Program Review and Assessment Committee Minutes

November Meeting 2016: Thursday, November 17, 1:15-2:45pm, CE 309

Attending: K. Alfrey, S. Baker, K. Black, L. Bozeman, J. Connor-Zachocki, L. Easterling, S. Graunke, T. Hahn, M. Hansen, M. Huffman, S. Hundley, C. Kacius, S. Kahn, J. Lee, X. Liu, D. Malik, L. Maxwell, M. Meadows, A. Mitchell, J. Motter, H. Mzumara, C. Nielsen, K. Norris, L. Ramos, L. Ruch, S. Scott, K. Sheeler, C. Toledo, M. Urtel, S. Weeden

1. Welcome and Review/Approval of October 2016 Minutes
   - A recommendation was made to make changes beyond those seen in a version of the October minutes circulated to the committee. These changes were read and a motion to approve the minutes with the changes was offered and it was seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously with the identified changes.

2. 2017 Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) Leadership, nominations for Vice Chair
   - Tyrone Freeman consented to run for Vice-Chair in 2017. Other nominations were called. None were offered. A vote on Freeman's nomination will occur at the December meeting of PRAC.

3. Discussion item: Eligibility of PRAC members for PRAC grants
   - Background: The tradition has been that PRAC members are not eligible for PRAC grants.
   - Discussion: It is not certain when the tradition began. One understanding is that as long as part-time or full-time faculty are involved in the activity, then a PRAC member can be involved. It was indicated that a conflict-of-interest concern had been raised and led to questions about what it would mean for PRAC members to be getting the grants.
   - Proposal: The idea of having PRAC members be co-principle investigators (co-PIs) was offered as a way to address the conflict-of-interest concern and have PRAC members be part of the grants. It was argued that this makes sense because so many PRAC members are involved with assessment across the campus. A move was made to vote to adopt the proposal. The vote was taken: 28 yes, 2 abstentions.

4. Capstone Panel and Discussion — Kathryn Lauten (World Languages and Cultures [French], School of Liberal Arts), Ken Wendeln (Kelley School of Business), Aaron Ganci (Visual Communication Design, Herron School of Art and Design)
   - Wendeln—Began by reminding members that there are many views of and perceptions of where the focus of assessment ought to be. In the Kelley School of Business, J401 and J402 have been the capstone classes, each focusing on case studies. Critical thinking and writing have been the center of assessment efforts in these classes. Assessing writing has been difficult because of the labor-intensive nature of assessing all the writing produced. In order to have students follow up on

their decisions, a new, second course is being offered, J411, Business Decision Making. The course is organized around the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) standards, including management and leadership, collaboration and oral communication, and professional skills and competencies. In Business Decision Making, J411, the course schedule centers on the following activities: individual rehearsals of business decisions, the formation of teams to develop business plans, team practice rounds, and finally team competition rounds. Teams compete in class and against teams from other campuses nationally and internationally. The assessment is focused on business acumen as indicated on a business-based balanced scorecard. The goal is to get all of the teams in J411 above the 80th percentile. The process allows the program to see what students are doing and make adjustments in the curriculum. Some analysis of the data shows variation in contributions by team members, which are brought to student attention in order to encourage engagement and improvement on their part. An early community of practice under the leadership of Sharon Hamilton provided the encouragement, support, and motivation behind what is presently being tried in the capstone course. (See related PowerPoint slides.)

- Kathryn Lauten—With changes in the credit offered for foreign language in the School of Liberal Arts, the capstone course changed from a one-credit course to a three-credit course. The change also brought a focus on particular competencies, including presentational speaking, writing, interpretive listening, interpretive reading, interpersonal skills, and intercultural competence. The French program used national competencies to decide on the achievement levels they wanted students to attain. The assessment of what they achieve involves using signature assignments in an ePortfolio that are coupled to reflection. Presently, the program is working with students to find places where they can be reflective about their experience throughout their time in the curriculum, with a concentration on finding where weaknesses occur through tools like VoiceThread. Canvas is used to provide comment and voice feedback. Zoom is used for the students to practice speaking with one another.   The process has created moments at which students can monitor their progress. Each class in the curriculum has a signature assignment tied to a competency, so by the time of the capstone, the program and the students have a good idea of how the students do with the competencies over time. In the future, students will take a national exam, which will allow for comparison with students from across the country.

