

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, February 20, 2020, AD 1006

1:30 – 3:00pm

Agenda/Minutes

Attendees: Karen Alfrey, Peter Altenburger, Marta Anton, Leslie Bozeman, Nicholas Brehl, Julie Davis, David Farber, Steve Graunke, Daniel Griffith, Michele Hansen, Stephen Hundley, Carole Kacius, Susan Kahn, Caleb J. Keith, Sara Lowe, Clif Marsiglio, Pamela Morris, Howard Mzumara, Kristin Norris, Todd Roberson, Anusha S Rao, Morgan Studer, Elizabeth Wager, Scott Weeden

1. Welcome, review and approve previous meeting minutes (5 minutes)

CK: Tom his unable to attend, so I will be filling in as chair of the meeting. Meeting minutes were approved.

2. *Culturally Relevant Assessment* (30 minutes) - Christine Robinson, Karen Singer-Freeman, and Harriet Hobbs, University of North Carolina—Charlotte, Office of Academic Affairs Assessment

Stephen Hundley introduced guest speakers from UNC- Charlotte. Grateful to our guests, who are long time contributors to the Assessment Institute.

Christine Robinson, Harriet Hobbs, and Karen Singer-Freeman introduced themselves. Harriett: National Equity Challenges- Need to take an objective look at our assessment approaches and disaggregate the data. Address entrenched practices that reinforce inequities. Look at classroom practices - assignments and the types of assignments that reinforce inequities.

Karen: We are trying to provide targeted information and strategies that faculty and assessment professionals can use to make rapid improvements. Referencing the article they shared - Everywhere we look, we see equity gaps (based on ethnicity, family history, income status, rural/urban). Often times, when faculty are faced with these uncomfortable revelations they struggle with how to respond. We help them provide culturally relevant pedagogy. Where we see a powerful place for change is in the assignments they give students. We see assignments because it is something we can share with experts, get feedback from multiple perspectives....as opposed to having someone literally watch me teach.

Utility value (Epples 1970 – used in science education to reduce equity gaps)- students will do better work when they see that the assignment has value/meaning.
Inclusive content- limits effects of prior knowledge and privilege on student performance.

Alignment with teaching - students who come from privilege/prior experience are more likely to ask questions when the assignments are not aligned or seek clarity.

Accessible materials- students who are not privilege may not buy the textbook ahead of time, so making material that are accessible is important.

Clear instructions & Scaffolding

Inclusive environment – yes, culturally responsive teaching, but also asking questions that make everyone feel like they can participate in the discussion and their perspectives are valued.

Theoretical Analysis of Assignment Types (see matrix on slide)

Inclusive projects – where faculty members allow the students to pick the material, genre, etc. Explain why the assignment is useful to any student.

What our Research Supports:

Developed a measure that 165 students have completed and 50 faculty and assessment professionals. Anyone interested in taking it or seeing it, follow the link on the slide. Feedback indicates that our initial assumptions were somewhat correct. The types of assignments were very general (e.g., reflective writing, writing in the discipline) and they are in the process of looking at specific assignments.

Provocative questions:

How would you encourage faculty to examine if and how assignments are disproportionately impacting equity in student learning?

Discussion responses:

Karen Alfrey – TILT framework is a good process for examining assignments (Transparency in Teaching and Learning, MaryAnn Winklemes)

Dennis Rudnick – does the institution value this work? Systemic teeth? Are we giving faculty permission to take risks?

Karen Alfrey – Gen Ed course review process does not require this. Just get DFW rates and they are encouraged to look at this.

Michele Hansen/Steve Grauke- IRDS has new features that will allow faculty to disaggregate information by student demographics. But faculty wouldn't be able to look at an assignment and have information about their students.

Karen – if you don't give faculty this information, they are unlikely to be compelled to see it. I was able to see equity gaps in the tests and it was a critical factor to moving the needle on this. If the equity gap is being driven by a certain type of assignment, you can really begin to improve student outcomes.

Peter Altenburger – Graduate instructor. Initial thought was to get feedback from students on their student survey – could ask them about specific types of assignments.

Christine – challenge for us...we looked at courses with high DFW, which happened to be in the STEM fields and were likely to be multiple choice exams so it was hard to look at different types of assignments. And the large classroom sizes deterred them from doing anything else other than test.

What actions can the PRAC take to influence faculty to examine assignment types at IUPUI?

Kristin- PRAC grant to encourage faculty to look at this.

Susan Kahn- I think there's a caveat, particularly in the case of reflective writing and eportfolios – they need to be well developed. They need a lot of professional development in order to implement them with students. So yes, you can present the broad findings, but each of the assignment types are different and difficult to implement.

Response: Glad you brought that up. Yes, true. Every time we've talked to people who do one of these types, everyone acknowledges that these can be done better. Even multiple choice exams. Alignment, scaffolding, explanation – all need to be done well. We can all ask our students how they feel about the assignment along these lines.

Pamela- I come from a place of privilege and when I look at the assignment, I don't think I could see how it would be challenging for other types of students. The very process of having these conversations with the students has value...particularly when you are looking at these criteria.

Christine- we worked with a CHEM faculty member who distributed this to their students. The faculty member already used an innovative pedagogy and what she found was not great. But, she was able to hear from students about the method/approach. She thought she was good (really focused on her pedagogy) and was really happy to participate. She shared her findings from her colleagues.

