

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, January 22, 2004

1:30 to 3:00 p.m., UL 1126

Joyce Mac Kinnon, Chair

Karen Johnson, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1. Approval of December Minutes.....J. MacKinnon
2. Subcommittee Reports Subcommittee Chairs
3. Action ResearchM. Hansen and V. Borden
4. End-of-Course Assessments and P-16 and ICHE Plans T. Banta and H. Mzumara

MINUTES –

Present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, D. Appleby, S. Baker, T. Banta, K. Black, D. Boland, P. Boruff-Jones, C. Dobbs, E. Gonzalez, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen, K. Johnson, E. Jones, J. Kuczkowski, J. Mac Kinnon, D. McSwane, K. Morrow, H. Mzumara, J. Orr, M. Plummer, K. Rome, E. Sener, J. Smith, C. Souch, and C. Yokomoto

Guest: Vic Borden

The minutes of the PRAC meeting of December 11, 2003, were approved as written.

Erdogan Sener volunteered to chair the grants subcommittee. Trudy Banta reminded the group that it is important for committee members to encourage colleagues to submit projects.

Sharon Hamilton reported on the Capstone Faculty Learning Community, which is looking at capstone courses across campus to establish benchmarks for achievement of the standards that the Faculty Council approved and that were identified by the summer academy team.

Hamilton also reported on the ePort subcommittee. Charlie Yokomoto will serve as the PRAC liaison to the ePort Management Committee.

Two questions were raised about the PULs: Should they be expanded to graduate level or considered as principles for lifelong learning? Betty Jones asked about the possible inclusion of health and wellness as basic goals and noted that these are conspicuously absent on a campus with such a large health component. Others noted the absence of civic responsibility in the PULs and pointed out that many other institutions include civic responsibility and/or wellness in their basic goals. Other suggestions for revision to the PULs included graphical communication and visual communication. Joyce Mac Kinnon asked if the committee wished to reopen the topic of the PULs, and a subcommittee to revisit the PULs was formed, consisting of Sarah Baker, Betty Jones, Catherine Souch, Howard Mzumara, William Agbor-Baiyee, Sharon Hamilton, and Joe Kuczkowski. Joe questioned the wisdom of changing the PULs just as they are becoming well-

known and accepted as they are, and one of the subcommittee's charges will be to consider this question.

Donna Boland reported for the Program Review Subcommittee. In its last meeting, the subcommittee sought to identify priorities based on what could be done well in the time frame. They are looking at comments by the accreditation team, and Karen Black has made a spread sheet. The subcommittee is looking at the themes that appear in these comments, focusing especially on the strengths and weaknesses of IUPUI, as well as on trends and potential implications. They are considering interviewing the chairs of departments that have gone through review.

Michele Hansen (director of assessment for University College) and Vic Borden (IMIR) presented a report on Action Research, a new trend in Institutional Research, based on initial theory by Kurt Lewin and others in organizational management. This model emphasizes collaborative work between institutional researchers and administrators or others who are engaged in assessment/analysis. Rather than the administrator or group simply requesting data and analysis from the institutional research office, they work with office staff in all parts of the process, from defining the problem, clarifying who will receive data and what it will be used for, instrument design, data collection, making plans based on research, and even report production and delivery.

Borden and Hansen offered two case studies based on work they have done for the IUPUI Diversity Cabinet and for University College on assessing orientation.

Questions centered on means of facilitating collaboration so that time is not wasted and on considerations about Chancellor Bantz's doubling initiative and the move to PeopleSoft.

Joyce Mac Kinnon noted that President Herbert complimented both Trudy Banta and IMIR at the Faculty Council meeting.

Trudy Banta introduced a report by Howard Mzumara on the ICHE and P-16 Plans and the End-of-Course Assessments described in the latter. Mzumara's presentation is appended to these minutes. Discussion focused on implications for IUPUI, and PRAC will continue this discussion at the February meeting.

An Action Research Paradigm for Institutional Research

Michele J. Hansen
University College

Victor M. H. Borden
IMIR

Background

- Traditional IR as “information provider”
 - External accountability
 - Senior administration aggregate data needs
 - Resource allocation, budgeting, planning
- Any real “research” is campus-wide study, perhaps with some “drill down”
- Integration of IR and Assessment nurtures a collaborative research approach
- Action Research paradigm offers a useful framework for this

Overview

- Introduction and Literature Review
- Action Research Paradigm contrasted with Traditional Institutional Research Paradigm
- Applications of the Action Research Model
- Potential Barriers to Action Research
- Implications and Conclusions
- Discussion

Introduction and Literature Review

- Kurt Lewin and Colleagues – Linking Organizational Surveys to Action
- Program Evaluation and Educational Reform
- Action Learning and Action Research
- Current Applications of the Action Research Model – Education and Health Care
- Accreditation – Emphasis on Implementing Improvements based on Outcome Evaluations
- Institutional Change – Fostering Support and Commitment through Participation.

