

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, January 18, 2007

UL1126

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of the December minutes K. Johnson
2. Implications for campus action derived from IUPUI's survey data G. Pike
3. Questions for a proposed panel on program review J. Smith
4. PRAC grant reports Sue Blackwell
5. Response to Trustees on general education T. Banta
6. Committee reports
7. Adjournment K. Johnson

MINUTES –

Members Present:

William Agbor-Baiyee, Drew Appleby, Kate Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Donna Boland, William Crabtree, Krista Hoffmann-Longtin, Susan Kahn, Joyce Mac Kinnon, Allison Martin, Craig McDaniel, Melinda Meadows, Howard Mzumara, Megan Palmer, Gary Pike, Kenneth Rennels, Elizabeth Rubens, Kathryn Steinberg, Randi Stocker, Mark Urtel, Russell Vertner, Debra Winikates, Marianne Wokeck, Nancy Young

Guest: Susan Blackwell, School of Education

Minutes from the December meeting were approved.

PRAC Grant Reports

S. Blackwell presented a report on her PRAC grant project, an assessment of the Transition to Teaching Program (T2T) that used a Web-based electronic portfolio. Department of Secondary Education faculty collaborated with faculty from the School of Liberal Arts and with middle and high school teachers to create rubrics and score each portfolio. Highlights of findings include:

- The vast majority of students demonstrated content knowledge, professionalism, and proficiency in the School of Education Principles of Teacher Education.

- The scoring process revealed that the levels of proficiency (Proficient, Developing, and Needing Support) were too broad. A four-level design will be used for this year.
- Students reported that their greatest challenges were working with a wide range of students (e.g., English language learners and students with exceptional needs).

Adjustments to the portfolio resulting from project findings will include:

- Revising prompts for student reflections.
- Revising the rubrics to provide more specific description of the various proficiency levels.
- Migrating to the IUPUI ePort from the current Web platform.

Adjustments to field work (school placements) will include:

- Matching T2T students with English language learners in a tutoring setting.
- Increasing the amount of seminar discussion on issues of differentiated instruction.

Adjustments to assignments will include:

- Use of inquiry notebooks.
- Incorporation of material focused on making adjustments for students with exceptional needs and language barriers.

Blackwell shared an example of the e-portfolio. T2T students were asked to provide an introduction to the portfolio, a description of the school, profile of the class, and a unit plan. The portfolio also displayed work done by their classes for particular lessons or units. T2T students kept logs of their experiences during these teaching activities.

T. Banta asked how Blackwell felt about currently proposed legislation requiring prospective secondary-level teachers to earn degrees in their disciplines. Blackwell responded that T2T students generally enter the program with degrees in their disciplines or with related experience. She stressed that legislation should not be based on a single court case. T2T is sufficiently rigorous when implemented with the appropriate fieldwork components, but not all similar programs meet this standard. R. Vertner asked whether the program used the IUPUI ePort or another portfolio platform. Blackwell replied that the current portfolio is Web-based and designed around a common template; plans are to migrate to the IUPUI ePort next year.

Implications of IUPUI Survey Data for Campus Action

G. Pike reported on the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), focusing on trends from 2002 to 2006. The response rate for the IUPUI campus was approximately 30 percent each time the NSSE was administered (in 2002, 2004, and 2006). NSSE has identified five benchmark areas, but Pike finds these areas too broad. He prefers to work with “scalelets,” which combine small numbers of survey questions into constructs that can be scored in a range from 0 to 100. He noted that scalelets are not necessarily reliable and valid indicators for individual students, but they accurately portray large groups. The first scalelet, *academic challenge*, is comprised of course

challenge, writing experiences, and higher-order thinking. The other scalelets include *active and collaborative learning*, *student-faculty interaction*, *enriching educational experiences*, and *supportive campus environment*. A meaningful increase over time for an item and/or scalelet is three or more points.

