

## **Program Review and Assessment Committee Minutes**

### **December Meeting 2016: Thursday, December 15, 1:15-2:45pm, CE 305**

Attending: K. Alfrey, S. Baker, K. Black, S. Boyne, L. Bozeman, L. Easterling, T. Freeman, S. Graunke, T. Hahn, M. Hansen, S. Hundley, D. Jerolimov, S. Kahn, J. Lee, S. Lowe, A. Mitchell, J. Motter, H. Mzumara, B. Orme, E. Ramos, S. Scott, K. Sheeler, M. Urtel, S. Weeden, S. Zahl

Guests: M. Myers, B. Christe, J. Thorington-Springer, S. Zoller

---

1. Welcome and Review and Approval of Minutes
  - The meeting opened with a review of the agenda. Then, a motion was made to approve the November minutes. The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken. The November minutes were approved unanimously.
2. 2017 PRAC Vice Chair election
  - President Lee reminded everyone that a motion was made to have Tyrone Freeman run for vice chair. Additional nominees were called for. None were offered. A vote was taken. Freeman was voted vice chair unanimously.
3. Vote on funding for those PRAC grants recommended for approval by the PRAC Grant Subcommittee
  - President Lee reviewed out loud the three proposals that were circulated by email before the meeting, all from the PRAC Grant Subcommittee. A call for a vote was made. Each grant received a separate vote and each received unanimous approval.
4. PRAC Grant Report: “Evaluation of Professional Empathy Skills in Healthcare Engineering Technology Management (HETM) Students” — Barb Christe, Healthcare Engineering Technology Management
  - This grant project focused on empathy in clinical settings by HETM students. The first step in the project was to develop a rubric, but what would be used as an empathy indicator was an initial problem that had to be addressed. The decision was made to use the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire. Participants were 42 students who took the questionnaire, all of them men. The research question focused on differences in empathy scores between U. S. and international male students. The international students were from Saudi Arabia. The results showed the international students had lower empathy scores than the U. S. students. The PRAC Grant money was used to present a workshop at a national conference that used the results as a basis for the content. In addition, a non-academic report on the results was written. The results have prompted a change in the curriculum, the change focusing on talking more to international students about empathy to encourage them to increase their abilities with this skill.
  - Questions and Discussion:

- Why was the hypothesis focused on why men have more trouble? Answer: The men involved do not have much experience talking with women. This is why empathy was tested.
  - To what extent does language play a role? Answer: The process is about validation in a relationship from a technical standpoint. Language plays a role, but the focus is on the communication of technical information. Conversation training is used to work with clients. Working with the questionnaire helps to support this approach. Role-playing occurs during training to support the work with clients.
5. Update on Comprehensive Student Record — Mary Beth Myers, IUPUI Registrar
- Background: Employers are becoming increasingly clear that official university transcripts are not valuable to them when assessing graduates. Employers and others are looking for student assessment of “soft skills,” such as teamwork, leadership, communication, etc. Two professional associations and Lumina partnered on a Comprehensive Student Records project to attempt to address this need. IUPUI was selected as 1 of 12 institutions nationwide to participate in this project.
  - The New Document and Its Value: IUPUI students have long been encouraged and even been expected to engage in several high impact practices outside of the classroom where significant lifelong learning can occur. Capturing and recording this “learning outside of the classroom” was the major goal of this initiative. Through the process of capturing experiential and applied learning experiences, students should be better able to articulate their overall learning and potential employers will have information relevant to the skills they are trying to assess. The Comprehensive Student Record captures assessed learning outcomes associated with each student experience instead of merely recording student participation as traditional transcripts do. Based on defined assessment rubrics and established learning outcomes, these experiences are then verified by the registrar on an official university record.
  - Results of the Project: A Comprehensive Student Record task force was created. The task force then established a governance structure, and assessment and verification procedures. A template for approving learning experiences that will be added to the record was developed, which required that each experience be tied to at least one Principle of Co-Curricular Learning. In addition, rubrics and assessment procedures were put in place to assess whether the expected learning occurred. IUPUI's requirement that the learning experiences outside the classroom be dutifully reviewed and assessed is now seen as a model for many public institutions. IUPUI will assist other IU campuses interested in incorporating this new record into their processes.
  - The Record Itself: The document is called the IUPUI Record of Experiential and Applied Learning (REAL). There are six broad categories represented under which numerous student experiential experiences can be captured and summarized. A time line is included with the record, outlining during which year each experience occurred. It also includes a summary of which Principles of Co-Curricular Learning was achieved for each experience. A second page provides a more

graphically pleasing image for the user along with more detail about each experience.

- Ongoing Development: Five pilot experiences were approved and student experiences in these areas will be updated to the SIS over the next several months. SIS tables and a workflow process have been set up. The Comprehensive Student Record (CSR) taskforce has also created a list of “new experiences” that would be of value to incorporate as things move forward. Since the work of the CSR taskforce is complete, a campus committee needed to be established or identified as an appropriate one to carry on the business of reviewing and approving new experiences, making suggestions for changes, revisions, etc. Based on conversations with campus administration, it was determined that PRAC—based on the deep understanding and appreciation of assessment—would be the appropriate group to review and approve proposals for more experiences that could be added to the record.
- Questions and Discussion:
  - Was the integration of an ePortfolio into the record considered? Answer: Yes. Certainly, the idea is that with a digital record an ePortfolio could be linked at some point in the future.
  - In terms of the workflow, where will requests for the addition of specific student experiences to the record originate and be approved? Answer: Those offices that are responsible for each of the unique experiences (i.e. Center for Service Learning, Center for Research and Learning, Study Abroad Office, etc.). In many cases, personnel in these offices have been doing the assessment and have a local database with the relevant information, but to this point it has not been provided in a standard way to students or third parties.
  - Is this system meant to interface with graduate education? Answer: Yes, but at the moment the focus has been on undergraduate experiences. There is not a reason graduate experiences could not be added.
  - Are there ways to make sure that all of the assigned principles get reviewed, since students can be good at some things but perhaps not others? Answer: No. The assumption is that if two Principles of Co-Curricular Learning are assigned to an experience, the student should demonstrate learning on both those principles. If they don’t, the experience should not be added to the record.
  - Comment: A PRAC structure for working with the new system will be worked on in the spring.

6. Discussion of Student Survey Needs — Michele Hansen and Anne Mitchell, Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS)

- Background: IRDS wants to be sure that the surveys it creates are useful. IRDS has agreed that individual schools are the place to attempt to meet expectations. The campus deans agree. IRDS is focusing on campus-wide surveys and the IRDS office realizes that conversations about surveys and their uses are needed with the schools.

- How Surveys Are Constructed and How They Are Used: Surveys typically include domain-specific information and additional supplemental information. Surveys can be centered on interviews and focus groups. Phone surveys are more appropriate for alumni. Over the years, dwindling response rates have been occurring with campus surveys, so an effort is being made to collect information at critical points in a student's time at IUPUI. IRDS will be shifting away from the Continuing Student Survey to shorter and topic-specific surveys.
  - Review of What Has Been Learned from Recent Surveys: Information has been gathered about student decisions, on factors associated with success, on student experiences, and on alumni satisfaction. IRDS is looking for alternative ways of collecting data, such as through Twitter. Alumni surveys also raise questions about how to get in touch with our graduates. Recent problems with sample size have occurred because of response rates. IRDS wants to set up collaboration across schools in order to coordinate the larger surveys.
  - Questions for PRAC to Consider: What information is missing from recent surveys and at what point should information be collected? Who should collect that information? What common questions should appear in Blue? Should there be a survey on the transition to the major?
  - Additional Ideas Being Considered: An alumni survey for graduates 1 – 3 years out. A new survey policy similar to Bloomington and others that says that if an institution-wide survey is going to occur, that survey should go through IUPUI Faculty Council's Survey Policy Committee. This should help with a sense of when surveys are best administered and of how to support better response rates.
  - Anne Mitchell will be back in January to talk about specific surveys and how they may be used. Both Hansen and Mitchell will return in the future with information from discussions with deans and others who work with and administer surveys in the schools.
  - Questions:
    - When the peer mentor survey is administered, what is done with the information? Answer: Mentors use it in the first-year seminar program.
7. Assessment Institute Track Leaders Debriefing — Karen Black, Director of Program Review, and Assessment Institute track leaders
- Background: Track leaders were asked to provide a summary of what happened at this past October's Assessment Institute in order to create a better connection with *Assessment Update* and the institute itself. Track leaders agreed to provide the information, and this panel will become a standing panel presentation at PRAC.
  - Assessment Institute Track Leader Presentations:
    - Jennifer Thorington Springer—High Impact Practices (HIPs)
      - The track is looking for ways to open the definition of high impact practices.
      - Some common themes in this track: changing demographics and how best to serve students; paying attention to the quality of high impact practices; redefining student success in high impact practices through backward design; getting more students to participate in high impact practices.

- Sarah Zoller, Marian University—Graduate Track
  - Some common themes of this track: multiple assessments and how to combine the data; co-curricular assessment; more assessment of student self-awareness in graduate study.
- Leslie Bozeman—International and Global Learning
  - Some common themes of this track: challenges of addressing global learning at large institutions; private institutions and what they do with international and global learning.
- Susan Kahn—ePortfolio Track
  - Typically, participants come to the sessions to learn about ePortfolios. Of the four health-related sessions, three came from pharmacy schools.
  - Some common themes: how to use ePortfolios as a mode of learning; what is happening in graduate and professional programs; co-curricular learning.
- Question from the moderator: What was innovative in the tracks?
  - Jennifer Thorington Springer — Presentations from IUPUI and IUB tended to be more innovative. IUPUI's taxonomies, which have been designed to support implementation of high impact practices, were shown to be very useful. Additional innovations: tools for supporting faculty designing courses for high impact practices; techniques for working on language for taxonomies; and using NSSE responses to support high impact practices, especially for first-generation students.
  - Sarah Zoller— The keynote on assumptions about part-time graduate faculty was a highlight, especially as the assumptions affect how we look at part-time faculty from the professions.
  - Leslie Bozeman—Innovative ideas included the keynote centering on definitions of global learning; what it means to use a multiple-disciplines approach to international and global learning; deciding who needs to be involved in international and global learning assessment and how it might become a campus-wide concern; addressing the lack of equal funding for international offices; and innovations in working with internationalization grants.
  - Susan Kahn—The most developed presentations on ePortfolios came from IUPUI presenters. Innovative approaches included the use of ePortfolios to support development of professional identity and to assess the quality of one's work; support for integrative learning; and a great keynote focused on using ePortfolios in science to help students understand that scientific inquiry is about not knowing the answer and to document their process of developing and testing hypotheses.
- Karen Black closed the session by inviting members and other participants to read *Assessment Update* columns on the above topics.

## 8. Adjournment

- Adjournment at 2:45

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, January 12 from 1:30 to 3:00 in University Hall 1006

Thursday, February 9 from 1:30 to 3:00 in University Hall 1006

Thursday, March 9 from 1:30 to 3:00 in University Hall 1006

Thursday, April 6 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall 1006

Thursday, May 11 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in University Hall 1006

Respectfully submitted by Scott Weeden  
December 23, 2016

## **Mapping Assessment using Anthropological Methods: Supporting Faculty Development and Student Learning across Multiple Sections of an Introductory Course**

**Abstract:** While other disciplines have made significant steps in assessment, the field of anthropology is just beginning to coordinate assessment among its introductory courses (Loker 2016). This project provides a model for aligning course learning objectives with departmental, university, and state-level goals and synchronizing these and the assessment of student performance across multiple sections. This project innovatively draws from anthropological methods used to coordinate team-based coding of qualitative data to 1.) map ANTH-A104 section learning objectives with IUPUI's PULs and statewide competencies 2.) develop master grading rubrics and example booklets that correlate faculty assessment of student performance and support student learning. (100 words)

## **Purpose of Project:**

**Problem:** In contrast to other disciplines, such as History and Mathematics, little research has been carried out within the field of Anthropology to establish protocols for standardizing the assessment of student learning in introductory courses, which often include varied assignments and readings (Loker 2016).