Action Research Paradigm

- Continuous cycle of data collection → data analysis → data feedback → action plans → data collection
- Stakeholder empowerment through active and on-going participation
- Data feedback meetings promote collaboration, dialogue, and collective analysis
- Active learning and discovery fostered by critical reflection process
- Data-driven action plans developed = research linked to action

Research Question and Evaluation Focus

Traditional

- Given to researcher
 - Top-down directive
 - Bottom-up request
- Clarification of request
 - Discussion of context and use

Action Research

- Developed together
 - Requester or researcher
- Specific questions often deferred until vested parties brought together

Data Collection

Traditional

- Researcher finds and collects data
- Researcher accountable for integrity of information

Action Research

- Stakeholders have role
 - Collecting data
 - Learning about nuances
- Shared responsibility for integrity

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Traditional

- Researchers responsible through dissemination
- May consult with stakeholders to gain insight into the results

Action Research

- Stakeholders involved in stages of data analysis
- Preliminary results presented and discussed
 - Further analyses shaped by those discussions.

Report Presentation and Dissemination

Traditional

- Researcher prepares and often presents results to stakeholders

Action Research

- Presentation and report writing responsibilities shared
- Presentations involve
 - active discussion
 - facilitation of action plan development

Follow-up

Traditional

- Some additional analyses may be requested or perhaps some clarification
- Often the end of the process

Action Research

- Stakeholders design action plan based on results
- Data collection included in follow-up plan
- Further lines of inquiry established for next cycle of research

Application 1: Diversity Indicators

- **Research Question Focus - From “summative evaluation” to “formative process”**
- **Data Collection – Range of sources, iterative process**
- **Data Reporting and Feedback – Indicators assembled for review and development of a rating system**
- **Development of Action Plans**
- **Action – In response to “high priority indicators” reports completed to facilitate dialogue and understanding**
- **Assessment - Exploratory gives way to confirmatory and formative/summative mix; monitoring implementation of actions taken**

Application 2: Evaluation of New Student Orientation

- **Research Question and Evaluation Focus** – reassessment of goals; incoming students' needs; impacts on knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors
- **Data Collection** – focus groups and questionnaires, sought perspectives of all major stakeholders
- **Data Reporting and Feedback** – meetings with orientation leaders and faculty stakeholders
- **Development of Action Plans** – facilitation of dialogue and data-driven proposals
- **Action** – implementation of proposed changes
- **Assessment** – on-going formative evaluation; re-administration of process and outcome instruments

Potential Barriers

- Role ambiguity and comfort level of administrator (in role of researcher) and researcher (in role of administrator)
- Participation is fundamental and essential, but may not be perceived as positive by all stakeholders (role overload, role conflict and more meetings!)

Potential Barriers

- Emotional barriers
- Political obstacles
- Managerial Control Imperatives

Seo, M. G. (2003). Overcoming emotional barriers, political obstacles, and control imperatives in the action-science approach to individual and organizational learning. *Academy of Management: Learning and Education*, 2(1), 7-21.

Overcoming Potential Barriers

- Clearly explain roles and expectations
- Establish atmosphere of openness and trust
- Up-build positive affect
- Leverage opposing forces
- Bring external legitimacy to the organization.

Implications

- Useful paradigm for linking assessment data with action
- Effective paradigm for conducting formative program evaluations, meeting accreditation requirements, and implementing organizational change
- Powerful data deployment approach
- Effective approach for minimizing resistance to change

Discussion

Program Review and Assessment Committee – Jan. 22, 2004

Indiana P-16 Plan and Core 40 End-of-Course Assessments

Presentation for Members of the Program Review
and Assessment Committee (January 22, 2004).

Trudy W. Banta & Howard R. Mzumara
tbanta@iupui.edu hmzumara@iupui.edu

Background...

- ❖ Increased demand and greater expectation for the vast majority of students to successfully complete education beyond high school ...
- ❖ Providing all Indiana children with the academic foundation they need to navigate a “high-tech” and complex world is the basis of the Education Roundtable’s P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement.
- ❖ Commitment to provide a high quality education for all students to succeed ...

Background ... continued

- ❖ **P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement:**
 - **Ensuring all students succeed at every level:**
 - Pre-Kindergarten (early learning/school readiness)
 - K-12
 - Higher Education

- ❖ **Framework for Policy & Planning Dev't in Higher Ed:**
 - **Goal 2: Improve student preparation** (see pp. 9-11)
 - Increase collegiate preparation to maximize the potential for student success

Greater Expectations: Dual Goals

- ❖ Access to college learning of high quality for every student in the country, and
- ❖ Appropriate preparation for all to succeed at this demanding level.

Ref: AAC&U (2002). Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college. (National Panel Report) Washington, DC: Author. Online document available at: www.greaterexpectations.org

(see chapter 2: Barriers to Quality from School to College)

Barriers to Achieving Higher Ed Goals

- ❖ Many entering students spend much of the first year catching up, particularly in mathematics and writing.
- ❖ High drop out rates (low retention rates, etc.)
- ❖ Continuing differential impact on minority groups and economically disadvantaged, who disproportionately need remedial courses and leave college before completing their degrees.

