Program Review and Assessment Committee
January Meeting 2016: Thursday, January 14, 1:15-2:45pm, CE 307
Minutes

Present: K. Alfrey; P. Altenburger, S. Baker, T. Banta, R. Bentley, L. Bozeman, P. Ebright, C. Gentle-Genitty, S. Graunke, T. Hahn, M. Hansen, E. Huang, S. Hundley, D. Jerolimov, C. Kacius, S. Kahn, J. Lee, S. Lowe, S. Lupton, M. Meadows, J. Motter, H. Mzumara, C. Nielsen, M. Pistilli, M. Roberts, C. Schuck, S. Scott, K. Sheeler, M. Urtel, C. Walcott, J. Watson, S. Weeden

1. Welcome and approval of December minutes

2. Presentation on a pilot using AAC&U VALUE Rubrics – Kristy Sheeler

Jennifer Lee opened by saying that she as interested in hearing about experiences using the Association of American Colleges and University's (AAC&U's) VALUE rubrics. Kristy Sheeler was then introduced to talk about the experiences of Communication Studies in using these rubrics. Sheeler indicated that Communication Studies faculty have an ongoing interest in assessing student learning, and they recently decided to work with AAC&U's VALUE Rubrics. In particular, they chose to use the Oral Communication VALUE rubric. Their assessment began in spring 2015 with a pilot using faculty and 225 speech artifacts (recorded student speeches) from Comm-R110, focused specifically on five areas: central idea, support of central idea, language, organization, and delivery evaluated using a four-point scale. This was followed by a second pilot in summer/fall 2015 focused on 75 speech acts, using independent raters and a four-point scale.

Results of the faculty study (the study) revealed that students are performing at a satisfactory level, overall improvement occurred, but some faculty were not comfortable giving the ratings. A comparison with the later independent rater study showed that faculty ratings were slightly lower than those of independent raters. Results of the independent rater study showed that video recordings were a problem (camera placement needs to be improved), norming with these raters was difficult, and language and delivery were rated lowest of the five items evaluated, something both faculty and independent raters agreed was an area for improvement.

Overall, the faculty and independent raters evaluated the recorded speeches in a similar way, and the department discovered that its own rubric is more robust than the corresponding VALUE rubric. Based on the results, the department is planning to continue professional development to help faculty feel comfortable with the evaluation process, to continue norming using their rubrics, to add a final exam to the course with questions mapped to course learning outcomes, to revise the course rubrics, to develop in-class assignments to improve students use of language and delivery, and to find a new video recording system and/or request the cameras be moved to a different location.

During the following question and comments session, Trudy Banta encouraged the department to do what it could to at least improve the camera placement in the recording studio. Sheeler indicated that faculty may not have focused on the language and delivery issue because of other concerns, but with ongoing professional development opportunities, that will hopefully improve, and the department has opted to continue working with its own internal rubric, based on the VALUE rubric, in its ongoing assessment efforts.

3. PRAC Grant Report: "Examining the Viability of an Online BSW Degree Cohort through the Review of the IU School of Social Work BSW Program's Four-Year Online Course History, Student Experiences, and Impact" – Ivette Barbosa and Carolyn Gentle-Genitty, the School of Social Work

Ivette Barbosa opened the presentation describing the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program at the IU School of Social Work. She noted a high frequency of online courses in the program due to student demand. Assessing how well the program is doing proved a bit daunting at first because decisions about what information to gather and where to gather it had to be made. The reviewers decided to survey the students to see how many had taken an online course and how. They also looked into the grade-point averages (GPAs) of students taking 8 or more online classes to see how they compared with those taking face-to-face classes. They found that there was no significant difference between the two sets of students (GPA of 3.30 and 3.31). They also found gathering the information to be difficult as they were not housed in one location.

They decided then to use Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) to help. They were able to create a qualitative and quantitative approach, part of which involved using course evaluations and focus groups and a 31 item student survey. They had some difficulties with the method, but the results did show that they are offering enough courses for a full degree program, which was a surprise. Students in both face-to-face and online classes did about as well as one another, suggesting that an online program does have viability.

During the following questions and comments discussion, it was revealed that some training of faculty may be necessary. A standardized evaluation tool is being developed, but it will not be ready until 2018. It was suggested that a mid-semester/end-of-semester evaluation process be tried to gather information on quality. Growth in offering online classes is available, but helping students with why to take them needs to be addressed (students see them as being convenient or as creating ease rather than as an alternative to face-to-face offerings). Retention in the online courses offered is high, which suggests online courses have some viability as an alternative instruction method for students.

PowerPoint file attached.

4. Discussion of PRAC Annual Reports: Perceptions and Potentials − Jennifer Lee

Jennifer Lee opened the discussion by asking who writes the annual PRAC reports in the various units. Some of the answers included that one person writes and collects

information to contribute to the report; that the report is a collaboration among programs in a unit; and that the process is a collaboration, but that one person is responsible year-to-year. Often an associate dean will write the report.