**Goal:** The purpose of this project is to map and coordinate assessment of statewide competencies, PULS, and course-level learning objectives across multiple sections of IUPUI's ANTH-A104 Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. Since each section of ANTH-A104 includes different assignments, in-class activities, and exams built around similar textbooks, the goal of this project is to facilitate instructor creativity in the area of pedagogy while coordinating assessment. Preserving such creativity is key to enhancing student learning by giving faculty flexibility in adjusting course activities and assignments to better match the given make-up of student learning styles in a class from semester to semester and as the student body changes. To achieve the proposed goal, Dr. Audrey Ricke will lead the department in developing and implementing a series of master grading rubrics and accompanying example booklets, which contain excerpts of complete, incomplete, and "almost but not quite" student performance. The initial master grading rubrics and example booklets will be developed in Spring and Summer 2017 and implemented in Fall 2017. These materials, which will be stored on the department's shared IU Box folder, will function as living documents. Department faculty will be able to revisit the documents at the end of each academic year, uploading suggestions to the folder and approving additions and refinements of the grading rubrics and booklets where applicable.

## **Intended Outcomes of the Project:**

The outcomes of this project are two-fold: the production of professional development resources for faculty in the area of student assessment and the creation of a model to correlate assessment across introductory sections with variable pedagogical approaches. On the individual instructor level, one outcome will be easy access to guidelines (master grading rubrics and examples) to help instructors align



their in-class and out-of-class assignments with IUPUI's PULs and statewide competencies. In addition, the creation and inclusion of example booklets will increase consistency in assessment across sections and serve as a resource for designing student support materials. On the university and discipline level, this project will contribute a model for coordinating the assessment of learning in both introductory anthropology courses and other disciplines where varied approaches to teaching a course are desired.

### **Assessment Methods:**

As the Gateway coordinator for ANTH-A104, Dr. Audrey Ricke will serve as the project director. She will adopt a model for coordinating assessment and developing rubrics and example booklets based on past scholars' guidelines for developing codebooks for team-based qualitative analysis (MacQueen et al. 2008; Ryan 1995). Much like coding qualitative data for abstract and concrete concepts derived from theory, the assessment of undergraduate writing involves the instructor determining the degree to which students' written performances match or deviate from learning objectives derived from course, university, and state-wide academic goals. Whether it is a team of researchers coding various unstructured interviews or a team of instructors grading different written assignments, a codebook is essential to coordinate assessment.

### **Mapping Learning Objectives to IUPUI's PUL 5 and Statewide Competencies**

**Step 1:** Dr. Ricke will finalize IRB approval in Fall 2016. In January 2017, Ricke will create a Google at IU group space for all IUPUI ANTH-A104 faculty and ask them to complete a shared excel chart in order to begin the process of mapping the course learning objectives to the different components of PUL 5 Understanding Society and Culture and of the statewide competency Socio and Behavioral Ways of Knowing. The chart will consist of the department's list of learning objectives as rows. There will be columns for each of the ANTH-A104 instructors. Each instructor will cut and paste the learning objective from his/her syllabus that matches each of the department's objectives, indicate which of the PUL 5 components (i.e. 5.1 to 5.3) and statewide competencies for Socio and Behavioral Ways of Knowing (5.1

to 5.6) most closely align with that objective, and give a brief description of what type of assessment tool they plan or currently use, i.e. comparison paper or exam question about religious practices.

**Step 2:** In February 2017, all of the ANTH-A104 faculty will meet for approximately 1.5 to 2 hours to 1) finalize the alignment of the department's course objectives to particular components of PUL 5 and the statewide competencies and 2) decide if certain learning objectives must involve a written component for assessment. If time permits, we will begin discussion of what complete vs. incomplete performance looks like in student written responses associated with particular learning objectives. Prior to the meeting, Ricke will analyze the faculty-produced chart from Step 1 for major deviations in alignment of selected PUL components or statewide competencies and circulate the results and meeting agenda to course faculty via email. Ricke will take detailed notes at the meeting and upload the finalized alignment chart to a shared IU Box folder. In preparation for Step 3, she will ask faculty to email her their grading rubrics for the written assignments/essays they indicated in the chart as well as ask them to collect and send at least two anonymous examples each of complete, incomplete, and "almost but not quite" student work as it relates to the targeted learning objectives.

### **Development and Piloting of the Codebook for Correlating Assessment**

**Step 3:** Ricke will use the remainder of the spring semester and summer 2017 to compile master grading rubrics and sample example booklets for each learning objective currently linked to student writing. In order to do this, Ricke will look for the common themes across the submitted grading rubrics for the same learning objective and write an overarching grading rubric that is applicable to the varying assignments and consistent with the associated PUL and statewide competency components. The master grading rubrics will not address point values but focus on capturing the key elements essential for demonstrating mastery. Ricke will also start development of the accompanying example booklets which will provide instructors with an idea of what different levels of mastery look like for particular components across a variety of assignments. The booklets will follow Gery Ryan's guidelines for

qualitative codebooks and consist of the following a) inclusion criteria b) exclusion criteria c) complete examples d) incomplete examples e) close but not quite examples (1995). See the attached supplemental materials for an example. Faculty will review the draft rubrics and booklets in the shared IU Box folder and be encouraged to post comments by August 7, 2017.

**Step 4:** In August 2017, Ricke will organize a focus group of all ANTH-A104 instructors to finalize the grading rubrics and example booklets. Based on the feedback from the focus group and Box comments, Ricke will make any additional changes and post the finalized grading rubrics and booklets to the shared IU Box account. In October, Ricke will lead a one hour norming session with ANTH-A104 faculty, who will all grade the same set of three anonymous FERPA-approved student papers from one of her ANTH-A104 sections using the new grading rubrics and example booklets and discuss their scores collectively. Following MacQueen et al.'s guidelines, wherever less than 85% of the faculty differ on the assessment of a paper, Ricke will lead a discussion to clarify varying interpretations and make adjustments to the corresponding grading rubric and example booklet, re-posting the final versions in the shared IU Box folder (2008). The department will ask all ANTH-A104 instructors to use these grading rubrics where applicable and save and upload to the IU Box two anonymous FERPA-approved examples each of complete, incomplete, and "close but not quite" student written work from that semester.

**Data Analysis:** In December 2017, Ricke will compare the submitted graded papers for the same learning objective from Step 2 with those submitted by faculty after the norming session to determine the extent to which intergrader reliability increased. For those learning objectives where Ricke has samples from at least two out of the seven ANTH-A104 faculty, Ricke will segment each document by paragraph or sentence depending on length and compare the agreement across graders of what was evaluated as complete vs. incomplete following the inclusion and exclusion criteria. She will note areas in the Fall 2017 submissions where agreement is below 85% and revisit these areas next semester in a norming session to clarify.

**Evaluation and Dissemination of Results:** Ricke will present and receive feedback about the assessment model and its results at national anthropology conferences, such as the American Anthropological Association and the Society for Applied Anthropology, as well as at the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. In addition to submitting the final report to the PRAC committee, she will publish the results in academic journals, such as *Education Assessment*.

**Details on Intended Use of Findings for Program Improvement:** The professional development materials from this study will be used to support anthropology faculty in all stages of their careers in designing learning projects and correlating assessment across multiple sections while maintaining pedagogical creativity. At the same time, the alignment process will isolate areas of student learning where more attention is needed within a given section, such as a course section that does not explicitly address a particular component of the statewide competency or PUL. Using this information, the ANTH-A104 coordinator can better arrange mentorship for the instructor with a faculty member who is explicitly addressing the issue. The developed model will also be used to coordinate assessment across the multiple sections of IUPUI's ANTH-A103 Human Origins and Prehistory. In addition, the process of developing the example booklet by looking at sample student work across the sections will highlight and isolate areas that students commonly struggle with. The same resources that are used to support faculty will then be modified to guide students through the writing process, such as practice exercises where students pick out the complete answer and explain why. See the attached supplemental materials for an example. Together, the master grading rubric and example booklet project will provide a model for departments at IUPUI and beyond that will show rather than describe for both faculty and students the criteria and process for assessing student performance while valuing creativity.

## References Cited:

- Loker, William. 2016. "What Do We Want our Students to Learn? Learning Outcomes for Anthropology." *Anthropology News*, September 16. <http://www.anthropology-news.org/index.php/2016/09/16/what-do-we-want-our-students-to-learn/>
- MacQueen, Kathleen, Eleanor McLellan-Lemal, Kelly Bartholow, and Bobby Milstein. 2008. "Team-based Codebook Development: Structure, Process, and Agreement." In *Handbook for Team-Based Qualitative Research*, edited by Greg Guest and Kathleen MacQueen, 119-136. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Ryan, Gery W. 1995. "Medical Decision Making among the Kom of Cameroon: Modeling how Characteristics of Illnesses, Patients, Caretakers, and Compounds Affect Treatment Choice in a Rural Community." Ph.D. diss., University of Florida, Gainesville.

**Simple Budget:**

Item	Cost
<p>MaxQDA Analytics Pro Software-</p> <p>To be used to code and analyze qualitative data gathered in faculty meetings, focus groups, and compare assessment of sample student work (intergrader reliability)</p>	\$785.00
<p>Supplemental Salary for A. Ricke - to develop the grading rubrics and example booklets and analyze effectiveness of these materials and the norming session over the next year, including summer 2017. A. Ricke is on a 10 month contract which does not cover work in summer months.</p> <p>Funding for A. Ricke to go to national conferences, like the American Anthropological Association meetings (approximately \$1000 for travel, lodging, and registration) and the Society for Applied Anthropology meetings (approximately \$1200 for travel, lodging, and registration).</p>	\$4215.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5000.00</b>

## Indiana University School of Nursing: PRAC Assessment Project Proposal

**Name and rank/title of Project Director(s):**

Cynthia M. Bemis DNP, RN, NE-BC, Clinical Assistant Professor  
Indiana University School of Nursing  
Community & Health Systems Department

**Program/Track and School:**

Baccalaureate Nursing Program, Nursing Graduates, School of Nursing

**Campus Address:**

Indiana University School of Nursing  
600 Barnhill Drive, NU 405W  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

**Phone:** (317)278-2230

**Fax:** (317)274-2411

**E-mail:** [cmbemis@iu.edu](mailto:cmbemis@iu.edu)

**Project Title:** Evaluation of the BSN Program Outcomes as Demonstrated by the Nurse in the First Year of Practice

**Project Dates:** December 1, 2016 – November 30, 2017

**Project Checklist**

**Statement of support:** Dr. Diane Von Ah, Associate Professor and Chair, will submit a letter of support for this project.

**Simple budget:** See narrative on page 7.

**IRB Approval:** Ongoing IRB approval has been obtained for evaluation of student graduate surveys, manager/educator questionnaire, and one-on-one interviews with managers/educators. Protocol # 1606235937

## **Abstract**

In today's complex healthcare environment, it is imperative that nurses are prepared in a manner that teaches them to be safe, competent providers of care. The process of evaluating nurses at the end of their program of study is a summative evaluation by preceptors on demonstration of the nursing program objectives and satisfactory program completion. While the evaluation may provide a theoretical understanding of the graduate nurse's ability to perform in practice, they do not demonstrate the nurse's abilities to competently care for others. Tracking a graduate's performance as they enter the practice setting will reflect more accurately achievement of program outcomes and deficits that may exist.