Recommendations:

Become Equity-Minded

- Ask students. Know who your students are and will be.
- Disaggregate the data by race/ethnicity, gender, social economic, and transfer status
- Examine assessment processes
- Build institutional commitment to reduce equity gaps

Professional Development

- Facilitate conversations about equity gaps on your campuses
- Present evidence/data
- Seek out stereotypes or bias that may be perpetuating equity gaps

Karen – Assessment Institute (Tia McNair) was where we first started looking at all of this.

SH: Thank you for your time. Reminder for the CFP. Our presenters will be doing some work on Grand Challenges in Assessment.

3. *Culturally Responsive Assessment is Just Good Assessment* (25 minutes) – Dennis Rudnick, Associate Director of Multicultural Education and Research

My background is in multicultural teaching and Dr. Ladson- Billings was significant to my work. When I was asked to write a response for the article, I was in the CTL here at IUPUI and we were talking about how to do culturally responsive teaching. She argues that considerations in equity and culture are emblematic of high-quality teaching. How do institutions value and encourage that?

Multicultural education is just good teaching.

Culturally sustaining pedagogy – there's been a challenge with our diverse groups of learners --- saying that we need to misuse/mislabel learning styles based upon student demographics.

Montenegro and Jankowski are saying the same thing as Ladson-Billings. How are we assessing our assessment practices? So many of our assessments are perpetuating our inequities. Their value is intrinsic to how well they do on a test. Dominant ways and perspectives are inherent in how we do assessment. Deficit orientations are deeply embedded in how we think about communities and we need to change.

Critical Self-Reflection – We need to acknowledge our assumptions. Sandra Harding – talks about strong objectivity. If you are going to be more objective, you need to consider how your own identities impact your teaching and assessment practices.

Assessment efforts- when we fail to consider our perspectives or biases, we will perpetuate unfairness and legitimize oppression under the guise of objectivity and fairness. What sort of humans, citizens are we producing as a campus? This is about assessing ourselves.

Culture Matters – All students have culture and culturally responsive assessment benefits all students. This is not a plug and play...different strategies may not work for all of our students. We need to slow down and really engage with our students.

Purpose of Assessment – is the purpose to prove or to improve? Prove that we are being objective or authentically using assessment to improve the educational outcomes of our assessment? How might we culturally approach to improve our assessment?

Blooms Taxonomy merged with James Banks work on making curriculum more cultural and integrative. (see slide).

4. *Test Optional Update and Discussion* (25 minutes) - Michele Hansen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) and Boyd Bradshaw, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management and Chief Enrollment Officer

Erol- working to develop a framework for creating a pathway for student success

Boyd- everyone is aware that IU is moving to test optional and this is really changing how we look at the student admittance process. We have some autonomy on how to implement this at IUPUI. We have some decision points to still make and are open to feedback.

Effective Aug. 2020 for the incoming class of Spring 2021. We don't admit a lot of students, so this will give us a good way to test it.

University College Admissions. – requires a test score and a GPA. Currently, we look at one or the other.

If a student were to choose not to submit a test score, which we estimate 10-15%, they have to make a decision at the application process; cannot go back/change. Those who choose to not use a test score, students with 3.1 GPA will be admitted. IRDS did an analysis – students with 3.1 or above students are very successful at IUPUI.

Looking at direct admissions – This varies from one school to another. Over the next month, we are looking to the schools to define their options. Identify the floor admit and what options/criteria the schools want to look at. Developing a tool with IRDS to evaluate their college essay.

Michele – due to mounting concerns of equity, access and success as well as predictive validity of using standardized tests, many institutions are going test optional or test blind. IUs Board of Trustees and IFC approved of us looking at the options. We found that SAT doesn't add much of a predictor of success. Once you take into account HS GPA, the SAT has no predictive validity at IUPUI. Makes sense – 4 years of school is more important than sitting on a test for a few hours. CHAID analysis allows us to look at relationships among variables. We wanted to identify cut scores and GPAs. It organizes students along HS GPAs—this is how we identified what HS GPA cutoff should be. We are doing this for each school because the data didn't support us choosing one HS GPA for the campus. We needed to make it specific for each school.

Steve – we were asked by Honors college to identify a cut score as well. They were looking at graduation from IUPUI in 4 years with a cumulative of 3.75 or higher. We found that 3.75 HS GPA was a good predictor of that outcome as well as having 8 or more college dual credits and the honors diploma.

Michele- Also need to add rigor of HS curriculum. We are advocating a combination of factors be used to consider who is admitted. Schools get to define rigor of HS curriculum criteria. We are using the essay (Univ. of Chicago has really interesting prompts) as well. Using research that defines rigor of HS curriculum.

Boyd – we are trying to figure out what the score is going to be to determine if you get it. Currently, we don't have admission readers, so this will change how we look at the admissions process. We get 14,000 applications. We try to have a 2 week turn-around.

Errol- we hope to create some innovative prompts that would help us really examine these. There is currently a standardized essay prompt currently. IUPUI may want to think about adding or removing barriers to the process.

5. Announcements (5 minutes)

Meeting was adjourned at 3:04pm.