Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, September 11, 2003
1:30-3:00 p.m., UL 1116
Joyce Mac Kinnon, Chair
Karen Johnson, Vice Chair and Recorder

AGENDA –

1.   Approval of May Minutes (attached).......................................J. Mac Kinnon
2.   Welcome .... Charles Bantz and T. Banta
3.   Update on student eportfolio (including conversations with Ivy Tech
              State College), and AAC&U Summer InstituteS.Hamilton and S. Kahn
4.   Discussion of PRAC Mission/Observations
              regarding PRAC Annual Reports .... K. Johnson
5.   Volunteers for Subcommittees ....J. Mac Kinnon
              Grants Review
              Student ePortfolio
              Performance Indicators for Teaching and Learning
              Program Review
6.   Adjournment...J. Mac Kinnon

MINUTES -

Present: W. Agbor-Baiyee, D. Appleby, S. Avgoustis, S. Baker, T. Banta,
K. Black, D. Boland, P. Boruff-Jones, C. Dobbs, S. Hamilton, M. Hansen,
L. Houser, K. Johnson, E. Jones, S. Kahn, L. Kasper, J. Kuczkowski,
J. Mac Kinnon, S. Milosevich, K. Morrow, H. Mzumara, J. Orr, M. Plummer,
I. Queiro-Tajalli, E. Sener, J. Smith, C. Souch, R. Vertner, C. Yokomoto

After the members introduced themselves, Chair Joyce Mac Kinnon welcomed
everyone to the first meeting of the new academic year.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved as written.

AAC&U Summer Institute:

Susan Kahn reported on the Summer Institute of the Association of American Colleges
and Universities (AAC&U). The Institute is part of that organization's Greater
Expectations theme, which focuses on improving undergraduate learning.   Our team's
project centered on the ePortfolio, and members attended a series of meetings as well
as formal presentations. The topics on which they worked included the Senior
Academy's role in evaluating students' ePortfolios, the technological requirements for

the pilot implementation of the ePort, and student and faculty training needs. Our team's final report was well received by the Institute team, and a copy is appended to the minutes.

ePortfolio:

Sharon Hamilton praised the Institute team for its fine work and offered a report on progress with the ePort since last spring's final PRAC meeting.

Hamilton reported that Marcia Baxter Magolda's Workshop on Development of Student Learning (held on August 11) was a success, with 42 attendees. Work included development of prompts for reflective writing and discussion of issues and questions about the ePortfolio. Meanwhile, ePortfolio team members met with Ivy Tech faculty and staff for an exploratory discussion of ePort for Ivy Tech students, modified to their learning goals (which closely map onto our PULs). The Ivy Tech team expressed interest in further conversations and possibly a pilot project possibly in the fall of 2004.

Hamilton further reported that the IUPUI ePort pilot is taking place in two Thematic Learning Communities this fall, including a usability study with students and faculty. Lecturer Jan Dewester has been appointed OPD Faculty Fellow to study the usability features and potential for enhanced learning from the student perspective and usability and feasibility from the faculty perspective, as well as to report on any issues or concerns raised during the pilot phase.

In conjunction with course transformation, the ePortfolio received dedicated tuition dollar funding to hire programmers to develop the technological infrastructure and to provide support for the pilot project, for student focus groups, and for professional development. The programmers are being hired now and will start as soon as possible.

Further work has concerned development of principles to guide the ePortfolio:
- Intellectual property:
    - Students own the artifacts they upload onto the portfolio, and have full control over permission to view;
    - Faculty own their grades and comments on student work, and have full control over permission for them to be used in the ePort

- Commitment/Compliance:
    - Commitment rather than compliance model
    - Similar to Oncourse, we are consulting with faculty, students, and staff to build the best infrastructure we can, drawing upon the best that is being developed in the country but focusing on our IUPUI campus culture and our PULs.

The ePortfolio team is building the infrastructure so that it will be usable and customizable according to the needs of academic programs and departments; the default "matrix" is the learning matrix based on the PULs, but the specific goals of any particular department or professional school may be either cross-indexed with the PULs, or developed in a separate matrix. Initial efforts are targeting first year students in thematic learning communities because of the opportunity for them to be introduced to the PULs and the Oncourse/ePort technology as part of the learning community and then have evidence of learning to upload from at least three different subject areas. Expansion will be entirely voluntary, as it was with Oncourse. There will be information available from those who pilot and then continue to use the ePort in order to help faculty and students decide how ePort can support their teaching and learning. Modifications and refinements will be ongoing, based on feedback from students and faculty.