## **Purpose of Project**

The 2016 Indiana University (IU) School of Nursing strategic plan (Appendix A) has four areas, one of which pertains to the education of nurses that are prepared to deliver state-of-the-art care. Aligning with the strategic plan is to evaluate program curricula to meet national demands and priorities. Many of these priorities are found in the Institute of Medicines 2010 report on *The Future of Nursing: Leading change, Advancing Health*. These include:

1. The evidence of the value that a nurse's education plays in linking it to every health care quality measure and patient performance outcome.
2. The increase in proportion of Bachelor of Nursing Science (BSN) prepared nurses to 80% by 2020.
3. The improvement of data collection and information infrastructures.

Additional national priorities include the need to collaborate with our practice partners to meet the needs of our students and the health care facilities. In 2012, Indiana hospitals reported 37,978 vacant registered nurse positions. Nursing and residential care areas reported another 3,223 vacant RN positions (Indiana Action Coalition, 2013). Indiana is projecting a 17,521 shortfall of BSN nurses by 2020 (Indiana Action Coalition, 2013). In addition to the projected shortages is the gap between education and practice. Many



in nurses in practice think that graduate nurses are not fully prepared when entering practice (Numminen, O., Laine, T., Isoaho, H., Hupli, M., Leino-Kilpi, H., & Meretoja, R., 2014). Competence in nursing practice is related to quality and patient outcomes. Making sure that our graduates are prepared to deliver safe, quality care in their nursing practice needs to be a priority for the IU School of Nursing and included in our methods of evaluation.

The current evaluation of program outcomes in the IU School of Nursing is limited. The current evaluation is not reflective of student performance in the nursing role and does not allow for feedback on areas that need improvement. Currently, the performance of schools of nursing are based on basic data collected upon graduation mainly use for accreditation purposes. Both internal and external drivers are used to create the overall evaluation of a nursing program. Internal drivers are the collection of data used by the institution to enhance the effectiveness and quality of the nursing program. These may include items such as evaluation by preceptors during and at the end of the program; graduate program satisfaction; alumni and employer surveys; and faculty satisfaction with the program. External drivers are those imposed by national and regional accrediting bodies (Lewallen, 2015). Included here are State Boards of Nursing, Accreditation Commission for Nursing Education (ACEN), and Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). Accrediting bodies usually focus on key standards that include items such as graduation rates; NCLEX pass rates; attrition rates; faculty qualifications and ratios; program resources; and program policies (Lewallen, 2015). While the information provided in these evaluations give a summative view of performance, very little insight is obtained about the performance of the graduates once they are in practice as a licensed nurse.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the graduate nurse, after licensure is achieved, in the first year of practice. The study is part of a collaborative effort with Indiana University Health, a major community partner with the IU School of Nursing and employer of our graduate nurses. Demonstration of BSN program outcomes in IU School of Nursing graduates during their 12-18 months of nursing practice will provide valuable data about the achievement of our nursing program outcomes. In collaboration with

Indiana University Health, employee and employer feedback on performance in program outcomes will be collected and analyzed over the course of this project. Information collected will be used for program evaluation and improvement. The specific aims of this project are:

1. To determine if nurses graduating from the IU School of Nursing BSN program are demonstrating achievement of program outcomes during their first year of nursing practice.
2. To determine if a top employer of nurses from our program feel that our nurses are demonstrating the state-of-the-art care needed in their facility based on achievement of the BSN program outcomes.
3. To compare the performance of IU School of Nursing graduates with nursing graduates of other programs in Indiana.
4. To determine areas in the BSN program that need improvement.

### **Intended Outcomes of the Project**

The intended outcome of this project is to determine the achievement of BSN program outcomes demonstrated by self and employer-assessed behaviors in IU School of Nursing graduate nurses during their first year of practice.

### **Assessment Methods**

All new registered nurse graduates hired at Indiana University Health in the academic health center (Methodist, University and Riley) are placed into a residency cohort. The nurses for the purpose of this study were hired at Indiana University Health in the fall of 2015 and spring of 2016. At the beginning of the cohort the nurse graduate completes the Casey-Fink Graduate Nurse Survey (Appendix B). There are nine questions within the survey that represent outcome measures of the Indiana University School of Nursing program outcomes. The questions are answered on a 4 point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Most of the nurses begin their residency program after orientation about four to six months into practice. Additional demographics on the survey that will be assessed are the nursing school

that the nurse attended, the type of degree received, and if the nurse had previous health care work experience. The questions will be analyzed to determine baseline outcomes for any nurse that attended IU School of Nursing and compared with a combined group of nurses from other schools of nursing that attended comparable programs of study. Approximately 300 nurse surveys have been collected and data entry has begun with help from the Office of Research Support at the IU School of Nursing. Electronic questionnaires (Appendix C) will be sent to employing managers, educators, preceptors, and charge nurses of the new graduates in November 2016, requesting feedback on practice performance in BSN program outcomes. One on one interview with managers, educators, preceptors, and charge nurses for qualitative feedback will be sought. The interviews will take place over the months of December 2016 and January 2017.

### **Data Analysis**

All data analysis will be in collaboration with George Bakoyannis and Susan Ofner, biostatistical and qualitative experts within the IU School of Nursing, Office of Research Support. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests will be used to statistically evaluate potential differences in outcome performance scores between different schools of Nursing. In order to adjust for the potential confounding effects of gender and type of nursing program, quantile regression will be employed based on bootstrap standard error estimation. Additionally, each outcome will be assessed on graduates of IU School of nursing to determine performance. Qualitative surveys and interviews will be used to determine the level of perception and satisfaction with nursing managers, educators, preceptors, and charge nurses interacting with IU School of Nursing graduates during the first year of practice.

### **Evaluation and Dissemination of Results**

A final report of project outcomes will be disseminated to the PRAC Committee, the IU School of Nursing executive leadership team and strategic planning committee, the BSN curriculum and evaluation committee, Indiana University Health research committees and executive teams, and the Sigma

Theta Tau Nurse Faculty Leadership Academy for discussion and planning of significant findings. The findings will be published and widely disseminated through conference presentations nationally.

### **Intended Use of Findings**

The finding from this study will be incorporated in the evaluation of the IU School of Nursing BSN program and used to make curricular and program decisions. We will celebrate the areas that we are excelling in and make plans to improve in areas of need. The finding will be discussed as a new innovative way to assess programs of nursing in the State of Indiana thru the Indiana Center for Nursing and the Indiana Nurses Association. A long-term goal will to bring the National Council of Boards of Nursing onboard in a national initiative to better evaluate programs of nursing in each state.

### **Budget Narrative**

The funding for this project will be used to support a research assistant to help with data mining and analysis and to pay for conference registration/travel for the purpose of dissemination of results at professional conferences. The IU School of Nursing, Office of Research Support will provide survey evaluation and data analysis.

Research Assistant (220 hrs x \$15/hr)	\$3300.00
Registration/Travel to Present at National Conference ( 2017 Annual National League for Nursing Conference, San Diego, CA)	\$1700.00
Total	\$5000.00

## References

- Indiana Action Coalition (2013). An overview of the nursing workforce, educational capacity, and future demand for nurses in the state of Indiana. Retrieved at:  
[https://www.ic4n.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Final-report\\_Indiana-Nursing-Data\\_IAC-Education-Subcommittee.pdf](https://www.ic4n.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Final-report_Indiana-Nursing-Data_IAC-Education-Subcommittee.pdf)
- Institute of Medicine, IOM Report (2011). The future of nursing; Leading change, advancing Health. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2010/The-Future-of-Nursing-Leading-Change-Advancing-Health.aspx>
- Lewallen, L. P. (2015). Practical strategies for nursing education program evaluation. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 31(2):133-140.
- Numminen, O., Laine, T., Isoaho, H., Hupli, M., Leino-Kilpi, H., & Meretoja, R., (2014). Do educational outcomes correspond with the requirements of nursing practice: educators' and managers' assessments of novice nurses' in professional competence. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 28(4):812-21.

## Appendix A:



## 2016-2021 Strategic Plan Overview

### Transformational Nursing, Unlimited Possibilities

**Focus Area #1:** Educate nurses prepared to deliver state-of-the-art care, conduct cutting edge research, and lead significant healthcare improvements in Indiana and beyond.

#### Supporting Strategies:

1. Evaluate IUSON academic curricula for relevancy by matching our programs to national demands and priorities.
2. Optimize resource allocation to create viable, high quality programs that meet the public needs for nursing care.
3. Create educational programs and teaching strategies that are efficient, innovative, and effective.
4. Grow our culture of excellence in education as evidenced in faculty as exceptional educators and academic leaders.
5. Renew focus on attracting high quality, diverse students for all educational programs with an emphasis on graduate programs.

**Focus Area #2:** Recruit and retain high-quality faculty and staff.

#### Supporting Strategies:

1. Renew focus on attracting and retaining faculty and staff.
2. Review and modify organization and community structure to address culture challenges and promote positive, collaborative atmosphere.

**Focus Area #3:** Be a national leader in innovative science to improve patient outcomes.

#### Supporting Strategies:

1. Maximize Office of Research Support (ORS) resources across the continuum from idea to dissemination.
2. Strengthen portfolio of externally funded research to improve patient outcomes in Indiana, the nation, and the world.
3. Increase breadth and depth of research funding from sources that provide indirect funds.
4. Accelerate translation of research into practice and curriculum.
5. Seek funding for and implement more competitive recruitment and retention packages for full-time research faculty.

**Focus Area #4:** Cultivate internal and external partnerships and initiatives to advance future approaches to research, education, and service.

#### Supporting Strategies:

1. Create IUSON Partnership and Innovation Team.
2. Develop collaborative partnerships based on IUSON mission, vision, areas of excellence and needs of stakeholders locally, nationally, and globally.
3. Deliver innovative services to external markets, focused on IUSON areas of excellence.
4. Develop partnerships to support advocacy efforts that enhance the health and well-being of Hoosiers.
5. Expand international initiatives in nursing education, research, and service.

Dated: 7/08/2016

## Appendix B:

**Casey-Fink Graduate Nurse Experience Survey (revised)**  
 © 2006 University of Colorado Hospital. All rights reserved.