Next Lee asked the group who reads the report. Most indicated they believe their reports are not widely read. University College does send out its report and encourages its faculty to read it. It was suggested that one way to assure wide distribution is to have the report sent to faculty from a unit's faculty senate. It was pointed out that how the reports are distributed can make a difference.

Finally, Lee asked whether there is fear surrounding the production of a PRAC report. Responses suggested there is some concern by faculty of what will happen if the report does not meet expectations. Trudy Banta reminded the group that PRAC reports are designed, or should be designed, to indicate evidence of student learning and what is being done to implement changes based on findings. Typically, accrediting organizations want to see the results, so having information from each unit helps to show accreditors what we are doing and what we are working on.

5. Announcements – Jennifer Lee

Susan Kahn made an announcement about implementing a new ePortfolio platform, Taskstream, and members of her office and CTL are willing to come to schools to discuss how to implement it. Jennifer Lee reminded everyone of the LEAP conference at Ivy Tech on Feb. 26, and she encouraged participation. Trudy Banta would like information on what has been done in using information from PRAC reports to implement findings, especially for written communication and critical thinking. This information will be used as part of the Excellence in Assessment Designation that the campus is applying for.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, February 11, 1:15-2:45 in CE 307

Thursday, March 10, 1:15-2:45 in University Hall 1006

Thursday, April 14, 1:15-2:45 in University Hall 1006

Thursday, May 19, 1:15-2:45 in CE 307

Discussion of PRAC Report readership and feedback

Who in your unit writes the PRAC Report? Who contributes to it?

Who in your unit reads the PRAC report? Whom do you imagine reads it outside of the unit? Who else might benefit from reading it? Is there anyone you might not want to read it?

What kind of feedback would be most valuable in response to the PRAC Report? Feedback about the report as a document? About the assessments conducted within the unit? About the use of assessment data? Other kinds of feedback?

In what ways is the university better and in a better position to know itself because of these reports?

Are there any risks to the schools associated with the PRAC Annual Report?

COMM R110 Public Speaking Assessment Efforts

WHAT DID WE LEARN AND WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT IT?

What have we done?

R110 Textbook: Fundamentals of Speech Communication
- Faculty authored and launched Fall 2014
- Incorporates critical thinking model, student-centered and approachable
- Includes assignment choices and standardized rubrics for all outlines and speeches based on VALUE rubrics

Faculty Pilot, Spring 2015
- Using course rubrics adapted from VALUE rubrics
- 225 speech artifacts for each of 3 assignments (~13% of population)
  - Second informative speech
  - First persuasive speech
  - Final persuasive speech (signature assignment; speech of policy)
  - Faculty evaluated live presentations

Independent Rater Pilot, Summer/Fall 2015
- Using VALUE rubrics
- Independent, trained raters
- 75 student artifacts from among all spring 2015 R110 sections
  - Final persuasive policy speech (signature assignment)
  - Raters evaluated classroom recordings of live presentations

How did we do?

FACULTY PILOT SPRING 2015
4-POINT SCALE
- 4 EXEMPLARY; 3 SATISFACTORY; 2 NEEDS WORK; 1 DEFICIENT

N=225	INF	PER1	PER2
Support of central message	2.8	2.8	2.82
Use of citations	2.62	2.74	2.8
Organization	2.8	2.77	2.8
Language	2.8	2.79	2.94
Delivery	2.72	2.81	2.83

INDEPENDENT RATER PILOT, SUMMER/FALL 2015
4-POINT SCALE
- 4 EXEMPLARY; 3 SATISFACTORY; 2 NEEDS WORK; 1 DEFICIENT

N=75	Rater 1	Rater 2
Supporting Material	3.027	2.972
Central Message	3.541	3.178
Organization	3.125	3.109
Language	2.888	2.931
Delivery	2.861	3.095

What did we learn?

From Faculty Pilot
- Majority of students performing at satisfactory level or better
- Overall improvement, even if slight, in all categories except organization (held steady)
  - Use of source citations improved from 66% to 75% of students performing at a satisfactory or better level over the three speeches
- Not all faculty are comfortable evaluating language (N dipped from 225 to 155)
- Faculty ratings overall *ever so slightly* lower than independent raters

From Independent Rater pilot
- We have crummy camera placement for recording student speeches
- Norming is hard and takes time
- Language and delivery lowest rated categories
- Confirmation of faculty pilot assessment ratings (we're not too easy)

Overall
- Our faculty and our independent raters assessed student performance similarly
- Our rubrics in our R110 textbook can be simplified

So now what?

1. More professional development
- ◦ Faculty need to feel comfortable teaching and assessing language
- ◦ Continual norming using our rubrics

2. Pilot final exam, Fall 2015-Spring 2016
- ◦ 100 questions mapped to our 10 student learning outcomes
- ◦ All sections required to use this comprehensive final
- ◦ Using Testing Center, pilot in fall 2015, all in spring 2016

3. R110 textbook second edition (fall 2016) and beyond, continual revision of rubrics

4. Additional language and delivery work for students in class

5. New recording system—using Kaltura to replace ECHO

6. Your suggestions, comments, questions?