The faculty and staff involved in working on the e-Portfolio project include:
- EPort Core Team: Jay Fern, Sharon Hamilton, Susan Kahn, Stacy Morrone (with Jan Dewester as a Faculty Fellow for 2003-2004) (meet biweekly)
- EPort Management Team: ePort Core Team plus Vic Borden (IMIR), Mary Fisher (Faculty Governance), Joyce Mac Kinnon (PRAC); Howard Mzumara (assessment of effectiveness of ePort); Michelle Verduzco (Students) (will meet quarterly)
- PRAC Subcommittee: will meet as they determine
- Communities of Practice: Funded multidisciplinary faculty communities exploring and sharing strategies for integrating the PULs into discipline-specific learning; working to refine campus expectations for learning in relation to the PULs; and providing suggestions and advice as they determine appropriate to the ePort core in relation to the PULs (to begin in 2004)

Sam Milosevich pointed out that mechanisms for compliance need to be built in from the start so that people won't be surprised, and Hamilton replied that individual units will be able to decide what, if any, use they wish to make of the ePort system, so that neither PRAC nor the ePort development team will need to ensure compliance. She pointed out that specific departments or schools could, however, decide to require faculty and students to participate.

Joe Kuczkowski raised the question of the University's role in setting and enforcing guidelines for appropriateness of uploads in the ePort. He pointed out that some students have misused Oncourse. He also asked how long the portfolios would remain online. Could the ePort be part of an orientation for transfer students? Hamilton replied that the question of guidelines is being approached from two directions: (1) faculty development in the guiding of students to appropriate assignments to upload. (2) administrative work with Kenny Cruz on a disclaimer, which would state that students select and are responsible for what is in their portfolios. Further, items with no date and stamp will be identified as not necessarily legitimate course assignments. A student's ePort will be maintained for as long as the student maintains alumni membership (which they get free for the first year after graduation). Hamilton also added, in response to the question about orientation, that the portfolio template will have avatars programmed

with student voices to orient transfer and new students to use of the ePortfolio system. Because of Ivy Tech's new program, transfers from there will not need orientation. Meanwhile, electronic portfolios like ours are proliferating across the country as more and more students transfer once or twice in their college careers; many will be bringing electronic portfolios with them.

Drew Appleby congratulated Sharon and team members on their flexibility.

Milosevich recommended that the avatars in the orientation program talk about professionalism and appropriateness.

PRAC Mission and PRAC Annual Reports:

Karen Johnson reviewed the revised PRAC mission statement and led a discussion on the PRAC Annual Reports, which are the most immediate concern. She pointed out that everyone has done an excellent job of leading their units in providing clear accounts of how they evaluate student work, and that part of the overall report has received commendations. Now we need to add information about how faculty members and departments are acting on the information they receive from evaluating their students. Faculty are increasingly burdened, and it is important to make the on-going assessment process as easy and painless as possible, so she requested suggestions from the Committee about what might work best in getting this information. A number of excellent suggestions were offered, but, because this recorder was leading the discussion, she did not note all of the names of the commenters. She apologizes to those whose names are not recorded here.

Charlie Yokomoto pointed out that, as in working with students, it is important to set high expectations but also to make those expectations clear and to be available to help. He briefly recounted his experience in making "house calls" to departments in his school, and reported that they worked but did not have much carryover. He suggested that monthly meetings of the persons responsible for their departments' reports might help, both in stimulating activity and in sharing strategies. It is also important to have direct involvement of the deans in making sure that faculty understand that they must participate in assessment.

It was suggested that PRAC get permission from those who have done especially good jobs with their reports to give their names as contacts for those who ask for help.

Catherine Souch pointed out that program reviews are often a strong stimulus for reporting. She asked if there might be more guidance concerning which units or departments can use the "short form" and which need to continue work on the full report form.

Drew Appleby described the APA Online Mentoring Service, which maintains an expertise list for its members to consult; it is organized by specific areas of concern. Perhaps we might institute such a list.

Betty Jones raised the issue of tenure-track faculty, who must emphasize the work that will support their tenure cases best. She suggested that we look into informing them of the uses and value of assessment and of the ways in which it can develop into research projects that are fundable and publishable.

Erdogan Sener closed the discussion with the comment that no matter how well we work, the faculty as a group must accept the need for assessment. They must realize that the collection of data benefits them.