- I. List the top three skills/procedures you are *uncomfortable performing independently at this time?* (please select from the drop down list) **list is at the end of this document.**

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_ I am independent in all skills

- II. Please answer each of the following questions by placing a mark inside the circles:

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. I feel <b>confident communicating with physicians.</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I am comfortable <b>knowing what to do for a dying patient.</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I feel comfortable <b>delegating tasks</b> to the Nursing Assistant.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I feel at ease <b>asking for help</b> from other RNs on the unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I am having difficulty <b>prioritizing patient care needs.</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I feel my preceptor provides encouragement and feedback about my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. I feel staff is available to me during new situations and procedures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I feel overwhelmed by my patient care responsibilities and workload.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I feel supported by the nurses on my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I have opportunities to practice skills and procedures more than once.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. I feel <b>comfortable communicating with patients and their families.</b>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
12. I am able to complete my patient care assignment on time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. I feel the expectations of me in this job are realistic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I feel prepared to complete my job responsibilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. I feel comfortable making suggestions for changes to the nursing plan of care.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. I am having difficulty organizing patient care needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. I feel I may harm a patient due to my lack of knowledge and experience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. There are positive role models for me to observe on my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. My preceptor is helping me to develop confidence in my practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. I am supported by my family/friends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. I am satisfied with my chosen nursing specialty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. I feel my work is exciting and challenging.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. I feel my manager provides encouragement and feedback about my work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. I am experiencing stress in my personal life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. If you chose agree or strongly agree, to #24, please indicate what is causing your stress. (You may circle more than once choice.)				
a. Finances				
b. Child care				
c. Student loans				
d. Living situation				
e. Personal relationships				
f. Job performance				
g. Other _____				



**III. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job:**

	VERY DISSATISFIED	MODERATELY DISSATISFIED	NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED	MODERATELY SATISFIED	VERY SATISFIED
Salary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vacation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benefits package	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hours that you work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Weekends off per month	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your amount of responsibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunities for career advancement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount of encouragement and feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity for choosing shifts worked	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**IV. Transition (please circle any or all that apply)**

**1. What difficulties, if any, are you currently experiencing with the transition from the "student" role to the "RN" role?**

- role expectations (e.g. autonomy, more responsibility, being a preceptor or in charge)
- lack of confidence (e.g. MD/PT communication skills, delegation, knowledge deficit, critical thinking)
- workload (e.g. organizing, prioritizing, feeling overwhelmed, ratios, patient acuity)
- fears (e.g. patient safety)
- orientation issues (e.g. unit familiarization, learning technology, relationship with multiple preceptors, information overload)

**2. What could be done to help you feel more supported or integrated into the unit?**

- improved orientation (e.g. preceptor support and consistency, orientation extension, unit specific skills practice)
- increased support (e.g. manager, RN, and educator feedback and support, mentorship)
- unit socialization (e.g. being introduced to staff and MDs, opportunities for staff socialization)
- improved work environment (e.g. gradual ratio changes, more assistance from unlicensed personnel, involvement in schedule and committee work)

**3. What aspects of your work environment are most satisfying?**

- peer support (e.g. belonging, team approach, helpful and friendly staff)
- patients and families (e.g. making a difference, positive feedback, patient satisfaction, patient interaction)

- c. ongoing learning (e.g. preceptors, unit role models, mentorship)
- d. professional nursing role (e.g. challenge, benefits, fast pace, critical thinking, empowerment)
- e. positive work environment (e.g. good ratios, available resources, great facility, up-to-date technology)

**4. What aspects of your work environment are least satisfying?**

- a. nursing work environment (e.g. unrealistic ratios, tough schedule, futility of care)
- b. system (e.g. outdated facilities and equipment, small workspace, charting, paperwork)
- c. interpersonal relationships (e.g. gossip, lack of recognition, lack of teamwork, politics)
- d. orientation (inconsistent preceptors, lack of feedback)

**5. Please share any comments or concerns you have about your residency program:**

---



---

**V. Demographics: Circle the response that represents the most accurate description of your individual professional profile.**

1. Age: \_\_\_\_\_ years
2. Gender:
  - a. Female
  - b. Male
3. Ethnicity:
  - a. Caucasian (white)
  - b. Black
  - c. Hispanic
  - d. Asian
  - e. Other
  - f. I do not wish to include this information
4. Area of specialty:
  - a. Adult Medical/Surgical
  - b. Adult Critical Care
  - c. OB/Post Partum
  - d. NICU
  - e. Pediatrics
  - f. Emergency Department
  - g. Oncology
  - h. Transplant
  - i. Rehabilitation
  - j. OR/PACU
  - k. Psychiatry
  - l. Ambulatory Clinic
  - m. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

5. School of Nursing Attended (name, city, state located): \_\_\_\_\_
6. Date of Graduation: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Degree Received: AD: \_\_\_\_\_ Diploma: \_\_\_\_\_ BSN: \_\_\_\_\_ ND: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Other Non-Nursing Degree (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_
9. Date of Hire (as a Graduate Nurse): \_\_\_\_\_
10. What previous health care work experience have you had:
- a. Volunteer
  - b. Nursing Assistant
  - c. Medical Assistant
  - d. Unit Secretary
  - e. EMT
  - f. Student Externship
  - g. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you functioned as a charge nurse?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
12. Have you functioned as a preceptor?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
13. What is your scheduled work pattern?
- a. Straight days
  - b. Straight evenings
  - c. Straight nights
  - d. Rotating days/evenings
  - e. Rotating days/nights
  - f. Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
14. How long was your unit orientation?
- a. Still ongoing
  - b.  $\leq$  8 weeks
  - c. 9 – 12 weeks
  - d. 13 – 16 weeks
  - e. 17 - 23 weeks
  - f.  $\geq$  24 weeks
15. How many *primary* preceptors have you had during your orientation?  
\_\_\_\_\_ number of preceptors
16. Today's date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C:

Confidential

Evaluation of BSN Program Outcomes as Demonstrated by the Nurse in the First Year of Practice  
Page 1 of 2**Evaluation of BSN Program Outcomes as Demonstrated  
by the Nurse in the First year of Practice**

Participant ID \_\_\_\_\_

In the past year, have you on-boarded a recent graduate nurse from the IU School of Nursing?

- Yes  
 No

Are you a Manager, Educator, Charge Nurse, or Preceptor?

- Manager  
 Educator  
 Charge Nurse  
 Preceptor

---

**Please rate in your professional opinion, the IU School of Nursing, graduate nurse's ability in their first year of practice on the following:**

	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Intellectual engagement in the practice environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to use clinical reasoning in practice decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to use holistic and culturally sensitive care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to coordinate care and collaborate with the interdisciplinary team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to provide family-centered care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to understand and consider healthy policy and regulations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to conduct oneself based on professional standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to apply ethical and legal standards in practice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to effectively communicate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to lead/manage quality and patient safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to integrate information management and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exhibits advanced-beginner level confidence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please reflect on recent IUSON new graduate nurses you have hired, include strengths and areas of needed improvement

\_\_\_\_\_

*Confidential*

Page 2 of 2

Please provide any comments specifically related to the IU School of Nursing graduate in the first year of practice.

---

Are you willing to participate in a one-on-one interview with the researcher to hear more about our study and provide additional qualitative information on our graduates?

- Yes  
 No

If you answered yes to the previous question and would be willing to provide your personal information to be interviewed, please leave your name and contact information here.

---

**Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI  
PRAC Assessment Project Proposal**

**Name and rank/title of Project Director(s):**

Sara Anne Hook, M.B.A., J.D., Professor of Informatics/Human-Centered Computing

Liugen (Louie) Zhu, Ph.D., Lecturer, Informatics/Human-Centered Computing

**Program/Track and School:**

B.S. in Informatics, School of Informatics and Computing (SoIC)

**Campus Address:**

Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing  
535 W. Michigan Street, IT 589  
Indianapolis, IN 46202

**Phone:** (317) 278-7690

**Fax:** (317) 278-7669

**Email:** [sahook@iupui.edu](mailto:sahook@iupui.edu)

**Project Title:** Reviewing, Revising and Implementing the Program-Level Outcomes (PLOs) for the B.S. in Informatics

**Project Dates:** January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017

**Project Checklist**

\_X\_ **Statement of Support:** Dr. Davide Bolchini, Chair, Human-Centered Computing (HCC) Department, will submit a letter of support for this project.

\_X\_ **Simple budget:** See Data Analysis on page 5.

\_X\_ **IRB approval:** Project Directors will seek IRB approval for the faculty survey and questions for the individual interviews.

**Abstract:** This project combines a syllabus review, a survey of faculty members and interviews with key stakeholders to examine existing Program-Level Outcomes (PLOs) for the B.S. in Informatics and to use the results of this inquiry to revise the current PLOs, which are woefully inadequate, outdated and difficult to measure. The project directors assist faculty members to ensure that the revised PLOs are integrated into syllabi for all courses that are part of the B.S. in Informatics and are matched with appropriate assessment methods to clearly demonstrate that the PLOs are being achieved as the curriculum evolves in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Purpose of the Project:** For Fall semester 2016, all faculty members teaching courses in the B.S. in Informatics program were asked by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the School of Informatics and Computing (SoIC) to add Program-Level Outcomes (PLOs) to their syllabi and to tie these PLOs to specific assignments and other assessment methods in their courses.<sup>1</sup> This information is intended to complement the current syllabus requirement to match learning outcomes and assignments with the PULs.<sup>2</sup> It is likely that most faculty members did not do this because of the short timeframe and lack of understanding about the PLOs.

Unfortunately, the PLOs for the B.S. in Informatics are generic, woefully outdated, difficult to measure and have not kept up with the evolution of the fast-changing discipline of Informatics and the emerging career opportunities for people with this degree. One of the project directors did add information about the PLOs to her syllabus and linked them to individual assignments, but found it frustrating because of issues with the existing PLOs. At various points over the last few years, faculty members talked about the need to revise these PLOs, but attempts to do so were barely started before more immediate concerns took precedence. As daunting as the revision of the PLOs and alignment with courses may be for some faculty members, it is imperative in an era when a wide variety of constituents, including students, parents, potential

## PRAC Proposal (Hook & Zhu)

employers, taxpayers, legislators and university trustees, want to ensure that campuses are doing what they promise to do in terms of preparing graduates for the 21<sup>st</sup> century realities of work and life.<sup>3-4</sup> Moreover, as already seen in other industries, a wide variety of technology-enabled and well-funded enterprises are making inroads into the once-secure realm of higher education, with certificates, coding camps, MOOCs and other venues providing learners with a myriad of choices to obtain the content and credentials they need. A review of the literature indicates a number of strategies for reviewing, revising and implementing program- and course-level outcomes and how to map these to the curriculum for online as well as face-to-face courses.<sup>5-11</sup>

The revision of the PLOs is essential at this point in the evolution of SoIC, especially given the feedback from the Program Review team this past spring. The two project directors are the most appropriate people to lead this effort, since they are the most senior faculty members in the B.S. in Informatics program and their courses are the backbone of the degree. Many of the program's courses are already online and the project directors are working with colleagues at the regional campuses to offer a Collaborative B.S. in Informatics. As one of the first completely online degrees to be created through the IU Online initiative, the project directors are especially eager to see how the findings from the project can inform the development of this new degree.<sup>12</sup>

In order to comply with what SoIC's Associate Dean has requested, to improve the B.S. in Informatics program overall, to clearly demonstrate student learning that matches the PLOs and to plan wisely and strategically for the program in the future, the project directors will devote 2017 to the following activities:



## PRAC Proposal (Hook & Zhu)

1. Gather and review all syllabi for courses in the B.S. in Informatics program to see which syllabi are in compliance with the request to include the PLOs and whether the PLOs are tied to specific assignments and other assessment methods (Spring 2017).
2. Prepare and distribute a survey to faculty members teaching courses in the B.S. in Informatics program to gather their thoughts on the existing PLOs and their input on what the future PLOs should be (Spring 2017).
3. Interview the Department Chair, SoIC's career services staff and appropriate industry professionals about what the marketplace needs in the way of properly-prepared, work-ready graduates from the B.S. in Informatics program (Summer 2017).
4. Present the findings from #1-#3 to the Informatics curriculum committee and SoIC administration (Fall 2017).
5. Collaborate with faculty members and administrators to revise the PLOs based on the syllabus review, faculty survey and individual interviews (Fall 2017).
6. Oversee updating SoIC's website and all B.S. in Informatics marketing and curriculum materials to reflect the revised PLOs (Fall 2017).
7. Prepare and submit a final report by December 2017 that will assist with the next Program Review and Assessment process for the B.S. in Informatics.

**Intended Outcomes of the Project:** The intended outcome of the project is to develop an updated and carefully considered list of Program-Level Outcomes (PLOs) for the B.S. in Informatics that is specifically tailored to this unique degree and that includes the input from faculty, administrators, career services professionals and potential employers.

**Assessment Methods:** Assessment methods will include review of syllabi from B.S. in Informatics courses (core and elective courses), a web-based survey of faculty members teaching courses in the B.S. in Informatics program and interviews with stakeholders.

