IUPUI Program Review and Assessment Committee  
May 15, 2014, 1:30-3:00pm, CE 409  
Minutes

**Attendance:** K. Alfrey; P. Altenburger; T. Banta; K. Black; C. Gentile-Gennity; S. Graunke; M. Hansen; S. Hendricks; L. Houser; S. Hundley; K. Johnson; S. Johnson; S. Kahn; M. Kolb; J. Lee; K. MacDorman; L. Maxwell; H. Mzumara; B. Neal-Beliveau; C. Nilson; M. Rust; S. Scott; A. Teemant; C. Toledo; C. Walcott; S. Weeden; K. Wills  
**Guests:** A. Buchenot; J. Gosney; C. Tandy; R. Vernon

**Minutes:** approved as circulated

**PRAC Grant Report:**

- Assessing Student Interviewing Competencies through Second Life  
  o Project collaborators: Robert Vernon, Director of MSW Direct, online program (rvernon@iupui.edu), Darlene Lynch, and Cindy Tandy from Valdosta State University (joined via video)  
  o Standardized Client Project:  
    - Artificial client is created and programmed to teach students right and wrong ways of doing an interview and to assess student behavior/learning and benchmark; the project collaborators created “Jenny,” an artificial client in Second Life

- **Steps:**  
  o Create scenario basics and draft initial script  
  o Paper test  
  o Program chatbot in Second Life  
  o Test with students

- **Scenario and initial script**  
  o First step was drafting an initial script, including logic tree/branching program to present a stimulus and give the student a variety of choices/responses  
  o Case of a middle aged woman; married; caring for infirmed mother-in-law  
  o Client response informs student choices, and a decision tree yields a resolution  
  o Faculty generated scenario with branching parts; challenging-yet-realistic interview typical of an experience a BSW/MSW student would encounter

- **Paper test**  
  o Materials are put on 3x5 cards to pilot the concept/language/etc. prior to programming  
  o “Walk through” paper cards used to validate script/simulation

- **Program chatbot in Second Life**  
  - Program avatar (“Jenny”) – looks and behaves like a person
• Students enter the simulation, get a notecard of instructions, and produce a ‘head’s up display’ to start the interview
• Second Life is a virtual world; looks like a game, but it is not; it is the ‘game’ you want to make

• Testing with students:
  o Cindy tested the concept with students (Valdosta)
  o Oriented the students through written directions and video tutorial
  o Instructed to try out several attempts to make the client happy; helpful/unhelpful responses
  o Completed a reflective report that captured:
    • Experience/feelings of what they learned
    • Experience was like in navigating Second Life
  o Students thought it was a valuable experience; enjoyed the work
  o Students initially had some performance anxiety
  o Students could interact in Second Life without observation; thus, students could play with responses, make mistakes, etc. not affecting real-life client or another student
  o Students could see the results of a misplaced response
  o Students learned that they could control the process to create a successful/unsuccessful interview

• Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  o How did the students respond? Did they learn something from this experience? How were data gathered?
    • Quasi focus-group was conducted
    • Students were learning how to give good and better feedback/responses
    • As they gave responses, they could see client responses
  o Were you able to track how many students completed the interaction successfully vs. having the client ‘walk away’ from the student?
    • No information on this; relied on student self-report
  o What are the next steps?
    • Don’t yet know, as project directors have taken on administrative roles
    • Could be used at both macro- and micro-levels (organizations; individuals)
  o Is there a link to a demonstration?
    • No

Canvas Learning Management System (LMS) Outcomes Tool:

• John Gosney, Faculty Liaison, Learning Technologies, UITS (jgosney@iu.edu)
  o To learn more: http://next.iu.edu (click on the Canvas tab)

• IU is moving to a new LMS called Canvas
  o All IU courses will be provided in Canvas for fall, in addition to being in Oncourse
  o In many respects, Canvas is similar to Oncourse
Example rubrics with aligned outcome
  o This is something new in Canvas that Oncourse did not have
  o Create at a course-, department-, and institutional-level rubrics to accompany outcomes
  o Once outcomes are created/configured, they can be imported and linked to individual courses
  o Assignments can be linked to a specific outcome and rubric
  o Can be efficient to review an assignment based on a specific outcome and add comments and record a grade
  o Learning can be assigned for credit or not within a specific course (example: evaluating PULs within and across courses without any impact on the course grade)
  o Sample reports can be generated to capture information on outcomes by student/course

Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  o Does the individual instructor have the ability to modify rubrics? Not for higher-level (beyond course) rubrics
    • Can reports be aggregated across an entire course, program, etc.?
    • Will depend on where rubrics are created and what permissions are granted
  o Information being input into Canvas integrated into SIS?
    • Potentially rich data feed that can be integrated; some pilots are underway
    • What is exported out of Canvas is open
  o Where do the data reside?
    • Canvas is not hosted at IU; hosted in the cloud
  o Information being used in conjunction with FLAGS?
    • Natural next step conversation to determine what should occur
  o When do we switch altogether to Canvas?
    • Oncourse will be available at least through the end of summer 2016
    • Goal is to have everyone actively teaching in Canvas by fall 2016
  o Course migration?
    • Hope is that we will have some type of basic migration tool to assist in this effort
  o Combine rosters in one section?
    • Yes, this can occur; works a bit differently in Canvas than in Oncourse
  o ePortfolio platform on Canvas?
    • Limited; an RFP is out now to examine a new ePortfolio platform

PRAC Grant Report:

Writing Assessment in the Age of the Digital Archive
  o Andy Buchenot, School of Liberal Arts – Department of English
    (buchenot@iupui.edu)
Department has an interest in creating a departmental community in order to better understand what is happening in various courses (communication, coordination, alignment).

Also wants to determine what kind of writing is happening.

2 significant gaps were identified, which informed basis for project:
- Need within department to coordinate/standardize/understand what is occurring in each course.
- Role that computer technology can play in nuanced ways; we are not asking the kinds of questions that we could be doing related to computer technology, assessment, and databases (storing and accessing student work).

Process:
- Address gaps in current research on writing assessment by developing a database to store and sort student writing over multiple semesters.
- Develop strategies to begin analyzing student writing qualitatively and quantitatively using the database.
- Collect documents in Oncourse.
- Use Microsoft Access to create database with flexible, searchable records.
- Develop “meta-tagging” system.
- PRAC grant supported opportunity to hire research assistant to work on database design and programming.

Numbers:
- 3 semesters
- 53 courses
- 482 students
- 1,547 student texts

Essay types:
- 51% critical essay
- 25% creative essay
- 21% reflective essay
- 3% other essay

PULs the department feels are most important:
- 65% critical thinking
- 45% core communication
  - Within critical thinking:
    - 46% thought analysis – knowledge, procedures, etc. – was most important outcome
    - Applying and creating knowledge are also highly valued

Next steps:
- Now that we have a database that is searchable, we can produce answers to various research questions.
- Bodies of student texts that are targeted to a course or delivery method.
• Use digital texts to do broad analysis of texts themselves

• Dissemination:
  o Presented at 2013 Assessment Institute in Indianapolis
  o Presented at 2013 Thomas R. Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition
  o Manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Teaching Writing*

• Future plans:
  o Examine “raw” computer scoring (Word Count, Word Smith, Cometrix)
  o Begin identifying quantitative traits
  o Develop qualitative research groups (W131 first, English department soon)
  o Continue building partnerships

• Questions from PRAC colleagues:
  o Is database accessible to other departments?
    • Happy to share how to build database, but access cannot be granted due to presence of student identifiers
  o What would have happened if you had received a lot of assignments that were non-textual essays? Could database house them suitably?
    • Have to come up with another set of codes
    • Yes, database can handle these types of assignments
    • Analysis would need to be re-thought based on type of essay
  o Any movement toward multi-modal work in English Department or elsewhere?
    • Little pockets of this exist; in Writing program, long history of introducing students to visual text and then having students respond to the text
  o How do you assess multi-modal documents?
    • Universities have been slow in reliance on differing types of student work
    • Among W131 instructors, there is interest in multi-modal assessment, but there is some uncertainty related to comfort level in this to occur; waiting for a catalyst

**PRAC Grant Subcommittee**

• Received one proposal for spring semester; recommended for funding
  o Sent by Dr. Cheryl Warner at IUPUC
  o Developing a Comprehensive Assessment System in New Graduate Program in Mental Health Counseling

• PRAC voted to approve and fund this project

**Trudy Banta:**

• We have had quite a year of PUL discussion:
  o In 2014, we are in Year 5 of PUL evaluation
  o PRAC meetings have discussed some next steps, including what we have learned about what is working, not working, etc.
o Questions remain about how long the cycle should be (3-years; 5-years)
o Ratings of effectiveness in student advising
o Opportunities within Canvas to tag assignments to outcomes
o More workshops will be planned to help with this process
o More work to do related to policy

- AAC&U Summer Institute in Vermont
  o Group of faculty and administrators will lead the group in thinking about general
education/PULs and recommendations for PRAC

Stephen Hundley:

- SHEEO/ AAC&U Multi-state Collaborative
  o IU/IUPUI is participating; more information will be shared at August meeting
  regarding faculty participation and assignments sought

Peter Altenburger:

- Thank you for great work this spring – lot of great strides
- See you all in August!

Meeting adjourned