

## Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, May 13, 2021

1:30 – 3:00pm

### Meeting Minutes and [Video Recording](#)

---

**Attendees:** Karen Alfrey, Marta Antón, Rick Bentley, Martin Coleman, Jerry Daday, Julie Davis, Lynn Dombrowski, Anita Giddings, Steven Graunke, Daniel Griffith, Tom Hahn, Linda Houser, Stephen Hundley, Susan Kahn, Caleb J. Keith, Jennifer Lee, Sara Lowe, Cliff Marsiglio, Brendan Maxcy, Pamela Morris, Howard Mzumara, Sonia Ninon, Ann Obergfell, Tonja Padgett, Saptarshi Purkayastha, Anusha S Rao, Emily Scaggs, Morgan Studer, Elizabeth Wager, Marlene Walk, Scott Weeden, Jane Williams

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

Tom Hahn called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM. Karen Alfrey made a motion to approve the minutes from April 2021. A vote was taken and the minutes from April 2021 were approved.

2. “How Should We Teach and Assess Ethics? Extending Findings from the Integrated Community-Engaged Learning and Ethical Reflection (ICELER) Project.” Martin Coleman, IUPUI Associate Professor of Philosophy; Grant Fore, Research Associate, IUPUI SEIRI; Justin Hess, Assistant Professor, Purdue University School of Engineering Education; Brandon Sorge, Assistant Professor, Organizational Leadership; and Elizabeth Saunders, Ph.D. Student, Engineering Education, Purdue University (40 minutes)

Stephen Hundley: I have the distinct privilege of getting to work with these colleagues as a member of the advisory board for a grant they have from the National Science Foundation called the Integrated Community-Engaged Learning and Ethical Reflection (ICELER) Project.

Justin Hess: This is a really large research project that we are going to talk about today, and we’ll be sharing results with you. Kathy Johnson is the PI. We want this to be interactive and will be using JamBoard during our time together today. Also what we share today are our views and do not represent the NSF.

This is the fourth year of a five-year project. Given the context of where we are at in the project, we are thinking about how lessons from this project can inform institutional culture. We have changed two departments in the School of Science and the School of Engineering and Technology. But we want to begin to think about how that can sort of be diffused or extended across IUPUI.

The faculty in this project have been informing our thinking here. And we want to spend this last year thinking more purposely. So we wanted to talk with you all today as

the experts behind the Profiles to think about how the findings from this project can begin to form.

[NOTE: Time was spent engaging with JamBoard answering the discussion questions sent in advance of the meeting.]

JH: I appreciate everyone engaging with that and sharing thoughts. I just want to briefly give some more context for the project itself. So there are three primary specific aims. The first is this intervention around a faculty learning community to promote shared learning and that results in changes in ethics instruction. The second, third, components are more of our research and evaluation questions.

The team viewed engaging the self as critical as an entry point to lay the groundwork for sparking enhancements to instructional practices, many of which ran counter to traditional disciplinary norms. So the FLC sessions of the project included readings in and out of class assignments, opportunities, give and receive, peer feedback, field trips and community dialogue. And then the focus on community building among the two departments was initiated a foster and encourage ongoing collegial discourses on teaching and educationally meaningful community engagement.

Martin Coleman: I'll open with a quote from David Foster Wallace from a commencement address at Kenyon College.

“There are these two young fish swimming along and they happen to meet an older fish swimming the other way, who nods at them and says “Morning, boys. How’s the water?” And the two young fish swim on for a bit, and then eventually one of them looks over at the other and goes “What the hell is water?”

This is a standard requirement of US commencement speeches, the deployment of didactic little parable-ish stories. The story thing turns out to be one of the better, less bull---y conventions of the genre, but if you’re worried that I plan to present myself here as the wise, older fish explaining what water is to you younger fish, please don’t be. I am not the wise old fish. The point of the fish story is merely that the most obvious, important realities are often the ones that are hardest to see and talk about.”

I want to say that ICELER is not made up of wise old fish making ethical pronouncements. It's about increasing awareness of what is obvious, important and often difficult to notice and talk about, namely the pervasiveness of ethics and its communal character. The water we swim in is pervaded with values that are public and that influence interactions as surely as any other facts. We encounter unavoidable choices about how to respond to them. Keep swimming obliviously.