**Data Analysis:** The intensive task of data analysis as well as the interviews with stakeholders will take place during Summer 2017, which is why the budget is composed of Summer stipends of \$2500.00 for each of the two project directors (who are 10-month faculty members). The project directors are capable of doing the data analysis themselves, with modest input from colleagues who have expertise in survey methodology as needed. Any data sets that can be shared will be uploaded to the IUPUI DataWorks repository.<sup>13</sup>

**Evaluation and Dissemination of Results:** In addition to reports to SoIC and the IUPUI campus, the project directors will submit proposals to present their methodology and findings at a national and/or regional teaching conference. They have already given presentations together at the Original Lilly Conference on College Teaching, the Midwest Annual SoTL Conference and the AAEEBL Annual Conference.<sup>14-16</sup> Because one of them teaches face-to-face courses and the other teaches online, the project directors especially enjoy comparing similarities and differences in pedagogical approaches, student engagement and student success in their courses and it will be interesting to discover whether course delivery methods have an impact on their findings and for future planning. The project directors will upload their materials and the final report to the IUPUI ScholarWorks repository.<sup>17</sup>

**Intended Use of Findings for Program Improvement:** The project directors will assist faculty in incorporating the revised PLOs into their syllabi and in crafting linkages with assignments that will assess whether courses contribute to helping students achieve these revised PLOs. The

findings will allow SoIC to produce a more comprehensive and data-driven report for the next Program Review and Assessment process for the B.S. in Informatics, which is scheduled for 2017-2018. The results will help to determine how existing courses should be modified to cover one or more of the PLOs, including assessment mechanisms, and inform the development of new courses. The revised PLOs are especially important in providing documentation for SoIC's recruiters, academic advisors and development staff to use in providing a clearer and more compelling picture of the emerging discipline of Informatics and the career opportunities that a B.S. degree in this field offers.

## References

1. Program-Level Outcomes (Learning Outcomes), Informatics Bachelor of Science (2016). Retrieved from <http://soic.iupui.edu/undergraduate/degrees/informatics>
2. Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) (1997). Retrieved from <http://due.iupui.edu/Undergraduate-Curricula/General-Education/Principles-of-Undergraduate-Learning>
3. Haviland, D., Turley, S., & Shin, S.H. (2011). Changes over time in faculty attitudes, confidence, and understanding as related to program assessment. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 20(1), 69-84.
4. Hubball, H., & Poole, G. (2008). Program-level assessment of learning outcomes in a faculty certificate program on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 1, 105-109.
5. Akinde, O.A. (2015). A pilot study of students' learning outcomes using didactic and Socratic instructional methods: An assessment based on Bloom's taxonomy. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(21), 2821-2833.
6. Attaway, A.N., Chandra, S., Dos Santos, B.L., Thatcher, M.E., & Wright, A.L. (2011). An approach to meeting AACSB assurance of learning standards in an IS core course. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 22(4), 355-366.
7. Downey, J.P., McMurtrey, M.E., & Zeltmann, S.M. (2008). Mapping the MIS curriculum based on critical skills of new graduates: An empirical examination of IT professionals. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 19(3), 351-363.
8. Keshavarz, M. (2011). Measuring course learning outcomes. *Journal of Learning Design*, 4(4), 1-9.
9. Lam, B.H., & Tsui, K.T. (2013). Examining the alignment of subject learning through outcomes and course curricula through curriculum mapping. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(12), 97-119.

10. Meyers, S.C., Nelson, M.A., & Stratton, R.W. (2011). Assessment of the undergraduate economics major: A national survey. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 42(2), 195-199.
11. Veltri, N.F., Webb, H.W., Matveev, A.G., & Zapatero, E.G. (2011). Curriculum mapping as a tool for continuous improvement of IS curriculum. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 22(1), 31-42.
12. Cavanaugh, J.K., & Jacquemin, S.J. (2015). A large sample comparison of grade based student learning outcomes in online and face-to-face courses. *Online Learning*, 19(2), 25-32.
13. IUPUI DataWorks (2016). Retrieved from <https://dataworks.iupui.edu/>
14. Original Lilly Conference on College Teaching: Evidence-Based Learning and Teaching (2016). Retrieved from <http://celt.miamioh.edu/lillycon/>
15. Midwest Annual SoTL Conference, University Center for Excellence in Teaching (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.iusb.edu/ucet/events/sotl/>
16. AAEEBL (The Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning) (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.aeebl.org/>
17. IUPUI ScholarWorks (2016). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/>

## Healthcare Engr. Tech. Management Professional Attributes

Successful graduates have excellent professional attributes. Students must have satisfactory professional attributes in all categories in order to receive a clinical placement for HETM 295 or HETM 492.

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory, requires improvement</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Organization Attention to detail</b>	Thorough attention to all details, can multi-task, can prioritize competing responsibilities	Needs to be reminded to complete assigned tasks, occasionally lacks follow through	Forgets important parts of projects, difficulties when asked to multi-task or prioritize
<b>Ability to meet deadlines, timeliness/reliability</b>	Deadlines are met consistently and predictably	Occasionally a deadline is not met or work is incomplete	Commonly deadlines are missed or work is incomplete
<b>Verbal communication</b>	Always tactful, effective, clear, articulate, communicates fluently in English	Sometimes conversations are unclear or inarticulate, occasional English fluency hurdles	Commonly makes inappropriate comments or jokes, uses slang which hinders communication, inarticulate, lack of English fluency
<b>Ability to accept criticism</b>	Consistently receptive to constructive criticism, consistently corrects errors based on feedback	Defensive or displays mild unprofessionalism when criticized, can change techniques/behaviors based on feedback	Occasionally (or more frequently) displays unprofessional behavior when criticized, does not follow suggestions for improvement
<b>Empathy</b>	Consistently demonstrates concern for the feelings of others, diplomatic	Sometimes behavior demeans or degrades the feelings of others	Limited sensitivity and diplomacy
<b>Demeanor, overall professional behavior in the workplace</b>	Self-starter, confident, reliable, embraces change	Attends to assigned duties, responsive to others, addresses concerns to the correct individual	Antagonistic with others, excessively shy or unresponsive, self-focused, complains often
<b>Personal grooming</b>	Clean, dress is professional and appropriate for the workplace	Meets major employer minimum standards for facial hair, piercings and body art	Unkempt, unprofessional, unacceptable piercings, body art or facial hair
<b>Collaboration</b>	Willingly shares ideas and materials with coworkers, offers assistance, offers criticism in a constructive manner	Shares ideas and materials, assists coworkers when asked, accepts the expertise of others	Prefers to work alone, reluctance to work with others, cannot consistently respect the views of others, does not consistently respect the expertise of others
<b>Initiative</b>	Displays enthusiasm, regularly seeks out additional opportunities, takes action without being asked	Displays positive attitude about assignments, completes them independently, seeks help when needed	Effort meets minimum requirements, no effort provided to work through difficulties
<b>Self-improvement</b>	Readily seeks out educational opportunities to improve technical skills, welcomes self-improvement opportunities	Participates in educational activities or self-improvement activities as directed	Has limited interest in self-improvement or educational opportunities which improve technical breadth or depth
<b>Adaptability</b>	Highly flexible and adaptable when environment or responsibilities change	Adjusts to change when required to do so	Resists changes, difficulty in adjusting when environment or responsibilities change

Note: employers will require other vital skills including HETM technical knowledge and expertise, computer abilities and written communication skills. These qualities are assessed elsewhere in the curriculum.

## Evaluation of Professional Empathy Skills in Healthcare Engineering Technology Management (HETM) Students

### **Professional Empathy:**

Professional empathy in healthcare settings may be described as a capacity to connect with a clinician in a relationship that demonstrates compassion and a willingness to help, evoking feelings of trust and mutual understanding.

Empathy can be viewed as a combination of behaviors and emotions derived from personal cognitive traits. Anecdotal evidence from the HETM Professionalism Rubric suggested that some IUPUI students in the healthcare engineering technology management major may lack well-developed empathy skills.

### **Project:**

The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire to gather quantitative evidence related to empathy skill sets in learners. Data was analyzed to determine if a statistically significant difference could be observed between student groups: domestic female students, domestic male students, and international male students. The research question was

Can a statistical difference between the empathy scores of domestic learners and international students enrolled in the HETM major be demonstrated?

**Data Collection Methods and Analysis:** In January, 2015, students who were enrolled in the healthcare engineering technology management program were asked to anonymously complete the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire. The total number of participants was 42. In addition, participants were asked to identify their gender and student status (domestic or international). No international students were women. Total empathy scores were calculated for each respondent utilizing the scoring guide associated with the tool and range from 0 (no empathy) to 64 (very empathetic), with 32 designated as neutral. Participant scores ranged from 35-59. A two-sample equal variance t-test was performed to identify statistical differences between groups.

23 domestic male students	Mean empathy score 46, SD 6.25
8 domestic female students	Mean empathy score 50, SD 5.89
10 international male students	Mean empathy score 40. SD 5.29

A statistical difference was found between the international and domestic male students ( $p=.023$ ). Interestingly, no statistical difference was found between male and female domestic students given that the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire generally reflects differences between men and women. A very strong statistical difference was found between domestic female students and international male students ( $p=.005$ ). This was completely expected as gender and cultural background are documented as contributors to Toronto Empathy Questionnaire scores.

**Dissemination:** The results of the project were disseminated in a November, 2015 article in *24x7* magazine entitled “The Empathetic Biomed.” In addition, the author presented a session entitled: *The Secret Sauce is Professional Empathy: Measuring and Improving this Vital Workplace Characteristic* at the Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation annual conference in Denver in June, 2015. The presentation included empathy development techniques suitable for the profession.

**Project Impact:** The project results offered the academic program quantitative evidence of a professionalism trait reported anecdotally as weak in some students. Student professionalism skills are critical in the sophomore course HETM 295, a clinical internship with a minimum of 180 hours of hospital-based learning. Utilizing this information, the program director created a more detailed screening program for clinical placement and an alternative non-clinical internship experience for students who cannot or will not successfully complete the pre-placement process. This has resulted in more satisfied students who are placed and more satisfied clinical site mentors.

## Toronto Empathy Questionnaire

(Spreng, R., McKinnon, M., Mar, R., & Levine, B. (2009). The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 62-71.)

### Instructions

Below is a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and rate how frequently you feel or act in the manner described. Circle your answer on the response form. There are no right or wrong answers or trick questions. Please answer each question as honestly as you can.

	never	rarely	sometimes	often	always
1. When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too					
2. Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal					
3. It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully					
4. I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy					
5. I enjoy making other people feel better					
6. I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me					
7. When a friend starts to talk about his or her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else					
8. I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything					
9. I find that I am "in tune" with other people's moods					
10. I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses					
11. I become irritated when someone cries					
12. I am not really interested in how other people feel					
13. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset					
14. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them					
15. I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness					
16. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him or her					

	never	rarely	sometimes	often	always
1. When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too	0	1	2	3	4
2. Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal	4	3	2	1	0
3. It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully	0	1	2	3	4
4. I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy	4	3	2	1	0
5. I enjoy making other people feel better	0	1	2	3	4
6. I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me	0	1	2	3	4
7. When a friend starts to talk about his or her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else	4	3	2	1	0
8. I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything	0	1	2	3	4
9. I find that I am "in tune" with other people's moods	0	1	2	3	4
10. I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses	4	3	2	1	0
11. I become irritated when someone cries	4	3	2	1	0
12. I am not really interested in how other people feel	4	3	2	1	0
13. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset	0	1	2	3	4
14. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them	4	3	2	1	0
15. I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness	4	3	2	1	0
16. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him or her	0	1	2	3	4

Neutral empathy: 32

Very empathetic: 64

No empathy: 0



## IUPUI COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT RECORDS (CSR) PROJECT



Mary Beth Myers  
Registrar & CSR Lead, IUPUI  
December 14, 2016

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

0



## Background

Employers overwhelmingly report they find little to no value in the University official transcript when it comes to assessing students for jobs.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

1



## Background

Instead, employers are hungry for verification of other skills:

