: That is correct. IUPUI is the acceptor of the credit. We need to articulate our policies on credit acceptance.

Michele Hansen: Students who have dual credits tend to do better than those who do not come in with dual credit.

Stephen Hundley: Next week we will talk about Criterion 5.

Susan Kahn: We may have the final version of the criteria. This may be the last time we look at the beta revision

5. Announcements and Adjournment

Stephen: RFPs for the Assessment Institute are due on March 8 2019.

Kristin adjourned the meeting at 2:46pm

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, March 21, 2019

University Hall 1006

Thursday, April 11, 2019

University Hall 1006

Thursday, May 9, 2019

University Hall 1006