While teaching ethical theory can be limited to lectures and readings about codes, frameworks, or list of virtues. Teaching ethics is necessarily unnecessarily experiential and communal. It requires reflective interactions with others. This presents in my concrete living, the challenge of considering who I am beyond familiar identities and images of myself. And it presents the joy of exercising human consciousness free of delusion and deception. This is the simultaneous challenge of asking how should I as a human being live? That is, the challenge.

Elizabeth Saunders: The first thing that we saw was a change in the intentionality of ethics and instruction. So before the FLC, the faculty talked about doing activities and having in-class discussions that resembled ethics instruction. However, these discussions were not explicitly framed for the purpose of engaging students with ethics. Now, as a result of the FLC, a lot of the faculty are talking about how they now see this connection between ethics and their course content a little more clearly as the quote suggests. And as such, they have updated their course materials to kind of explicitly highlight that and bring that intentionality forth for their students. We're also seeing a value in the continuity of ethics instruction.

The next thing that we're seeing is a change in the faculties, beliefs and perceptions of students' desire to engage with ethics based activities. Many faculty express beliefs similar to the quote that we see here, that students in earlier years might not be ready to engage in some of the course content or the ethics content. But faculty are finding that that's not necessarily the case. Both faculty in both departments have identify that students have this desire to engage in these discussions in the classroom.

We're also seeing that faculty are actively reflecting on their personal experiences during this process. So in the interviews we see that faculty are reflecting on their own experiences they had related to ethical behavior, ethical decision-making, and other things like that when describing how they created and developed assignments or activities for their students. And then finally, we're seeing deliberate changes and instructional practice. There are a lot of different ways that this is happening based on the course and the faculty member themselves. Interestingly, a lot of these changes were motivated by the kind of new found or uncover desire that students have to engage in ethics in the classroom.

Brandon Sorge: We also that have looked at faculty's comfort with community engaged learning, as well as their civic minded professional score. I am actually not at all surprised by the fact that our civic mindedness scores have actually seen a decrease over the three years. We are making faculty think about and look at what they do and how they engage with society differently. And society has changed rapidly over the last 18 months, which I think has impacted how all of us think about this. This is actually similar to other research that I've done and I would expect in the next couple of years we will see those increase as society changed a little bit more and they have more comfort in what they're doing around the civic minded professional.

And so as we've been going through this process, we've been seeing, as you can tell by the graphs, substantial changes, not statistically significant. We're going up and down with the different experiences that the faculty are having. But in each case, we're still seeing some change and some recognition that things are happening, whether positive or negative. They're still important pieces of this development and growth of our faculty.

JH: We present this question as a way to sort of guide this closing discussion. In your department or school, what are some opportunities for improving the integration and assessment of ethics and community engaged content and your core curriculum. And then what are some of the barriers or challenges?

Jerry Daday: What are the next steps? How does a faculty member take what you have learned and apply it to their practice? How do I translate this into what I do and what I teach? How does this scale? How do you replicate this and what does that look like?

MC: What we had talked about with Kathy Johnson was a week-long intensive program for faculty who wanted to consciously incorporate ethics into their teaching. And in my view, this could be taught in any discipline in any department. I mean, it would be beneficial for philosophy classes. I don't think philosophy as necessarily taught ethically or calls attention to ethics, where it's easier to focus on ethical theory. how are these things modeled? I mean, that's what needs to be emphasized if what we're teaching our practices that like to be an ethical earth scientist. It can't be that ethics is this add-on. So the, one of the aims of an intensive one-week thing would be to start thinking about how one models that in one's own practice. So there would be this sort of focus on my own practice, my own identity as a teacher, as a practitioner of my discipline. How that translates into a lesson or a curriculum. And you share that with the group. So that's what that's where our conversations have gone so far. Where would we where we'll go next? And it would take more thinking about how do we put this across disciplines. But I don't think that would be difficult if we stress sort of this broader framework.