- Communications proficiency
- Teamwork
- Leadership
- Engagement
- Research



## Background

- Higher education is recognizing that student learning occurs in numerous places and ways outside of our traditional classrooms
- How might we reflect these experiences so students are better able to demonstrate and articulate their overall learning



## AACRAO/NASPA/LUMINA PROJECT IUPUI Invited

Source: Comprehensive Student Record Project Overview, Chicago, 10/2015

1. Accelerate the creation of a comprehensive student record that includes more than the "official academic record."
2. Develop a framework for the development of these records.
3. Document the operational and policy considerations for registrars, student affairs officers and other higher education professionals to share with their campuses.
4. Document ways in which the credit hour limits or fails to limit the development of student records



INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
INDIANAPOLIS

4

## AACRAO/NASPA PROJECT & IUPUI Invited!

Source: Comprehensive Student Record Project Overview, Chicago, 10/2015

5. Directly assist a group of 12 institutions in developing models of more comprehensive records that may include:
  - Learning outcomes for experiences outside the classroom
  - Co-curricular learning records and outcomes
6. Communicate the results of the project to higher education audiences, generally:
  - During the project to discuss challenges, progress, results.
  - At the conclusion of the project to provide models that institutions may choose to emulate.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

5

## What are we trying to address?

1. How do we align student and employer needs for a comprehensive reflection of student learning?
2. How do we help students understand the need to communicate a broader record?
  - What is the value of this record to students and how will we articulate that?
3. How will we capture evidence of student learning that is not “grades?”
  - Learning outcomes from various experiences
  - Rubrics/assessment



## IUPUI Team

- Registrar/Lead, Mary Beth Myers
- Student Affairs, Tralicia Lewis
- RISE Director, Jennifer Thorington-Springer
- USSS/UITs Rep



## Make It About the Student - Hannah!



INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

8

## GOALS OF THE IUPUI PROJECT

Creation of a student achievement record reflecting **ASSESSED** learning experiences that have occurred outside of the classroom

**Registrar-verified**, delivered electronically

Include link to student self-reported co-curricular activities

*IUPUI lead....design with all IU campuses in mind*

Submitted along with official transcript (initially)



INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

9

## What We Have Accomplished

CSR project approved by ALC as #1 IU Priority

Registrar/UITs/USSS Team

IUPUI Team

– USSS & UITs colleagues familiar with our records!

IUPUI CSR Taskforce

Registrar Functional Expert assigned

Consultants from AACRAO and NAPSA



## Comprehensive Student Record Taskforce

Sara Allaei

International Affairs

Alison Bell

Degree Completion Office

Teresa Bennett

Solution Center

Cathy Buyarski

University College

Dominique Galli

Center for Research & Learning

Julie Hatcher

Center for Service & Learning

Hundley, Stephen

Planning & Assessment

Leslie, Stephanie

Study Abroad

Lewis, Tralicia

Student Affairs

Malik, David

Division of UG Education

Morrical, Erica

Registrar, Business Analyst

Rust, Matt

Career & Advising Services

Jennifer Thorington

RISE Challenge

Springer

Faculty Rep, Former President, IFC

Wokeck, Marianne



## What We Have Accomplished

### Governance & Verification

Template to submit new requests for experiences

- Expected Learning Outcomes/Principles of Co\_Curricular Learning
- Integration of knowledge
- Reflection(s)
- Assessment

FIVE Pilot Experiences approved

### Business Process

Workflow system  
 Online Initiation  
 Center approvals  
 Registrar approval  
 Updates to SIS

Workgroups set up in each unit



## What We Have Accomplished

### Phase 1 Experiences approved in ...

Service  
 Internship  
 Study Abroad  
 UG Research  
 Diversity

### Phase 2 and Beyond

- List of other experiences "ready" once Phase 1 is complete
- Will queue these up to be ready early 2017!



## IUPUI Achievement Record - Initial Experiences

### Verified Experience

### Responsible Office

Internships	Campus Career & Advising Services
Service	Center for Service & Learning
Student Abroad	International Services
UG Research	Center for Research & Learning
Diversity	Office of Diversity: Multi-Cultural Center



## What We Have Accomplished

### SIS Tables

### Sample Graphic

Creation of SIS Tables to capture Achievement Category, Type, Title, Sub-Title

Creation of sample graphic to display information in user-friendly way





## Which Students Affected?

- Initially roughly 300 currently involved in the approved experiences
- Expanding experiences Spring 2017 to include more students and begin the “build up” for incoming class



INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

16

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
INDIANAPOLIS

### IUPUI Experiential and Applied Learning Record

IUPUI validates all achievements presented on this Record and it is an official University document. Assessment occurs within each program responsible for the achievement and validation occurs in the Office of the Registrar. Each achievement is maintained in a centralized system. Students do not personally enter any information onto this record. Each Achievement is tied to an [IUPUI Principle of Co-Curricular Learning](#) as reflected at the bottom of the record. Note that achievements reflected by semester may have occurred during only a portion of the semester.

#### Student Information

Name <Student Primary Name>  
 Student ID <Student ID #>  
 Most Recent Major MS in Crim Jus and Pub Sfty

#### Summary of IUPUI Achievements

 Diversity 3 Semesters	 Global 3 Semesters	 Internship 560 Hours	 Leadership 2 Semesters	 Research 400 Hours	 Service 180 Hours
------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------

#### Achievement Timeline

2013 and Before	2014	2015	2016
2013 Pharmaceutical Research - Spring Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholar Alternative Break Trip Leader - Spring Information Technology Intern - Fall 2012 Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholar Community Service Leader - Spring Undergraduate Research Opportunity - Fall 2011 Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholar Alternative Break Trip Leader - Fall Undergraduate Research Opportunity - Fall	Spring IU Simon Cancer Research Fall Habitat For Humanity Multicultural Leadership Program Undergraduate Research Conference	Spring Habitat For Humanity Honors Research Undergraduate Research Conference Fall Honors Research	Spring Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholar Service Corps Summer Accounting Intern Diversity Scholars Research Fall Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholar Community Service Leader

#### IUPUI Principles of Co-Curricular Learning

Core Communication 2	Integration of Knowledge 10	Understanding Society & Culture 2
Critical Thinking 2	Interpersonal Development 4	Values & Ethics 2
Depth/Breadth/Adaptiveness 3	Intrapersonal Development 4	

Hans Galt-Hiers  
Registrar

Official record page 1 of 2 created on <mm/dd/yyyy>



## IUPUI MARKETING PLAN

- Prominence on IUPUI website (“brand”)
  - Student cameo
- Facebook 2021 page
- Career Planning and Placement Office
- Presenting with Student Affairs at all Themed Learning Community & Gateway classes in Fall
- Other Campus Councils



INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE  
UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

20

We Think this is Really COOL!!!....



21



Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS)

# Current State of Campus-Wide Student Surveys

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

## IUPUI Indianapolis Student Surveys

## Guiding Framework For Campus-Wide Student Surveys

- Ensure that information is actionable, timely, and collected at appropriate times.
- Ensure that information is used for decision making, planning, accreditation, and improvements.
- Use empirically-based approaches to design instruments that are valid and reliable.
- Use appropriate modes (phone, self-administered paper-based or web-based questionnaires, focus groups, interviews).
- Use empirically-based approaches to increase response rates so that samples are representative and analyses can be conducted at school/program level.
- Collect information at critical points in students' transitions (prospective, entering, transition to major, continuing, graduating/exiting, alumni).



## What We Learn From Student Surveys

1. Factors contributing to students' decisions to select IUPUI.
2. Incoming students' needs, expectations, sense of belonging, academic goals, levels of confidence, reasons why selected major, commitment to major, time commitments, etc.
3. Factors associated with academic success and persistence to degree completion (predictive analytics).
4. Students' experiences and satisfaction with all areas of their education – academic experiences (high-impact practices, self-reported learning gains, academic support, quality of professors and departments) to student experiences (campus life, co-curricular activities, technology resources).
5. Alumni students' satisfaction with experiences at IUPUI, learning outcomes, employment outcomes (job and salary information), civic engagement outcomes, graduate or professional school attendance plans and outcomes, loan debt, confidence to pay back loans, and more.



## IUPUI Campus-Wide Surveys

1. Entering Student Survey
2. Mentor Intake Survey - administered in First-Year Seminars and used by peer mentors to guide interventions
3. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
4. Continuing Student Survey – aim to replace this with a transition to the major/school survey and short focused surveys such as Jags Speak
5. Exit Surveys
6. Climate
7. Administrative Review Process Surveys
8. Alumni Surveys
  - First-Destination Survey (career services focused)
  - School-Based Alumni Surveys (for accreditation and more)
  - Campus-Wide Survey (last administered in 2014; used contacts from Alumni Association; very poor response rate)



INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

## Critical Factors and Challenges

In many cases we can't effectively use survey information for decision making at the campus level because of the following:

- Sample sizes are too low and samples are not representative enough for valid decision making.
- Response rates are too low to provide information at department or student major/plan code level.
- Schools administer their own exit and alumni surveys with no common questions. As such, we are unable to use the information for campus-level decision making and some schools are not able to analyze all of the data collected (do not have time or resources necessary to do so).



INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

## Discussion Points

- Where are there information gaps? What information is needed to augment assessment of student learning, accreditation, and planning?
- What information do we need to collect from graduate and professional students?
- In thinking about collecting information at key points in a student's life cycle or admission to graduation, where are we missing information?
- Does it make sense to administer a transition to the major survey for students who were recently certified into a school?
- Schools seem successful in administering their own alumni and exit surveys tailored to their needs and specialized accreditors' needs. However, the information is not available at campus-wide level and items vary. How can we best coordinate?
- Need to determine timing of Alumni Surveys: Each year? How many years out? One year out may provide appropriate information for determining effects of IUPUI degree and application of knowledge, success in job, earnings, etc.



## Next Steps and Strategies

- Common questions for Blue Course Evaluations may be a promising practice.
- There is interest in a transition to the major survey. This will require collaboration with UC/DUE and schools to design instrument and data collection process.
- IRDS is considering administering an alumni survey for graduates 1-3 years out and using contact information from company such as Alumni Finder and supplementing Qualtrics survey with phone contacts.
- We now have a campus-wide IUPUI Survey Policy.
- Best approach may be to work collaboratively, meet individually with schools in an effort to better understand data needs and develop instruments/processes that can meet school and campus-level decision making needs.
- We are introducing concept of Jags Speak.



## Contact Information

Michele J. Hansen, Ph.D.  
Executive Director  
mjhansen@iupui.edu

Anne Mitchell  
Director  
Survey Research and Evaluation  
amitch29@iupui.edu

Institutional Research and Decision Support  
irds.iupui.edu

[IUPUI Data Link](#)

Contact us with questions or requests for information!





