

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, January 16, 2020, AD 1006

1:30 – 3:00pm

Agenda/Minutes

Attendees: Karen Alfrey, Peter Altenburger, Rick Bentley, Leslie Bozeman, Jerry Daday, Julie Davis, Joe DeFazio, Steve Graunke, Daniel Griffith, Tom Hahn, Michele Hansen, Carole Kacius, Susan Kahn, Caleb Keith, Jennifer Lee, Katharine Macy, Clif Marsiglio, Khaula Murtadha, Howard Mzumara, Sonia Ninon, Kristin Norris, Jeffry Thigpen, Elizabeth Wager, Crystal Walcott, Scott Weeden

Remote attendees: Deborah DeMeester, Lynn Dombrowski, David Farber, Tyrone Freeman, Linda Houser, Carole Kacius, Suzann Lupton, Pamela Morris, Saptarshi Purkayastha, Anusha Rao

1. Welcome, review and approve meeting minutes (5 minutes)

T. Hahn called the meeting to order at 1:31 pm. Motion was made to approve minutes. Seconded by S. Ninon and unanimously approved.

2. Themes from *Research and Practice in Assessment* (30 minutes) – Nick Curtis, Director of Assessment, Marquette University; and Editor of *Research and Practice in Assessment* (learn more about this Journal at <http://www.rpajournal.com/>)

Nick: Excited to be with you today to share a provocative issue in assessment. Stephen approached me and asked me to speak about a provocative issue in assessment. I then asked, “Which one?” So, I will provide two options and let you decide which to cover today. They are: “How to move assessment practice from one of evaluation and improvement to one of innovation” or “Student partnership in assessment.”

The group voted for the second topic.

I’ve been working on this for 5-6 years. The presentation is titled “Students: The missing link in program-level assessment.”

(Re)Introduction to the Assessment Cycle: 1. Specify student learning outcomes. 2. Create and map curriculum to outcomes. 3. Select or design instruments. 4. Examine implementation fidelity. 5. Collect information about outcomes. 6. Analyzing data, reporting results, and maintaining information. 7. Use results for program improvement.

What’s missing from the cycle? Nick thinks it’s students. Everything in the cycle is about faculty and staff driving the cycle. Nothing is framed about what students know or do related to the cycle. Essentially, we’ve been making assumptions in program level

assessment for year. There may be cases where it is true we know best, but there may be cases where it is not.

Student Partnership is a field of study Nick has explored as it related to assessment. Shared a definition by Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felton (2014).

- Student partnership is a process, not an outcome.
- Student partnership is reciprocal.
- Student partnership requires and inspires mutual respect and shared responsibility.

Student Partnership in the Assessment Cycle: Assumptions, Considerations, and Doing It Better

Specify student learning outcomes:

Considerations

- Do your students know about program outcomes?
- Do they interpret them in the same way as you?
- Do they know why the outcomes are important?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to increase awareness of program outcomes
- Partner with students to develop outcomes a shared understanding and vocabulary
- Partner with students to foster a share understanding of the importance of the outcomes

Create and map curriculum to outcomes

Considerations

- Do your educational experiences align with the needs of students attempting to construct the knowledge and skills necessary?
- Do your students know that the educational experiences you provide link to outcomes?
- Do they know that experiences are often scaffolded over time?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to foster ownership and co-creation of their own program-level learning
- Partner with students to increase awareness of the link between outcomes and programming
- Partner with students to make the scaffolding of a program explicit

Select or design instruments

Considerations

- Do your students know that we collect program-level assessment information about outcomes?
- Do they interpret assessments in the same way as you? (if not, that is a HUGE issue)
- Do they know why the assessments are important?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to increase awareness of program outcomes assessment
- Partner with students to develop assessments with a shared understanding
- Partner with students to increase awareness of importance and improve motivation

Examine implementation fidelity

Considerations

- Do your students understand the intent of your educational experiences?
- Do those educational experiences always go as planned?
- Do students who experience educational experiences that occur differently than planned need extra support?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to increase awareness of educational intent
- Partner with students to assess implementation fidelity
- Partner with students to provide supplemental instruction to support outcomes

Collect information about outcomes

Considerations

- Are your students motivated to provide accurate assessment information?
- Are students always fully honest in giving responses to assessment questions?
- Do students connect their educational experiences to the assessments?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to increase motivation during assessment
- Partner with students to improve the accuracy of information
- Partner with students to ensure that our assessments are reflecting educational experiences

Analyzing data, reporting results, and maintaining information

Considerations

- Are you, as a non-student, interpreting the assessment information correctly?
- Is your perspective the same as your students?
- Do other faculty believe, trust, and care about the results of assessment information?
- Do your assessments tell the whole story?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to interpret 'why' assessment data is the way it is
- Partner with students to ensure that we interpret assessment data from the learning (not teaching) perspective

- Partner with students to collect and analyze deeper, richer qualitative information to support other assessment methods

Use results for program improvement

Considerations

- Are your assessment results used logically and intentionally to inform changes to your program?
- Are those logical, intentional changes effective in improving student learning?
- Do students know that assessment information is used in this way?