<u>Chancellor Bantz's Presentation:</u>

Chancellor Bantz arrived at 2:30. He expressed his pleasure at the extraordinarily good reception that our accreditation report received. One of his former colleagues was on our team, and she mentioned to him that our teaching and learning section was especially good. He noted IUPUI's obligation of civic engagement and said that he talks to faculty about how in no other context would people be allowed just to say that their work has been accomplished. He advocates highlighting successes but also frankly confronting difficulties. He has noticed that some faculty resist because setting guidelines for assessment automatically privileges specific aspects of their disciplines. He is particularly pleased in beginning his work at IUPUI that so many faculty are willing to work on PRAC and on assessment.

Questions:

Drew Appleby asked if Bantz thought it would be possible to create motivation by having assessment included as part of the tenure process. Bantz replied that the way to do this would be for units to build in statements about assessment and ensure that they are binding in decision-making. The issue of consistency in setting promotion and tenure guidelines was raised. Trudy Banta said that we do have some language about assessment in promotion and tenure guidelines, but this could be expanded and emphasized.

Joe Kuczkowski suggested that Bantz can send the message that assessment is part of good teaching. He also pointed out that some people are brought in for specific research foci, and cannot thus highlight the scholarship of teaching and learning in their promotion and tenure cases.

PRAC Subcommittees:

Joyce Mac Kinnon announced that more volunteers are needed for our four subcommittees. All PRAC members should e-mail Banta or Mac Kinnon with their top three choices.

Article:

Trudy Banta passed out an article on new ways of assessing student learning.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Karen Ramsay Johnson
Recorder

IUPUI Campus Team Report

3ʳᵈ Annual Greater Expectations Institute on
Campus Leadership for Student Engagement, Inclusion, and Achievement

IUPUI is an urban, commuter campus of 29,000 students dispersed among more than 20 academic and professional schools. The seemingly fragmented nature of the campus-- with so many different academic programs and so many working students with little time to learn with others outside the classroom—has made retention an ongoing challenge. A series of focused efforts has led to substantial increases in the past several years, however. Among these efforts are a number of initiatives intended to improve student learning and student engagement in learning:

- To bring coherence to our undergraduate curriculum, as well as to meet the general education needs of the many diverse professional and academic schools on the IUPUI campus, we developed and adopted six Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) intended to permeate the undergraduate curriculum and co-curriculum across the campus.
- We have been working for the past decade to explicitly integrate these PULs with discipline-specific learning outcomes, and to document and assess both improvement and achievement in student learning in relation to these PULs. We have also recently begun to consider ways to integrate the PULs with co-curricular goals and activities, particularly as we are now building residences for our predominantly commuter students. We are also developing an electronic student portfolio to document and assess growth and achievement in these PULs. We are at the point where we need to develop policies and procedures for coordinating, implementing, and assessing these initiatives to promote student learning.

FOCUSES: We recently received funding through an internal grant to pilot and implement our electronic student portfolio, beginning in Fall 2003. Our team at the AAC&U Summer Institute worked on developing policies and procedures for the pilot and subsequent phases of implementation of the portfolio. We considered such issues as integration of curricular and co-curricular learning; faculty governance; assessment plans and policies; and faculty development and student development needs, especially in relation to the technology infrastructure. More specifically, we focused on:

Developing a plan for the piloting and implementation of the portfolio, with attention to the following areas:

1. Integration of curricular and co-curricular learning

2. Faculty governance issues
3. Assessment plans and policies
4. Faculty Development Needs
5. Student Development Needs
6. Technological Functionality

ACTIONS

Stakeholders:

1. Clearly identify the groups of stakeholders who will be involved/affected—e.g., students, faculty, faculty governance and other relevant committees, advisors
2. Clearly articulate the benefit of the portfolio to each stakeholder group

Communicating and marketing the portfolio initiative:

1. Identify campus media/venues that might be effective in communicating about the portfolio to each stakeholder group
2. Develop mock-up of completed matrix, incorporating intentionally inclusive work samples, to present to various groups for endorsement
3. Develop streamlined presentation for stakeholder groups
4. Seek PRAC (Program Review and Assessment Committee) review and endorsement of levels of development of the PULs for the Learning Matrix
5. Ask Office of Multicultural Faculty Development and Student Life and Diversity to help ensure that portfolio supports identity affirmation for each student
6. Ask PRAC members to advise their schools about defining "advanced" levels of each PUL
7. Invite GEx team to present levels of matrix to Faculty Council Executive Committee for endorsement
8. Seek endorsement of matrix levels from Office of Academic Affairs and ensure that Dean of Faculties champions the project to the Deans' Council
9. Seek "champions" to support the project in each school (possibly from faculty who were involved in defining matrix levels)
10. Consider possible motto: "Show me the learning!"