**Current State of Student Campus-Wide Surveys – IUPUI Indianapolis**

**Current Surveys**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Purpose and Use</b>	<b>Administration Method</b>	<b>Timing of Administration</b>	<b>Average Response Rate</b>
Entering Student Survey	New First-Time to IUPUI Beginners and Transfers	Understand incoming students’ needs, expectations, reasons why selected IUPUI, sense of belonging, academic goals, levels of confidence, reasons why selected major.  Results used to predict factors associated with academic success (predictive analytics). School level data provided.	Administered during New Student Orientation on-line via Qualtrics	Each Year During Summer Orientation Sessions	80-90%
Entering Student Survey – After 3 weeks	New First-Time to IUPUI Beginners	Help peer mentors better understand students’ needs. Mentors use the information to direct students to campus resources, identify strengths, guide future planning/goal setting meetings, and help students develop strategies/action plans to meet desired goals. Also used to help build supportive relationships between students and mentors.	Administered during all first-year seminars online via Qualtrics and results shared with mentors.	Each fall and spring semester	Fall 2015 there were 2397 survey participants out of 3543 enrolled students in FYS sections for a RR of 68%.
Transition to the Major Survey (new proposed to replace Continuing Student Survey -CSS)	Students from UC and Transfer Students Recently Certified into Schools	Understand students’ needs at critical time in transition.  Results could be used by University College faculty and staff to understand what improvements need to be made to ensure successful transitions and by the Schools to understand students’ needs at a critical point during their transition.	Administered online via Qualtrics	Each fall and spring to recently certified students	Unknown
National Survey of Student Engagement (Peer Institutions, Public Research Institutions , entire NSSE Sample comparisons available)	Census of all First-Year and Senior Students	Student engagement represents two critical features of collegiate quality: 1) amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities, 2) how the institution deploys its resources and organizes the curriculum and other learning opportunities to get students to participate in activities that decades of research studies show are linked to student learning.  Campus can use results to assess indirect student learning outcomes and engagement and outcomes associated with participation in High-Impact Practices.	Online survey	Every 3 years in the spring. Last administered spring 2015.	19% FY 21% Seniors
School-Based Exit Surveys  No campus-wide survey conducted at this time.	Recent Graduates from Schools	Typically conducted to obtain information about students’ satisfaction with a range of academic and co-academic experiences during their matriculation and to inquire about their plans for the future. Purposes and uses vary by school	Schools Administer Surveys/ Methods Vary	December and May Graduates	Vary by School.

Survey	Population	Purpose and Use	Administration Method	Timing of Administration	Average Response Rate
Student Campus Climate	All Undergraduate and Graduate Students	The IUPUI Climate Survey is administered to all students at IUPUI. The survey, administered in collaboration with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), is designed to better understand the experiences of all individuals on campus. The survey employs a broad definition of diversity, focusing on race/ethnicity, gender, ability status, religion, political ideology, sexual orientation, gender identity, and veteran status. The data is used by various units on campus as well as DEI for diversity planning and decision making.	Administered on-line via Qualtrics	Every 4 Years Survey administered to census of faculty, staff, and current students in Fall 2014.	Under-graduates 12%  Graduate Students 16%
IUPUI Pulse  The purpose of survey is to get a pulse on critical issues and to make data-driven improvements	Varies depending on topic	IUPUI Pulse Surveys are brief surveys designed to provide quick information that faculty and administrators can use to improve the IUPUI student experience. Past surveys have focused on diversity, campus safety, housing, Democracy Plaza, and a variety of other topics.	Administered on-line via Qualtrics	Varies.	10% - 26.4% (survey on Student Health Services highest RR. Lowest RR was survey about political knowledge)
<b>Alumni Surveys</b>					
First Destination Survey  Started with December 2015 graduates, ongoing	December and May Graduates  Sample gathered in collaboration with Schools	Provides information on job/graduate school placement, starting job/salary, debt, satisfaction, schools could add items if needed (and many did)  Provides information about career and advising service and internships.  Conducted by Matt Rust , Director of Career and Advising Services, Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE)	Administered on-line via Qualtrics / phone follow-ups  Anonymous link (some administered through schools/some centrally)	All undergraduate students immediately post- graduation	May Graduates 45%  December Graduates 28%
Undergraduate Student Alumni Survey	Recent Undergraduate Alumni  Sample gathered from IUPUI Alumni Office (the list is not up to date and is biased toward more engaged students)	Assesses satisfaction with experiences/opportunities, self-assessment of PUL's, job/graduate school placement, debt, perception of quality of degree/would they come back if they could do it over, perception of preparedness for future, community engagement, civic outcomes.  CSL has used community engagement data for internal assessment of programs and external presentations	Administered online via Qualtrics	Last administered Fall 2014 – typically administered every 3-4 years  Recent undergraduate alumni (last 3 years)	Response rate 10%  Numbers of respondents too low to do anything at program or department level

Survey	Population	Purpose and Use	Administration Method	Timing of Administration	Average Response Rate
Graduate Student Alumni Survey	Recent Graduate Alumni  Sample gathered from IUPUI Alumni Office (the list is not up to date and is biased toward more engaged students)	Satisfaction with experiences/opportunities, self-assessment of PGPLs, job/graduate school placement, debt, perception of quality of degree/would they come back if they could do it over, perception of preparedness for future  Results: Nothing seems that surprising (most folks are satisfied 3 on a 4 point scale) / there are certain schools that have lower satisfaction / lower job placement.		Last administered Fall 2014 – typically administered every 3-4 years  Recent graduate alumni (last 3 years)	Response rate: 19% (over-representation of white students, Liberal Arts students; under-representation of Medicine)  Numbers of respondents too low to do anything at program level
Program Reviews Alumni Surveys	Varies –typically recent graduates or graduates over particular time period such as last 3 years. Employers occasionally included.	Department Chairs often have particular questions about student learning outcomes, employment/graduate school/professional school outcomes that only alumni surveys can provide. They often have good contact information and campus-wide surveys to date have not high enough response rates to allow analysis at the department level.	Usually online via Qualtrics and with Phone.	Varies	75%-90%  Employer not as high.
Current School-Based Alumni Surveys	School of Law  School of Nursing  School of Engineering and Technology  School of Dentistry (2013 – survey administered by IMIR for a fee \$1,500)  School of Medicine ( seems to be happening at the Department level)	A number of schools administer their own alumni surveys (typically for the purposes of accreditation – with tailored questions for their own needs / some accreditors require response rates over 70%)	Varies	Varies	Varies

\* Please note that other surveys are implemented each year related to specific programs and services such as the surveys conducted to support Administrative Reviews, UITS Annual Satisfaction Survey, Campus-Wide Advising Survey, and Healthy IU Survey.

### Points of Discussion:

- Where are there information gaps? What information is needed to guide strategic enrollment management, student success, accreditation planning?
- If we were thinking about collecting information at key points in a students' life cycle or admission to graduation, where are we missing information?
- Does it make sense to administer a transition to the major survey for students who were recently certified into a school?
- What information do we need to collect from graduate and professional students?
- Schools seem successful in administering their own alumni and exit surveys tailored to their needs and specialized accreditors' needs. However, the information is not available at campus-wide level and items vary. How can we best coordinate?
- Need to determine timing of alumni surveys: each year/ alumni how many years out? One year out may give appropriate information for determine effects of IUPUI degree and application of knowledge, success in job, earnings, etc.

### Alumni surveys can provide information on:

- How much students are learning in college, and how are they contributing to society after college.
- Whether students are leaving school with loan debt, if they are paying back their loans.
- What types of jobs students are getting after college and if they are going to graduate school.
- Alumni students' preferences, contact information, and current status.
- Insights into institutional quality improvements.
- Alumni experiences and satisfaction with all areas of their education – from academic experiences (quality of professors and departments) to student experiences (campus life, extracurricular activities, technology resources).
- Interests of alumni in making monetary contributions to the educational institution.
- Information on the interests of alumni to participate in alumni events.
- Information for the purpose of regional Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation and student outcomes that are often required for specialized accrediting agencies.
- \*\*Alumni surveys are the one of the only sources of information about students' application and integration of knowledge learned by completing an IUPUI degree.

### HLC Accreditation Indicators:

1. A number of financial indicators
2. Enrollment (three-year increase or decrease of 40 percent or more)
3. Degrees awarded (three year decrease of 50 percent or more in degrees)
4. Full-time faculty (three year decrease of 50 percent or more in the headcount of full-time faculty)
5. **Student default rates (three-year student loan default rate of 30 percent or more for 2-year institutions or 25 percent or more for other institutions)** -- this does not come from survey data; Marvin may have this information
6. Minimal Full-time Faculty (headcount of full-time faculty divided by number of degree programs is less than one)
7. Student to Teacher Ratio (the number of undergraduate FTE students divided by the number of undergraduate FTE faculty is greater than or equal to 35)

### HLC Accreditation Indicators: Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

*Institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.*

*6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).*

<http://policy.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html>

IUPUI Alumni Survey Information may be a helpful source of evidence for #6.

### Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE) Indicators:

- The Indiana College Value Index combines data from multiple sources to provide a clear image of college completion, learning outcomes, return on investment, career success and long-term college graduate satisfaction. Once the index has been completed, it will be combined with existing economic data on colleges and shared publicly within the next Return on Investment report. <http://www.learnmoreindiana.org/indiana-college-value-index/>
- Indiana College Value Index consists of percentage of alumni who report that : 1) college prepared them well for life outside of college 2) they received support outside the classroom that helped them graduate, and 3) they are fulfilled in their current work.

## Assessment Institute Track Executive Summary: Community Engagement

### Expanded Interests in Assessment of Community Engagement, Beyond Student Learning and Success

Some campuses have adopted a broader definition of community engagement, which now includes a broader array of activities (e.g., community-engaged research, technical assistance/expertise provided, economic development, pipeline programs, outreach programs and events, service-learning courses, etc.). The broader interpretation has expanded the focus of assessment beyond student learning and success to topics such as community impact, partnership development, faculty success, and institutional growth. This expanded interest has created a need for new models, new and expanded data points or sources, and ultimately, a more comprehensive approach to capturing an array of activities and how they relate to a variety of outcomes.

#### Common Themes

##### *Reactive Assessment vs Proactive Assessment*

In general, there is tension between assessment to suffice external requests (e.g., awards, public relations/marketing, etc.)(reactive) and assessment that supports decision making and evidence that indicates progress toward strategic goals (proactive). While the two tensions do not need to be mutually exclusive activities, most campuses are struggling to implement processes and systems that support both goals simultaneously. Dialogue around data collection, methods, data management, and analysis ultimately lead to some very important questions: “What are we currently tracking and why? How do we intend to use the information?” “What do we need to know that we cannot currently answer given the information we have?”

##### *Assessment of What? Where is the Activity Happening?*

Historically, the majority of assessment focused on student outcomes within a course, a program, or across an institution. As campuses adopt a broader interpretation of community engagement and the need to say more about the impact of community engagement increases, greater attention is given to where the activity is occurring (e.g., course, project, sustained partnership, scaffolded across the curriculum) and the intended community outcome(s) (e.g., build capacity to service clients, change policy, address a specific community issue). Figure 1 further illustrates a variety of ways we can begin to talk about and assess community impact and may be useful as campuses begin to develop a more comprehensive approach to assessment of community engagement (Norris, Weiss, Wittman, Medlin, Mack, 2016).

Figure 1

- Reason – Discussed how campus climate, as measured by the Personal and Social Responsibility Index, influences student civic learning and engagement. Using learning models (i.e., Astin, 1993; Pascarella, 1996; Terenzini & Reason, 2005), there is an opportunity to examine how the student experiences the campus influences civic learning and engagement.
- Gavazzi – Described his model for assessing campus-community partnerships (a.k.a. – town-gown relationships) and how the tool may be useful for addressing issues and opportunities.
- Flaherty – Outlined a model for creating a campus culture for assessment by identifying key strategies and characteristics for success. The information is useful as campuses are expanding their interpretation of community engagement and are building or re-envisioning a comprehensive assessment plan.