Possibilities

- Partner with students to develop interventions most likely to work – from the learner’s perspective
- Partner with students in re-implementing the assessment cycle to evaluate the effectiveness of changes
- Partner with students to foster a shared understanding of the purpose of assessment

The underlying assumption we make is that what we do helps students with their learning. Partnering with students may improve motivation and improve clarity.

How often have you given something back to students and they say, “That’s not what I meant” or “That’s not what I thought you meant”?

If there is no regard for the method or findings, it because difficult to move to the final step of program improvement. Assessment needs to be focused on the learning perspective and not the teaching perspective.

Are the results used logically and intentionally to inform changes? Partner with students to develop interventions most likely to work from the learner’s perspective.

S. Kahn: I read a lot of the assessment report generated by our academic and co-curricular units. There is typically a gap between the assessment findings and the improvement process. My sense is that improvements are often based on information feedback from students, as opposed to the formal assessment process. I’m not sure I think this is a bad thing, but it does leave a gap when thinking about closing the loop.

Nick: I often frame student partnerships in assessment because of the fact that faculty care about students. I believe that faculty would make changes based on informal student feedback, even if it goes against findings from formal assessment processes. I think it is less common because many faculty and staff members do not feel student involvement/partnership is acceptable in this type of assessment.

T. Hahn: In running focus groups, I realized that I didn’t always know what they were talking about, due to their expressions. I felt old.

Nick: When I ran focus groups as a grad student, they give different answers to an undergraduate research partner than they gave to me. And it dawned on me, of course students are going to be more open and honest with their peers.

The current format of higher education works against this type of involvement for students. What challenges do you think exist if we were to implement this type of partnership?

K. Norris: Important to distinguish the difference between student partnership and student involvement. My fear is that we might be “using” students to benefit us and not using it as a mutually beneficial partnership or relationship.

Nick: Exactly. There is a huge difference between student involvement, representation, and involvement. I don't think there's a problem with student voice models or representation models if that is what you are calling them. I think the problem comes if you say you are using a student partnership model, but are in reality using a student voice or representation model. And, I'm not saying that all of higher education should be a student partnership model. I try to reserve partnership for the things that are most beneficial for students and faculty.

3. Program Review Panel (30 minutes) – Susan Kahn (Planning and Institutional Improvement, Moderator), Charles Feldhaus (Engineering and Technology), David Craig (Liberal Arts), Brent Arnold (Health and Human Sciences)

C. Feldhaus: I'm nervous because Stephen Hundley was chair before me. We are an unaccredited program in the School of Engineering and Technology. We are a leadership program. We have a certificate in Human Resource Development. Our masters in the MS in Technology. Undergrad headcount is 164 (via Elizabeth Wager). We generate a number of credit hours, but necessarily from our majors. Our graduation is on the increase. We're on a trajectory for 90 this year. We help with ABET accreditation through a number of courses.

In 2016, had an external review take place, because the previous review had been performed in 2003. Following the results, we have implemented an overhaul of the curriculum. We have been engaging in a strategic planning process for the department. We then looked at our brand and image and then worked on our curriculum. We now have swag and have updated our website.

They key is that it took 2 years to work on our curriculum.

There's a new “us”. We have a new brand. We have a pep in our step.

We are one of two departments in our school with positive headcount and credit hours.

Mentoring is a huge component of our department. We want to folks to know about and fit into our department culture. We use this more than a faculty reward system.

B. Arnold: The Department of Health Sciences has gone through a fair bit of transition. As the primary undergraduate department, we had structures different from the other departments in the school, including advisors. The bachelor's degree has 435 students

in it. Until this year, we were the fastest growing undergraduate major on campus. I think we may not grow the way we were, but may level off in the future.

As a guess, I'd say maybe 5% of my graduates get into the healthcare profession field. Our master's degree has had very low enrollment, sometimes no students in some years. We're continuing to monitor this degree.