Areas that have shown improvement at IUPUI include:

- Active learning
- Course interaction
- Information technology
- Support for student success

Responses from seniors indicate improvement in:

- Information technology
- Support for student success

No improvement was noted in

- Academic challenge

Pike studied results for a number of IUPUI schools on the *academic challenge* scalelet to identify examples of best practice, indicated by a score of five or more points above the IUPUI campus mean in 2006 (the mean was 58). High scoring schools tend to represent female-dominated professions. For instance, exemplary schools in writing experiences include Education and Social Work. Pike discussed writing with the Executive Associate Dean of the School of Education at IUPUI; she noted that the school has implemented new writing requirements, which might explain the high scores. Schools with high scores in higher-order thinking include Education, Nursing, and Social Work. C. McDaniel asked about the validity of scores based on student perceptions. Pike answered that his research has found that students tend to be honest. For example, he has found a correlation of .83 between students' self-reported grades and their actual grades. J. Smith commented that the findings only tell part of the student perception story. He noted that students' level of satisfaction in the School of Education is rather low compared with other units on campus, especially in the areas of student services and faculty availability. D. Boland pointed out Nursing students rate the unit low on similar satisfaction survey items. Pike responded that there is probably no one school that would come out higher than the others on all measures.

W. Crabtree commented that the NSSE was designed for residential colleges and wondered how well it reflects the experiences of students on our urban campus. Pike responded that the biggest challenge for commuter institutions is engaging students outside class, while NSSE measures in-class engagement. He believes that NSSE is a good measure of what we should really be doing. Crabtree asked whether we need additional assessment instruments. Pike replied that instruments like NSSE only take us so far; direct measures of learning, as well as qualitative information, help to provide a more complete picture. K. Hoffmann-Longtin mentioned that some programs are subject to specialized accreditation, which focuses on development of professional skills. Pike agreed that when intended learning outcomes are made explicit to students, they

understand more clearly what is valued and measured as academic success. W. Agbor-Baiyee asked how the data reflect the impact of exceptionally good or bad teaching, noting that excellent instructors make learning difficult concepts easy. Students may then incorrectly infer that the material was not challenging. Pike agreed that it is hard to address all the complex components of teaching and learning.

Questions for a Proposed Panel on Program Review

Smith described the purpose of the panel: to have a focused conversation about the Program Review process in order to determine ways to improve it. Sample questions were distributed and Smith asked for input. He indicated that Boland helped to facilitate the conversation.

Boland explained that the program review subcommittee held an open meeting last semester to understand current practices and lessons learned. The major issue that arose concerned the benefits of targeted reviews vs. comprehensive reviews. Some at the open meeting argued that a review targeted to specific issues was more informative to the unit. Boland suggested that future discussions of program review target lessons learned and best practices for the future, and that PRAC study reviews to identify specific issues that appear across units. E. Rubens asked for examples of such institutional issues. Boland responded that they include resources, research assistants, and strategies for recruiting students. Vertner added that concerns about teaching and learning facilities emerged in many reviews. He also suggested that the panel be scheduled separately from the PRAC meeting, so that non-PRAC members and senior leadership could be invited. Pike agreed that an open meeting might be good idea, but noted that including senior administrators could stifle open debate and critical comments. Agbor-Baiyee asked about the purpose of the program review panel. Smith said that PRAC's practice of scheduling presentations about individual reviews does not provide in-depth information about the value of the process. Johnson added that we should move beyond information from individuals and try to get a broader understanding of the program review process by examining multiple reviews.

Response to Trustees on General Education

Banta explained that the IU Board of Trustees has mandated a common general education program for all IU campuses and that the Statewide Transfer and Articulation Committee (STAC) needs to understand more clearly how general education credits count across campuses. She passed out a table showing how IUPUI courses articulate with IU-wide general education requirements and relate to the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs). McDaniel asked about campus-wide general education requirements. Banta explained that IUPUI defines general education in terms of the abilities that students develop rather than the courses they take. Some schools, however, require specific courses or numbers of courses in particular disciplinary areas and it is their prerogative to treat general education in this way.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:06 p.m.