3. Excellence in Assessment Designation application. Susan Kahn (5 minutes)

Susan Kahn: We submitted our application last week. Stephen and I had a very intense few days pulling it together. I think it is very good. We talked a lot in the limited space we had available. We had two pages to do an introduction, an endorsement by Nasser, two pages to talk about campus committees and offices related to assessment. And then a 3000-word narrative, which when you look at the questions that they're asking, it's quite difficult to fit everything you would like to say into that space.

We discussed the many changes in the last five years since our previous Excellence in Assessment Designation: The Institute for Engaged Learning, the Profiles, the Record, the Taxonomies of High Impact Practices. We talked about the growth of Student Affairs and Student Affairs assessment. The latter three represent evidence-based decision-making at IUPUI. And we wanted to convey the idea that when we're kind of going beyond the teach, assess, improve, reassess, improve approach. We wanted to demonstrate how evidence pervades our decision-making and strategies around undergraduate education. We wanted to show we are also advancing the work of assessment as a field through the Assessment Institute, *Assessment Update*, journal submissions and conference presentations. We also talked quite a bit about equity and our emphasis on equitable assessment. We also discussed how we need to continue to advance development around assessment at IUPUI.

So really, many of you unconsciously perhaps contributed to this through the work that you do as individuals and in your departments, programs, offices, and divisions. We really appreciate the support and the very good discussions that we've had in the last few PRAC meetings. They were most useful.

We could send the application packet out. It is short, but it is extremely pithy and concise. I think we worked hard to make it that way.

4. PRAC Reporting and Recognition Subcommittee. Karen Alfrey and Susan Kahn (15 minutes)

SK: For those who are new to PRAC, and with apologies for those who have been around for a while, I am going to talk about the purpose of the PRAC reports. ...

Some of you told me when I interviewed you about the state of assessment that you do assessment because we owe it to our students to give them the best possible education and set them up for success. We owe it to our disciplines, we owe it to our professions, we owe it to stakeholders, we owe it to the local community, and we're held accountable for systematic assessment and improvement by accrediting agencies. We do the PRAC reports to demonstrate we engage in assessment in a systematic way.

Our responsibility and accountability increasingly includes co-curricular units, as we've discussed, when we have student affairs and other co-curricular units reporting, that strengthens the case we can make to our stakeholders. We also use the reports as source material for various campus-wide reports, including accreditation, self-studies, and applications for recognitions like the Excellence in Assessment Designation.

Karen Alfrey: The reports are used to demonstrate what we are doing in other contexts. The reports are a conduit to get all of the good work that is going on in the units up to the campus level so that we can highlight it when it's appropriate.

SK: Let me say a little bit about the process. Every year for the last 12 years, the incoming crop of reports is reviewed by the PRAC Reporting and Recognition Subcommittee. We have the review sheet that we've developed and refined over the years. And the incoming group of reports is reviewed by the subcommittee. Using this review sheet to give both report writers and their schools or administrative units some feedback on the report and about the unit assessment and improvement processes. We have a review protocol that's well established: two reviewers per report, a third reviewer, if the first two have some major disagreement. The review sheet asks them to comment on learning outcomes, assessment measures, findings, improvements, and anything else they notice about the report. We also asked for viewers to comment on three new questions that we asked this year about the profiles, the record, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on assessment. This is a collegial and constructive process. It's not a competitive process.

So when you receive your reviews, probably early next week, you will see your reviewers' names and you will be able to contact them if there's anything that's unclear or if you would like their advice. If you are not the person who wrote the PRAC report or if that person is not on PRAC, please share the feedback with the writer and also please share the feedback with whoever is going to write the report for the current year 2020-2021.

Once the reviewers have completed their reviews, the subcommittee meets again to discuss impressions, concerns, trends, and recommendations for changes to the report guidelines, the reporting process or the review process itself. Here are some of the main findings and recommendations this year. We would like to see more specific examples of what mapping to the profiles looks like. Almost everyone said that they had had done that, but we didn't really see examples of it. So we would like to see some of that

on the Record. Both academic and especially co-curricular units have developed a lot of experiences. Some schools may need to do more to let faculty know that the Record exists; it's an opportunity for their students to show documented evidence of their achievement outside the classroom.