In the self-study we looked at 11 questions that were grouped together. The first set was about faculty and enrollment issues. The majority of my courses are taught by adjuncts. We currently have six faculty members. The second grouping of questions were about the undergraduate curriculum and if we had it configured to align with the current job market. The third grouping of questions was about our PhD program and the funding mechanism to get students here.

I think our report was more confirmatory than one of discovery. My faculty retreat went through a rigorous SWOT analysis that informed and drove our 11 questions. We were surprised by the clear responses about staff (recommended we add 9 faculty or reduce enrollment). There was concern about whether or not there was a clear student community in the department.

I had to share staffing concerns with the Dean. One of the other things I did was to build a spreadsheet and then prioritized and categorized items. We knocked out approximately 50% of the recommendations in the first year. We are still dealing with several of the long-term items.

Another area of focus was flexibility in the curriculum. It was recognized and valued in the report. We also got recognition for strong, outstanding tenure-track faculty in the program.

D. Craig: Undergraduate program only. Most of our courses are service courses. However, only 25% of our students are first-year. We teach writing and encourage students to perform high-level work. We were looking for research as we conducted our self-study. This was important in addition to serving students. The team said you are doing well, but there are way to improve.

We wanted to find out better ways to support and attract student through better communication. The program-review said that the program was being adversely affected by politics and decisions in the legislature.

We received practical advice about strategies to assess courses and review curriculum. We changed our major as a result.

You need to think about what you want to come out of your self-study. What directions are you interested in exploring? Taking students out into the community is important to us, especially as we think about diversity.

We found that morale was low and we were perceived as not being great at service. As such, we revised our faculty annual review process and panel.

We were encouraged to think about a master's degree in applied religious studies. We did focus groups with advisors in University College. We were encouraged to celebrate our successes. We began showcase a faculty member every semester and invited guests. We drafted and approved by-laws for the first time. We made changes to the major and are teaching more in the Christian tradition.

4. Update on *Year of the Capstone – Next Steps*, (10 minutes) – Jerry Daday, Executive Associate Dean, Institute for Engaged Learning

J. Daday: This is an initiative of Academic Affairs and PAII. How can we elevate what is happening with the capstones on campus. We wanted to learn about the experience on campus and provide opportunities for faculty to engage in structured activities. We wanted folks to be aware of the new capstones taxonomies on capstones.

In September, we did a World Café in the campus center that was attended by approximately 50 faculty members. There is a great deal of diversity related to capstone experiences on campus. There is some intentional scaffolding and in other cases it is less structured. Some have learning outcomes, some don't. Some have learning outcomes aligned with IUPUI+, some don't. Some student face barriers related to costs associated with capstones. We learned we need a funding mechanism that faculty can apply to in order to offset these costs for students.

We want to create a capstone webpage so that we can market the showcases of competence. We're also planning to have an Engaged Learning week that is showcased in the campus center for two hours (during lunch) Monday through Thursday. Our hope is that some of these are capstone projects. We want schools to send their best capstones.

Future professional development, based on a meeting with capstone faculty discussing the taxonomies. So, we are planning some faculty and professional development related to capstones, specifically as it relates to scaffolding. Some of this may be done with backwards design. Additionally, we want to ensure that the profiles are evident to the students in the capstone experience. Faculty articulated a desire for help with assessment strategies and reflection prompts. They want help identifying deliverables that would allow students to demonstrate learning as a product of the capstone. Faculty also want help with engaging stakeholders off- and on-campus.

Some faculty suggested it might be helpful if capstones were included as part of the PRAC report. It might be useful to discuss taxonomies in the PRAC report. Some faculty describe the variance in capstones as "inequality."

We have a capstone listserv with 107 members who have participated in the community of practice. Our next working lunch will review the capstone prompts. We will also do a charrette and we will then TILT them. We hope to have the capstone website up at the end of the month.

We will be doing some work on some of the taxonomies in the spring semester.

5. Leadership for Assessment and Improvement: Institutional Imperatives and Stakeholder Engagement and 2020 Assessment Institute Call for Proposals (10 minutes) – Susan Kahn

S. Kahn: We're passing around two calls for submissions. As you know, Stephen and I recently published a book and we are now working on a second book. We are looking to acquire more vignettes to include in the book. While we are past the original deadline, we are very low in submissions for some of the areas. We are particularly low in submissions of vignettes regarding external stakeholders. Please think about a submission and contact me if you have any questions.