- Aaron Ganci—The capstone plays a part in a three-point assessment used for all BFA students, which begins with student entry into the Herron School of Art and Design, and it is tied to Herron's interest in evaluating how the students are doing as they make their way through the program. Quantitative assessment is new to the school but it is being utilized. The assessment process begins with an entry portfolio as part of the acceptance process. A mid-career portfolio is completed, typically in the junior year. Finally, a culminating capstone portfolio is put together in the capstone course.   The capstone course is also used to assess department-specific learning outcomes. Also, national accreditation requires a public exhibition by the students at the end of the degree experience, and the capstone course provides a context for this. Five assessment categories are used in the capstone

course, with assignments tied to each. A set of rubrics is used to assess their efforts, including a Herron-based rubric for all BFA students, a Visual Communication Design rubric for the department, and an overall capstone project rubric.

- Questions and discussion:
  - o Question: A recent community of practice on ePortfolios in the capstone experience discovered a dichotomy in capstone expectations between specialization within one capstone course versus integration across courses. Where do the presenters see their capstone experiences falling? Answers: In Herron, because of the different faculty teaching the course, specialization is frequently the focus. In Kelley, a broad business background is the focus, with motivation as a strong factor.
  - o Question: Are international elements involved in the capstone experiences? Answer: In French, yes. In business, it is up to the instructor whether an international case is involved. In Herron, international content is open to students, although typically the projects do not involve international elements. An emphasis on semiotics does have them consider aspects related to international awareness.
  - o Question: How are the cases the students work on decided upon? Answer: Instructors decide. Comment: It is possible for the Office of Community Engagement to be involved in identifying potential projects. Modeling cross-disciplinary projects that occur on other campuses could be considered.
  - o Question: It makes sense that assessment would occur at the 300 and 400 level, where most students are minors and majors. However, the capstone may be the first place where students consider deficiencies. What happens when a four-year process is the focus? Answer: In French, the same competencies are used throughout, with benchmarking tied to national standards. This allows the program to check on progress over time.
  - o Comment: The situation for students in the IU School of Law is different in that the key moment in professional development is taking and passing the Bar exam. This process is less practice-focused and centers more on analytic expertise. The accreditation process is nationally focused. Response: Students in the Kelley School of Business face a similar process as they go on to take the CPA and CFA exams, which are typically associated with advanced students. The capstone for undergraduate majors tends to focus on a broad picture.
  - o Question: Are there factors common to capstones? Is it possible to identify taxonomies for capstones? Answer: Not sure. Perhaps taxonomies of high impact practices would be one place to look. Capstones tend to be for integration and application. Suggestion: Perhaps create a new community of practice at IUPUI that could look into creating a taxonomy for IUPUI.

5. Multi-State Collaborative Report — Stephen Hundley, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement and Michelle Hansen, Institutional Research and Decision Support.

- As a transition from the previous presentation to this one, Hundley asked, What other topics around capstones could be discussed? What are capstones doing with PULs, not

only with program level outcomes? What claims about student learning with PULs do we have? Do departments have a template for capstones versus faculty doing individual things? What are best practices to get faculty to develop signature assignments across capstones? What are best practices for reaching out to industry and community partners? What is the relationship between consistency and flexibility? How are we applying and integrating knowledge? Are there possibilities for interdisciplinary capstones? Hundley then asked whether there is interest in forming a community of practice around capstones, as indicated earlier. Some interest was indicated. One suggestion was to form a graduate and professional capstone panel at a future PRAC meeting. Hundley indicated that he and Scott Weeden, who will become chair of PRAC in January, will discuss this.

- Hundley then reported on efforts by a set of multi-state collaborative panels, supported by the State Higher Education Executive Offices Association (SHEEO) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Nine states have been involved, of which Indiana is one. The efforts have focused on critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and writing and communication. Hundley and Jennifer Lee are working on an initiative that includes gathering artifacts of student work from capstones and they hope to have faculty volunteers be trained to score the artifacts according to the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics (see https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics). (Information on the Multi-State Collaborative project can be seen at http://www.sheeo.org/projects/msc-multi-state-collaborative-advance-learning-outcomes-assessment). The collaborative that IUPUI is taking part in will be continuing into its third year.
- Questions: (None were offered.)

6. Collaborative Community-Based Learning, Kristin Norris – Office of Community Engagement
- Jennifer Lee announced that this presentation will be postponed until December.

7. Adjournment — The meeting was adjourned at 3:35

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:

Thursday, December 15, 1:15-2:45 in CE 305

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
November 21, 2016