Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, February 18, 2021

1:30 – 3:00pm

Minutes

[Link to Video Recording](#)

Attendees: Karen Alfrey, Marta Anton, Rick Bentley, Leslie Bozeman, Nicholas Brehl, Jerry Daday, Julie Davis, Lynn Dombrowski, David Farber, Peter Federman, Anita Giddings, Steve Graunke, Tom Hahn, Michele Hansen, William Helling, Linda Houser, Stephen Hundley, Susan Kahn, Jennifer Lee, Sara Lowe, Katharine Macy, Brendan Maxy, Clif Marsiglio, Pamela Morris, Howard Mzumara, Julie Otte, Michael Poletika, Saptarshi Purkayastha, Anusha S Rao, Emily Scaggs, Kristy Sheeler, Morgan Studer, Elizabeth Wager, Crystal Walcott, Scott Weeden, Linda Wardhammar, and Jane Williams

---

1. Welcome, review and approval of previous meeting minutes

    <u>Tom Hahn</u> welcomed everyone and began the meeting at 1:31 pm.

    A vote to approve the January minutes was held; they were approved unanimously.

2. Post-Pandemic Planning: Assessment Lessons Learned – Stephen Hundley

    Stephen Hundley welcomed everyone and explained that all attending would join a group in a Zoom room. Each group would have 15 minutes to answer three questions (five minutes for each question). A spokesperson will report the discussion back to the whole group.

    The explanation: Chancellor Paydar has a formed a working group looking into Post-Pandemic Planning. Paydar has asked for assistance with the following questions:
    *   Based on what we have learned during the pandemic, what has worked well?
    *   What are some challenges that remain?
    *   What are some things that we should adapt/adopt/scale in the future?

    PRAC members were invited to join a breakout room in Zoom to engage in a discussion on the above three questions. Members were then sent to breakout rooms in Zoom.

    After the breakout room discussions occurred, each group was invited to report out. Here is what they offered:
    *   <u>Group 1</u>:
        o   <u>What Worked Well</u>: (1) For the Campus Center and for programs related to student experiences, a benefit has been having a focus be on the impact of programs rather than solely paying attention to the numbers. (2) Instructors have discovered that moving to online learning creates opportunities to get rich sets of data in new ways (e.g. electronic tools for

measuring engagement, more opportunities for quizzes and other assessment measures, and so on). (3) Some programs have found that deepened skills in assessment have occurred (Herron students, for example, have become more sophisticated in their reflections). (4) Nursing discovered a useful process whereby students were allowed to vent 15 minutes at the beginning of each class. The feedback from students through this mechanism helped Nursing to work with the students to solve the problems they are facing. A deeper discussion occurred during class because a safe space and connection was created.

- What Was Challenging: (1) STEM fields have found it challenging to engage in course assessment without running into the temptation by students to cheat when unsupervised in the online environment. (2) It has also been hard to make sure students are meeting outcomes in labs, as contact hours are decreased due to social distancing constraints. (3) A steep learning curve has faced instructors delivering courses in the new learning environment and performing assessments. (4) How faculty use technology varies, which has been difficult for students to navigate. (5) Another problem for students has been access to stable internet and to technology tools.

- What Could Be Adapted/Adopted/Scaled in the Future: (1) Continuing to use engagement tools in Canvas to track student interactions and flag low engagement. (2) Aspects of online delivery of courses will continue to be useful, as will outreach and support. Some programs may continue to see more participation if a robust online presence continues. (3) Moving lecture material online frees up more time for assessment in the classroom. (4) Continuing to use or expanding the Center for Teaching and Learning support for learning new technologies and sharing best practices for consistency across classes would be a plus in the future.

- Group 2:
  - What Worked Well: (1) Faculty learned to teach creatively using technology. This improved the potential for significant learning, but the results were not as good as is seen in face-to-face classes. (2) Faculty have adjusted well to working in Zoom. DFWI rates are higher but technology is making communication with the students possible. (3) We anticipate these technologies will continue to be used when back to face-to-face classrooms. (4) Virtual global engagement proved beneficial as examples with universities in Rwanda, India, and Costa Rica highlight. (5) Smaller courses have benefitted from technology.
  - What Was Challenging: (1) Larger courses encounter frustration with technology. (2) Workload issues arose, such as faculty reluctance to agree to independent projects and research with students because of the extra burden this entailed. (3) Confusion arose over lab and clinical pandemic-related course policies.
  - What Could Be Adapted/Adopted/Scaled in the Future: (1) Continuing to look for opportunities for student interaction, such as options for small group interactions. (2) Virtual options create opportunities for students to lead. These include peer engagement, such as virtual game nights, virtual talent shows, and so on. (3) The use of engaged learning showcases where student work can be disseminated. (4) Synchronous connections are

helpful to facilitate student interactions. (5) Using technology to scale up faculty engagement in professional development offerings.