**2016 Assessment Institute at Indianapolis**  
**ePortfolio Track**  
**Executive Summary**

**Overview:**

- Reflected range of ePortfolio uses for undergraduate, graduate/professional, and co-curricular learning
- Highlighted use of ePortfolio as assessment strategy for graduate and professional programs (half of sessions in that area), including both behavioral (soft skills) and professional competencies
- Reflected interest in ePortfolio assessment of co- and extra-curricular learning
- Emphasized use of ePortfolio to support integrative and metacognitive learning (track keynote and other sessions)
- Continued attention to effective use of rubrics (four of ten sessions)
- Focused less than past Institutes on faculty buy-in and professional development (only two sessions paid significant attention to issues of faculty support)
- Highlighted newness of ePortfolio assessment in some academic fields; seven presenters in the new or developing “discovery” mode vs. three in more experienced or nuanced mode

**Keynote:**

Dr. Kathy Takayama, Northeastern University, “Cultivating Learning Cultures: Reflective Habits of Mind and the Value of Uncertainty”

Takayama discussed her use of ePortfolios to support collaborative inquiry, disciplinary ways of thinking and knowing, and formation of disciplinary identity in microbiology. She is especially interested in helping students appreciate uncertainty as a crucial element of inquiry; contrary to the way that science is commonly taught, the practice of science is about “not knowing” and defining an inquiry process. In an undergraduate neuroscience research course, Takayama guided students to think metacognitively about the inquiry process, helping them understand it as circular rather than linear, and prompting them to reflect on areas of uncertainty at particular points. Tapping the power of social pedagogy, she used ePortfolios to foster a culture of peer learning and teaching wherein students became resources for one another and learned how to learn through “not knowing.” In these “transitional spaces,” students focused on cyclical reflection and iterative dialogue that led to transformational disciplinary learning. Students need to engage in continuous metacognition to learn effectively as undergraduates and beyond; reflective learning communities and peer learning/teaching cultures can help them develop metacognitive competence and learn to be comfortable with uncertainty.

**Concurrent sessions:**

- “Using the ePortfolio to Document and Assess Co-Curricular Learning,” Sandra Bowles, Susan Gardner, Rebecca Linger, and Jane Condee, University of Charleston School of Pharmacy

## **Global Learning Track Executive Summary**

The Global Learning Track is one of the newer tracks in the Assessment Institute. Assessment in the area of global learning can be described as slowly emerging, developing, and exploratory. It has been most closely aligned with study abroad, and study abroad offices often have capacity issues when it comes to assessment. These offices focus on safety and security, program development, and evaluation, but they often do not have time to assess global learning. As global learning has expanded on campuses beyond study abroad, a number of commercial instruments have been adopted to assess students' global learning proficiencies, such as the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale. Across the board it appears that institutions, schools, programs, and individual faculty are seeking to determine what assessment methods work best for their specific contexts. Institutional-created pre- and post-test surveys are frequently used along with student self-perception surveys, as are rubrics, reflective assignments, and e-Portfolios.

Several themes surfaced in the 2016 Global Learning Track. They include the importance of faculty in the assessment process, use of frameworks and models to guide global learning efforts, and the use of data to improve instructional design. With regard to faculty, their role and how they understand the assessment process is essential. Faculty need to be key drivers in the process, and should view assessment as a tool to inform teaching and instructional design, and to enhance student outcomes, rather than as a means of evaluating their performance. Faculty and staff at some institutions are utilizing tools and strategies such the Global Learning Inventory, logic models, and backwards design in order to determine how well global learning is integrated across campus, develop curriculum, and guide assessment, especially campus-based or local global learning opportunities. Campus units are also realizing the need to amass a body of data significant enough to draw upon to make improvements in programs and instructional designs.

The level and complexity of global learning assessment varies by institution and can depend on institutional resources. Overall, institutions recognize or are beginning to recognize that they need to determine what data they have and what they need, and some are seeing the value of creating a template that encompasses institutional goals, specific intended outcomes, outputs, tools to be used, strategies to be employed, a time frame, and assignment of responsibility. Increasingly, significance is attached to intercultural competence as a learning



## **Assessment Institute Graduate and Professional Education Track Executive Summary**

Following is the Assessment Institute 2016 - Graduate and Professional Education Track executive summary that describes themes, innovations, and overall trends in maturity.

### Themes:

Common themes in the graduate and professional education track this year were as follows:

- Using multiple assessment methods to track graduate student progression and curricular improvement.
- Assessing beyond student learning and/or mapping student learning outcomes to other aspects of curricula.
- Mapping program outcomes to co-curricular programming
- Using e-portfolio in components of graduate and professional education
- Student self-assessment/awareness to calibrate academic demands and make curricular improvements

### Innovation:

Presentations for the track this year were compelling. Of note was the keynote address which created awareness of the work needed in educating and being more inclusive of adjunct faculty in the assessment process. Entitled “Assessment and Adjuncts: What They Don’t Know About Assessment and Why”, the keynote was delivered by Indiana Wesleyan University Deans, Stacy Hammonds and Joanne Barnes. They described the current landscape of a growing population of adjunct faculty in higher education, the methodology used to collect data and shared results for understanding adjunct faculty familiarity with accreditation, assessment and student learning outcomes. Recommendations for how to develop adjunct faculty as stakeholders in the assessment process were also presented. The project was research based and replicable.

Another compelling presentation given by Drs. Thomas Angelo and Jackie Zeeman from UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy described a study conducted with students and faculty using weekly time logs, focus groups and reflections as an innovative method to ascertain improvements needed to curricular and co-curricular programs in support of student success. Curricula and co-curricular programming are designed with certain expectations about the amount of time students will devote to studying. This study sought to investigate true perceptions of the students and faculty at a pharmacy school and was describe in a way that could be replicated by all disciplines in attendance.

Assessment has gained momentum in graduate education. There is a clear desire and effort to take curricular and co-curricular quality assurance to the next level using assessment data and innovating how and what is assessed. Presenters and attendees alike described ways their

## 2016 Assessment Institute Track Executive Summaries–High Impact Practices (HIPs)

### Executive Summary from Jennifer Thorington Springer and Julie Hatcher:

- **What are the common themes from presentations in your track this year?**

Common themes were clearly aligned with national concerns about the changing demographics of college campuses and universities and how we might prepare to best serve our incoming students, while also giving due attention to our current students' needs. While the track has done well in documenting and citing the importance of high impact practices and how they effectively help us to move toward teaching excellence and improving transformative learning experiences for our students, the themes this year illuminate a need to give additional attention to:

- The **quality of high impact practices** and how we ensure that they are being done well
  - Redefining **student retention and success** in HIPs by using the backward course and assessment design
  - **Increasing student participation** in HIPs
  - **Expanding HIPs** with a focus on inclusive excellence and equity mindedness
  - Intentionally stating and recognizing the importance of **Diversity in HIPs**—giving attention to demographics and student participant populations as well as creating opportunities for students to engage in cultural diversity
  - Recognizing the benefits in **combining different types of HIPs**—student success is improved when combining Themed Learning Communities and Service Learning, for example
- **Which institutions/programs/individuals are doing innovative work? Why?**
    - IUPUI – the development of taxonomies for each unit and program that fall under the RISE Program as well as others that are intentionally working on improving the quality of HIPs being offered at IUPUI. The taxonomies have been designed as guides to support the implementation of HIPs. Informed by the early work of California State University, featured as the HIPs track keynote the Assessment Institute in 2014 and 2015, IUPUI has extended and deepened this approach in important ways. Taxonomies will be used by various units on campus as tools to support a shared understanding of good practice and program fidelity while allowing for a better understanding of what dimensions of HIPs may lead to specific student learning outcomes. This work is innovative in that it goes beyond the importance of HIPs and will assist in creating blue prints on how we begin conversations about intentionality regarding HIPs—not only why are we doing them but also how and, most importantly, the quality of the HIPs being offered
    - IU, Bloomington – ongoing exploration of how the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) items can be used to understand student participants in HIPs and student outcomes. There is the plan to focus on underrepresented, first generation, and transfer students to be more inclusive re. those who are participating in HIPs. Additional attention will be given to entering students and their expectations for HIPs. The project hopes to offer campuses insight on how to design and evaluate HIPs to increase student participation.

## Executive Summary NILOA Track

This report provides a summary of key trends in the NILOA track as well as overall impressions.

### NILOA Sessions

Each of the NILOA track sessions were well attended. Audience members asked thoughtful questions and seemed engaged with presented material. In addition to providing context to NILOA's work, several presenters from the field and associations were invited to communicate topics pertinent to the assessment field.

NILOA track sessions (see below) focused on providing historical and current information on the assessment movement, current assessment initiatives such as the Multi-State Collaborative (MSC), Excellence in Assessment (EIA) designation, and Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), and engaging students and faculty effectively in assessment efforts as well as exploring the role disciplinary associations can play to support assessment efforts.

- **KEYNOTE:** *Past as Prologue: Advancing the Assessment Agenda by Avoiding Pitfalls of Our Own Making.* (Peter Ewell, NILOA senior scholar, and George Kuh, NILOA founding director)
- *Excellence in Assessment Designation: Sharing our Success Stories* (Teri Hinds Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), Stephen Hundley, IUPUI, and Tony Ribera, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology)
- *Using Intentionally Designed Assignments to Foster and Assess Student Learning* (Kimberly Green, Washington State University, Pat Hutchings, NILOA senior scholar, and Mary Kay Jordan-Fleming, Mount St. Joseph University)
- *Assessment for Learning That Matters* (Terrel L. Rhodes, Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U))
- *Alignment and Mapping: Helping to Make Meaning* (David Marshall, NILOA senior scholar, and Karen Ford, University of Sheffield)
- *Involving Students and Their Perspectives: A Student Panel Discussion* (Emily Teitelbaum, NILOA research analyst, Theopolies Moton, University of Illinois, Kaitlin Pennington, McKendree University, and Michael Thompson, IUPUI)
- *Future Directions of Assessment: Movement on the Field* (Natasha Jankowski, NILOA director, and Jillian Kinzie, NILOA senior scholar,)
- *Engaging Faculty: A Disciplinary View* (Daniel McInerney, Utah State University, Julia Brookins, and Jim Grossman, American Historical Association)
- *Updates From the Field: What Have We Learned From the Degree Qualifications Profile?* (Natasha Jankowski, NILOA director, and Paul Gaston, Kent State University)

### Innovative Work

The most innovative spaces are those trying to connect and make sense of the changes in the field. Thinking about how to communicate the work taking place within institutions to various audiences, as

**Assessment Institute 2016  
Student Affairs Programs and Services Track  
Executive Summary**

**Common themes from 2016 student affairs track presentations**

There were three common themes across the student affairs track presentations: academic and student affairs partnerships, assessing co-curricular programs in professional schools, and assessing co-curricular programs at the undergraduate level. These themes emerged organically from the submission process as no specific sessions were solicited.

Presentations focused on methods of assessing co-curricular programs and using assessment results to improve co-curricular programs at the undergraduate level have been included in the student affairs track for several years. During the 2016 Assessment Institute presentations of this type focused on emerging programs such as career coaching and aligning division assessment and planning efforts with institutional goals.

In 2016 faculty and staff within professional schools presented their assessment efforts related to discipline-specific, co-curricular learning programs. These sessions strengthened the theme of academic and student affairs professionals collaborating to assess student learning regardless of where that learning took place or which department had administrative oversight of a particular program.

**Which institutions/programs/individuals are doing innovative work? Why?**

The programs that appeared to be doing the most innovative work were the faculty and staff members overseeing co-curricular programs within the professional schools. The work of these professionals is unique in that it is co-curricular in nature, but not what one may immediately think of as student affairs work. Often, student affairs professionals focus on the undergraduate student experience, not graduate/professional students. Because these programs are housed school-based, the focus is primarily academic, but these faculty and staff recognize that learning is not limited to the classroom and take advantage of opportunities to assess learning that occurs through research opportunities, clinical experiences, paraprofessional career involvements.

**How would you describe the field of assessment through the lens of your track? What types of methods are being used? How are assessment results being used?**

The field of assessment is becoming nimble enough to allow assessment of student learning to take within traditional classroom settings, within traditional co-curricular experiences, and at the intersection where learning that is academic in nature occurs in a variety of settings. The field of assessment is no longer organized along institutional organizational lines. Most of the methods that are used are similar to those used by faculty, such as evaluating e-portfolios and using rubrics to evaluate student work products. Assessment results are used to respond to criticisms of higher education, to answer calls for student achievement by federal, state, and professional organizations, and to recruit students into particular programs.