Some Barriers to Readiness

Traditional age and older students face:

- ❖ The misalignment of high school work with college entry expectations
- ❖ The chaotic borderland between school and college
- ❖ Uneven preparation for independent, demanding college-level study
- ❖ The wasted senior year

Indiana's P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement

- ❖ A strategic framework for aligning policies, resources, and strategies across all sectors of Indiana's education system – with support for realizing improvements called for in *P.L. 146-1999*, *P.L. 221-1999*, and *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*.

P-16 Plan Key Components

❖ **Academic Standards, Assessment, & Accountability** (see page 5 of P-16 Plan)

- Clear and challenging K-12 academic standards in English/Language Arts, math, science, and social studies.
- Statewide assessments for measuring Core 40 academic standards.
- Accountability for school improvement and student learning.

❖ **Ensuring College & Workforce Success** (pp.15-16)

- Insist on high-quality, rigorous academic curriculum for all. Make Core 40 the required high school curriculum.
- Ensure the quality, consistency, and alignment of high school curriculum and instruction to Indiana's Academic Standards by implementing Core 40 ECA system
- Use appropriate End-of-Course Assessments as college placement exams

P-16 Plan Key Components continued

- ❖ Eliminating Achievement Gaps and Ensuring Academic Progress for All Students (pp. 12-14)
- ❖ Higher Education and Continued Learning
 - **Preparation for success** (see p. 20)
 - Require Core 40 or Academic Honors completion as a minimum public college admission requirement and as a mandatory state financial aid requirement for students attending public four-year universities in Indiana.
 - Use Core 40 ECAs as college placement information, eliminating current need for students to take college placement tests after they are admitted.

Ensuring College & Workforce Success

- Ensure Indiana's requirements for high school graduation provide students with the academic foundation necessary for the demands of college and a knowledge-based economy.
- Insist on high-quality, rigorous academic curriculum for all. Make Core 40 the "default" high school curriculum.

Higher Education & Continued Learning

- **Preparation for Success** – Maximize the potential for college degree completion by aligning college and university admission standards, remediation policies, and state-provided financial aid with the preparation needed to succeed in college.
- **Accountability** – Implement an accountability system and public report card for the state's higher education sector and for state-supported workforce training programs.

Core 40 End-of-Course Assessments (ECAs)

Indiana Department of Education

www.doe.state.in.us/core40

Center for Innovation in Assessment:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~cia/core40.html>

What are Core 40 ECAs?

- ❖ Core 40 ECAs are final exams measuring what high school juniors and seniors know and are able to do upon completion of targeted Core 40 courses.
- ❖ ECAs are “achievement tests” that are aligned with Indiana’s Academic Standards (for Core 40 courses).
- ❖ Core 40 ECAs have been developed for **English/Language Arts, Math, and Science.**
 - ❖ Other subject areas will be added in the near future ...

How are Core 40 ECAs Developed?

- ❖ Core 40 ECAs are developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) in consultation with committees consisting of Indiana K-12 educators and administrators, higher education faculty, and IDOE staff.
- ❖ Test modes available: the State plans to provide both online and paper-and-pencil formats for 2004 test administration.
 - ❖ Schools will be asked to select only one test administration mode for all students (HS juniors and seniors) participating in the assessments.

Purpose of Core 40 ECAs

- ❖ As part of Indiana's school accountability system (P.L. 221), Core 40 ECAs are designed to ensure the quality, consistency, and rigor of Core 40 courses across the state.
- ❖ Designed to help teachers, students, and parents determine how well students have mastered the content of a given course as defined by the Core 40 Academic Standards.
- ❖ ECAs are indicators of school improvement also designed to facilitate successful transition between secondary and post-secondary education.

2004 Operational Administration of End-of-Course Assessments

- ❖ End-of-Course Assessments for **English 11** and **Algebra I** will be operational this year, following two years of pilot testing in 2002-2003.
- ❖ **2004 Spring Pilot**
Information regarding piloting of End-of-Course Assessments for additional Core 40 courses will be available soon.
- ❖ 2004 test administration for **Algebra I** and **English 11** is planned for May to early-June.

Assessment-related Issues Concerning Core 40 ECAs

- ❖ Time of testing and/or Readiness of students participating in ECAs (cf. content coverage ...)
- ❖ Validity (curricular relevance, etc.) for making course placement decisions in college settings
- ❖ Fairness of Core 40 ECAs in assessing groups of students in different learning environments
- ❖ A “one-size-fits-all” approach to assessment ...
- ❖ Test security (in “high stakes” testing context)
- ❖ Lack of clarity regarding requirements and criteria for determining “pass” or “fail” decisions

Contact Information on ECAs ...

For More Information about the 2004 ECAs:

- Questions and Answers on Core 40 ECAs:
<http://ideanet.doe.state.in.us/core40eca/faq.html>

- For further questions about the Core 40 ECAs, contact:

IN Department of Education's ECA Help Desk

Phone: 317-232-9130

E-mail: eca@doe.state.in.us

Web Address for IN Ed Roundtable

Indiana's Education Roundtable:

www.edroundtable.state.in.us

Open Discussion

Question and Answer Session ...