The second call is for the Assessment Institute. We always like to have good IUPUI sessions to help bolster the quality of the institute. You are likely aware this is the oldest and largest assessment conference in the country. We have a number of tracks and also have ways to include items that may not fit in one of the tracks.

Please talk to me about questions for either of these calls.

6. Announcements (5 minutes)

T. Hahn: If you have colleagues who are hesitant to submit for The Record, we can help with that. We have students who can assist.

Please remember Celebrate IUPUI Day on Tuesday, January 21.

T. Hahn adjourned the meeting at 2:57 pm.

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

- Thursday, February 20, 2020, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, March 12, 2020, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, April 23, 2020, 1:30—3:00 pm
- Thursday, May 14, 2020, 1:30—3:00 pm



Year of the Capstone

**Update for PRAC Committee
January 16, 2020**

Institute for Engaged Learning, IUPUI

IUPUI

Year of the Capstone

- Initiative of Academic Affairs and Planning and Institutional Improvement
- Elevate the excellent work our students and their mentors are doing with Capstones
 - Learn more about structure of existing capstone experiences
 - Provide opportunities for faculty to participate in a formalized PD and CoP
 - Promote new IUPUI [Capstone Taxonomy](#);
 - Capture student participation and learning in these experiences (i.e. the Record)
 - Provide outlets for students to showcase Capstone projects



What have we learned?

- Diversity of capstone experiences
 - Across and within departments
 - Some intentional scaffolding across curriculum
 - Wide range: highly structured to varied student experiences
- Learning outcomes
 - Some alignment to old PULs and Profiles
- There is a cost barrier for students
 - some departments/schools offer assistance (poster-printing; supplies and resources)
 - need for a funding source that faculty can access (Institute is developing a program)



What have we learned?

- Public Display of Competence – important feature of a high-impact practice like capstone
 - Some Schools have a “Capstone Showcase” – others don’t
 - Opportunity to coordinate & publicize existing showcases (Capstone Webpage on IEL site)
 - Alternative option: Engaged Learning Week
 - Need for wider dissemination of capstone work
 - Employers, community partners
 - Use of ePortfolio
 - Possible database of capstone experiences
 - [IUPUI Record](#)



What have we learned?

- Engaged Learning Week
 - Goal: Elevate and promote the great work of our students in ALL areas of engaged learning; provide opportunity for that public display of competence
 - April 27 to May 1, 2020 in the Campus Center
 - Friday, May 1: traditional research and creative activity / internship day
 - Thursday, April 30: Space available all day Thursday for Schools to host a capstone showcase
 - Monday, Apr 27-Thurs Apr 30 from 11:30-1:30: opportunity for 120-160 students to showcase their engaged learning experiences
 - capstones, ePortfolio, Study Abroad/Global Learning Project, Community Engagement, Internship, Research/C-A, First-Year Experience Projects
 - Application portal will be available end of January



Future Professional Development

- Based on faculty input and suggestions, we have identified several areas for future PD
 - Appropriate scaffolding across curriculum
 - Backward Design – appropriately aligned learning outcomes
 - Integrate Profiles
 - How do we make the Profiles prominent for students in Capstone experiences? (not just for our assessment efforts – but for students to own)
 - Assessment Strategies
 - Reflection Prompts (depth, how to do it well, grading)
 - Student Deliverables (options, best-practices)
 - Engaging stakeholders on/off campus (faculty/staff within school and from different schools; employers; community partners; etc.)



Additional Ideas and Suggestions

- Make Capstones part of PRAC report for Departments
 - Capstones represent culminating experience; appropriate scaffolding is needed
 - Would help to stimulate conversations of learning outcomes and alignment across major/curriculum
 - Articulate use of taxonomies in PRAC report
- Use Capstone taxonomy in course approval process
 - Wide variety (“inequality”) in student experiences
 - Could ensure some minimum quality in this culminating experience
- Conversations about faculty workload within departments



Next Steps

1. We have a Capstone list-serve (107 members)
2. Capstone Community of Practice (CoP)
 - Meet monthly for 2 hours
 - Each meeting - we do something; improve practice
 - Next meeting – Feb 14 from noon-2:00pm
 - Review Capstone Prompts / Assignments (Charrettes)
 - Additional meetings will address PD items on earlier slide
3. Continue Engaged Learning Week planning
4. Capstone Website (part of Institute's site) – in work (ex. Publicize showcases in schools)

Please reach out with any questions, concerns or ideas/suggestions: Jerry Daday
(jdaday@iupui.edu)