- Group 3:
  - What Worked Well: (1) Faculty are more comfortable with technology and with teaching online. More faculty appreciate online teaching now, including its benefits and challenges and how to address these challenges. (2) Technology is affording us the opportunity to engage all students because students are not able to hide. (3) Using Canvas to support learning outcomes, assignments, and rubrics has been beneficial. (4) The Canvas gradebook functions were a positive. (5) Canvas may help us with reporting data (assuming we can get that data). (6) Using Qualtrics surveys help faculty and staff to see what people's preferences are. (7) IRDS is developing a feedback form that will allow IRDS website visitors to share something they want to contribute.
  - What Was Challenging: (1) Student surveys show that students are stressed, which may create enrollment challenges. (2) A critical mass of students want on-campus experiences while other students may now appreciate the flexibility of a hybrid modality. A question for us now is, how do we serve both sets of students and other students expressing preferences from their Covid experiences? How do we communicate to them in order to help them? (3) PRAC Reports and looking at the data: the pandemic has created a massive confounding effect with our data mainly because it is difficult, if not impossible, to look at trends over time. (4) IUPUC is reporting that the pandemic is providing course offerings that are giving opportunities for students who can only take classes online. For those students with high internet speeds and who can handle the online environment, the pandemic has been a positive. (5) Cheating is a concern, especially when exams are reused by faculty.
  - What Could Be Adapted/Adopted/Scaled in the Future: (1) We are more aware of student mental health issues and we need to make more accommodations and incorporate strategies that can help: not all students are OK. How can we use assessment to identify and highlight these accommodations and strategies? (2) We should continue to look for opportunities to engage in authentic assessment. (3) We have an opportunity to reach student populations who may not have attended the IUPUI campus—technology is allowing us to expand. (4) We should continue to develop new or different ways of learning in different modalities. Assessments of these modalities are not easy to do. (5) There are opportunities to continue with technology improvements and scale them. (6) One size doesn't fit all for teaching and for students: how do we communicate this to students? (7) We have a large sample of students who have learned online.   Could this now show us a market for the future?

- Group 4:
  - What Worked Well: (1) Some things that worked well include faculty using Canvas and other technology more widely and better. (2) The Center for Teaching and Learning, and others, have provided wider support and access to training. (3) Higher levels of participation in events has occurred (online meetings, extracurricular activities, orientations, and so

on). The School of Liberal Arts and the McKinney School of Law in particular saw this higher level of participation. In general, attending committee meetings was made easier. (5) Increased use of technology for assessing student learning. (The assessment was more authentic with the use of digital technology: ePortfolios, online quizzes, online exams, and so on.)

- o What Was Challenging: (1) Generating student participation in synchronous activities and class meetings was a challenge. (2) Connecting with students was more difficult. (3) There is a sense that everyone wants time and access to faculty and staff at all times, leading to problems with burnout. (4) The extra time needed for programming and teaching has been a challenge. (5) Financial and technological hardships have been witnessed in students. (6) Some challenges to assessment of student learning have occurred. Some examples: the loss of collaboration in capstone work, no on-campus presentations, and so on. (7) Some students have been expecting "high quality," if not the same quality of learning, in experiences this past year, but they are not recognizing that not all learning experiences are equivalent. (8) Negative feedback has been reported on course evaluations. (9) Lower quality final student work is occurring. (9) Campus childcare benefits were not sufficient to cover costs.

- o What Could Be Adapted/Adopted/Scaled in the Future: (1) More extensive use of Canvas and other teaching technology. (2) Continuing to provide and improve faculty training, and to provide opportunities for training in order to improve teaching and learning. (3) The use of virtual meetings for large groups. (4) The continuation of virtual orientations and advising for non-traditional and other students (both graduate and undergraduate students).

- Group 5:
  - o What Worked Well: (1) Zoom office hours worked very well. (2) Faculty did not get into issues with parking, and it was easier to bring outsiders in without contending with parking concerns. (3) More visibility of activities because the work was online. (4) Lower DWFI rates, which may have been related to faculty being more accommodating. (Perhaps being more accommodating should be employed more in the future.) (5) Conferences were more meaningful because the papers could be seen.
  - o What Was Challenging: (1) Being able to have informal conversations with colleagues at conferences was missed. (2) Flip classroom efforts were cut short. (3) Minority and international students have been alienated even more.
  - o What Could Be Adapted/Adopted/Scaled in the Future: [They were unable to get to the last item because they ran out of time.]

- Reactions to What Was Heard from the Various Groups: Susan Kahn pointed out that she thinks there is value in faculty and staff being able to get more information about students and the way they are having to manage their lives. She thinks there is an argument for carrying over some of the flexibility that has been a feature of teaching and learning during Covid. Steven Hundley closed by encouraging members to have similar conversations in their units about what worked well, what was challenging, and what could be adapted, and if members

would, to send what they learn to Hundley's office. Members were also notified that messages will be coming in March inviting them to add more information on what we have learned from our pandemic experiences.

3. Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) Data Sources and Overview – Michele Hansen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, IRDS, and Steve Graunke, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, IRDS

Michele Hansen: This presentation was designed to be a reminder of what is available through IRDS. This office provides information exclusively to the Ft. Wayne, Columbus, and IUPUI campuses. IRDS has a team that can help out with any qualitative and qualitative research initiatives associated with student success. IRDS is involved with direct and indirect measures of student learning. Direct measures include employment outcomes for students, graduate- and professional-school enrollment, consultations on embedded direct assessments of student learning, and grades and DWFI reports associated with carefully designed signature assignment experiences. Indirect measures include National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), local surveys associated with self-reported learning gains aligned with PLUS, campus climate surveys, retention and graduation rates, general DFWI and grade reports, and focus groups and interview protocols. They employ key practices: considering the needs of faculty, staff, administrators, and students; developing a comprehensive integrated data infrastructure to provide unprecedented access to data; and optimizing the use of enabled technology, such as Tableau, to put data in the hands of decision makers, especially disaggregated data. They also work on data governance and policies to manage the data that is generated, setting policies for its appropriate use. Part of this effort is coordinating when information will be gathered, such as when surveys will be sent to students, so that participants are not overwhelmed with survey requests. A Data Inquiry Group (DIG) has been created with members from across the campus who are key data users and analysts in the various units.

Steven Graunke: This presentation focused on reviewing what is on the IRDS website. He indicated that IRDS does presentations for different groups on campus. A first stop on the website was the Data Link page, which contains a wide variety of reports. One example are the surveys that are conducted. Graunke showed the Alumni Survey page and how the data in it might be used. He showed, for example, how alumni employment information can be accessed and what kind of information is available. Available as well is information on impacts on learning (which is tied to PLUS), information on further education, and information on campus climate (all appearing in a series of surveys going back multiple decades. He finished by showing members the DWFI reports and the NSSE reports. The secured versions of the DWFI reports provide deeper-level analysis, such as section-by-section information for the courses listed. PRAC members should have access to the secure information, but if members do not, Graunke encouraged members to let him or others at IRDS know and they will try to help the member gain access. The NSSE reports make it possible to compare IUPUI programs with other programs in other parts of the country. Learning outcomes information is also available. Graunke concluded by pointing the group to student survey data that is available on the IRDS site, as well as other information that is available, and he showed the group where they can go to fill out a data request form which those looking for information can use to request the information they are looking for.

Questions:
1. How are the Spring 2020 instruction modes broken out? Answer: The original modality that appeared in the course catalogue is how the sections are classified.
2. Any way the schools can help to support IRDS response rates for surveys? Answer: IRDS definitely encourages coordination and collaboration so that response rates can be increased. (Response rates are a concern when external accrediting bodies look for response rates that only reach a certain level.)

4. Upcoming NSSE Administration – Steve Graunke

   Graunke let the group know that this is a year that NSSE will be administered. A proclamation by President McRobbie indicates that NSSE must be administered every three years on all IU campuses. The last survey at IUPUI was in spring 2018. It will be administered again this spring. The survey is a large, cross-institutional survey that focuses on practices that students are engaged in that are linked to positive educational outcomes (collaborative learning practices, high-impact practices, interacting with faculty, getting a supportive feel from the campus environment, and so on). The survey is sent to a complete census of students at Ft. Wayne, Columbus, and IUPUI who are freshmen-year and senior-year students. The information has been used in the past to redevelop learning communities, to assess the effectiveness of high impact practices, to look at learning outcomes, to assess critical thinking programs, and so on. The information can be broken down to the school level, allowing a program to use cross-institutional comparisons to see how students are doing. Two topics were added this year by IUPUI. The first is IUPUI's response to the Covid situation (such as remote learning). The second is student engagement with diversity and equity programming. The first email to encourage students to take the survey will be sent out to students on Feb. 25. Follow-up emails will be sent out the rest of March reminding freshmen and senior students of the survey and encouraging them to take it. Promoting the survey has shifted from an in-person presence (tables, posters, etc.) to a social media presence. Graunke asked the group to promote the survey to first-year students and to students in capstone courses. All students taking the survey before April 15 will be entered for a chance to receive a $25 Amazon gift card. (Twenty students will win the gift card for participating.)

5. Excellence in Assessment Designation Update – Susan Kahn

   This presentation was moved to the next meeting in March.

6. Announcements

   Leslie Bozeman from the Office of International Affairs announced that the International Festival will occur the week of Feb. 21 to Feb. 27. Bozeman encouraged members to check out this all-virtual festival and offered information on it in the chat for today's meeting. She also provided a link to a Google Drive document that offers background images that group members can use. She encouraged members with questions to contact the Office of International Affairs.

   Linda Houser announced that because no PRAC grants were given last fall, they will be combined this spring. Four grants will be offered at $5000 each. The deadline was Feb. 15, but because the grants are combined, the deadline has been extended to March 1. Those who submitted in the fall will be invited to re-submit again this spring.

Future PRAC Meeting Dates:
- Thursday, March 11, 2021, 1:30 – 3:00 pm
- Thursday, April 8, 2021, 1:30 – 3:00 pm
- Thursday, May 13, 2021, 1:30 – 3:00 pm

Respectfully submitted by Scott Weeden