Training:

1. Develop training procedures for groups who will be using/assessing the portfolios—e.g., faculty, students, Senior Academy responders, advisors
2. Involve Office of Part-Time Faculty in training
3. Create strategies for ensuring that training incorporates issues of multicultural competence

Planning and piloting the portfolio:

1. Consider reframing and renaming the project: the "Learning Matrix" instead of "ePort"
2. Provide a set of operating principles for the project—e.g., "Cultural inclusiveness needs to pervade all aspects of the project"; include attention to security, privacy, and intellectual property issues
3. Ask PRAC representatives and Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement to identify level of PULs implementation for each school
4. Develop Gantt Chart for project management
5. Develop prompts for student reflections geared to successive levels of development of competence in the PULs; ensure that prompts are multiculturally inclusive
6. Specify possible types of co-curricular and extracurricular work samples that students might include in their portfolios; who will assess these submissions?
7. Develop initial technology infrastructure for pilot
8. Develop pre- and post-PULs questionnaire for students
9. Identify support resources for non-digitized matrix submissions (e.g., videotapes)
10. Develop action plans for each stakeholder group during pilot phases
11. Situate Fall '03 pilot in two Thematic Learning Communities, beginning October 2003
12. Identify and begin working with Beta Testing Users' Group
13. Implement Bug-Tracking Database

Beyond pilot:

1. Use pilot to identify sustainability issues and develop plan for expanding use of the portfolio
2. Define process for tracking students who participate in initial pilot
3. Develop procedures for evolving the Learning Matrix into a lifelong, professional portfolio
4. Consider issue of awarding academic credit for completing introductory and intermediate levels of PULs
5. Consider transfer student issues

TIMEFRAME FOR ACTION

1. Team continues to meet
   a. Identify guiding principles for project
   b. Create timeline for action (mid-fall)
   c. Identify responsible parties
2. Finalize deadlines for PUL levels
3. Create model matrix entries
4. Program initial version of portfolio for pilot
5. Create tutorial for pilot students
6. Develop Communication Plan
   a. Present at Learning Communities Colloquium early Spring '04
   b. Present at Moore Symposium Spring '04

7. Beta Testing
8. Fuller implementation by Fall 2004
9. Training Plan
    a. Faculty Training – Fellowship Position – Jan DeWester
    b. Student Training
    c. Mentor Training
    d. Advisor Training
    e. Support Professionals
10. Marketing Plan
    a. Develop Headlines, Bumper Stickers, Colloquium, Orientation
    b. Identify Marketing Wizards
        i. Harriett Bennett
    c. Additional funding sources?
11. Anticipated rollout 2005
12. Faculty Fellowships for Curriculum Transformation
13. Team Visits to All Schools for buy-in
14. Address security concerns

ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

Detailed evaluation plan already developed for purposes of internal grant proposal. Includes multiple methods, including both formative and summative assessment and evaluation, surveys, focus groups, identification of technology problems, assessment issues, logistical issues.

WHAT YOU MIGHT CONSIDER AS YOU DEVELOP YOUR PLAN

1. Campus Partners
    a. "Culture Keepers"
    b. Office for Professional Development, including Center for Teaching and Learning, Office of Multicultural Professional Development, Office of Part-Time Faculty
    c. Faculty Governance
    d. Student Life and Diversity Programs
    e. University College
    f. Early Adopters
    g. Major Critics
2. Campus Strengths
    a. Atmosphere for innovation
    b. Multicultural diversity of faculty, staff, students
    c. Support of Leadership
    d. Superior Technical Resources
    e. Information-Rich Environment
    f. University College role in integrating undergraduate education
    g. Collaborative Governance Model
    h. Consensus on the PULs

       i.   Project clearly tied to institutional mission and strategic plan
       j.   Track record of success with innovation
       k.   Success of Institutional Portfolio as a Model
       l.   Glowing Accreditation Evaluation

3. Obstacles to Success
   a. Multicultural diversity of faculty, staff, students
   a. Possibly too aggressive timeline
   b. Insufficient collaboration with stakeholders
   c. State support of education
   d. Possible ideological resistance from some sectors
   e. Possible personnel Resource loss
   f. Dependence on OSPI initiative progress
   g. Failure to achieve endorsement of project from major constituencies
   h. Unknown direction of system and campus leadership
   i. Failure to bridge the digital divide