We noticed some things that we usually notice. There's not always a clear alignment among learning outcomes, assessment measures, assessment findings, and improvement efforts. Some reports tend to describe methods but not findings or vice versa, findings but not methods. We need both.

What we're really asking is, what did you observe? What did you see? What do you think it means? And what will you do now to make it better if it needs to be better?

For next year, we would like to ask the writer's again to report on the Profiles to record the impact of the pandemic. And we recommend that the Profiles and the Record be incorporated into the guidelines on a permanent basis.

#### 5. PRAC Grants Awards. Linda Houser (10 minutes)

Linda Houser: The subcommittee receive eight proposals. As a reminder, this year, we collapsed the spring and the fall together. There were eight proposals and we had the funding for four grants. Here are the top four as reviewed by the committee.

The first one comes from the Communication Studies out of the School of Liberal Arts. And it's a proposal addressing designing a sustainable assessment plan with the community, the studies gateway, the capstone ePortfolio.

The second one that the committee is recommending comes from Student Affairs, in terms of a sophomore Key Club. It was built on the knowledge that there's low retention numbers that they will see from students transitioning from their sophomore to junior year. And so they want to evaluate to see if getting students involved in more campus activities during your freshman year and sophomore year will have any impact on the retention rate as they're moving their junior year.

The third one comes to us from the Division of Education and it addresses the development of an instrument to improve teacher candidate implementation of equitable practices in classrooms. And again, it's designed to try to get stakeholders involved in the development of an assessment instrument that will address relationships with learners and families.

The fourth one comes from the School of Nursing as a pilot program, providing support to new graduates. This one again is looking at assessing the impact of having a program that provides support to their graduates. We're seeing that first six to eight weeks as the graduates are transitioning into the practice setting, sometimes can be very stressful and can be very challenging to their second degree graduates. So they're wanting to develop and implement a plan, a support and coaching plan and evaluate it, to see if it has any impact on the graduates' success as they move through this transition period.

The recommended proposals were voted on and approved.

6. PRAC Vice-Chair for AY 2021-22. Stephen Hundley (5 minutes)

SH: Let me start with one part of the special recognition of Tom Hahn, who is wrapping up service as chair of PRAC, the Program Review and Assessment Committee. And actually Tom and Caleb, who's the vice chair, sort of served a longer term period. We did that so the PRAC service year could be aligned with the academic calendar. That resulted in a longer timeframe for Tom to serve as Chair and Caleb to serve as Vice Chair. So Tom's going to be cycling off, although we have recently established a sort of Past Chair role. And so Tom doesn't get to have time off for good behavior, because he's going to continue to mentor and help and continue to provide leadership. Caleb, of course, will assume the Chair role.

And we've reached out and asked Jerry Daday to serve as the Vice Chair coming into PRAC for the next year. And that will of course mean that Jerry will be Chair during the year of 2022-2023. And that's very significant because that is the year that IUPUI will go undergo our 10-year reaffirmation of accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission. And we think Jerry, for all the reasons that had been articulated in this meeting and previously, will really serve us well in that regard. So I think we will continue to be in good hands next year with Caleb and Jerry.

So please join me in thanking Tom. And please join me in thanking Caleb for his stepping up to serve as the Chair next year. And let's also give congratulations and thanks to Jerry for his willingness to take on this role as well.

7. Special Recognition. Stephen Hundley (5 minutes)

SH: Now I'd like to turn to special recognition—our own Susan Kahn is making a transition. And this is bittersweet because I'm very both excited for her, but also saddened for us. Susan will be retiring at the end of June after 23 years of service to IUPUI. I think if one word I could be associated with Susan, probably the word “portfolio” would be the best associated with her for a couple of reasons.

One, she's Susan came to IUPUI in 1998 from a long career at the University of Wisconsin. And she was brought to IUPUI to provide leadership for something known as the Urban Universities Portfolio Project, which endeavored at the time—it was very cutting edge—to try to encapsulate and represent what urban-serving public institutions we're trying to do to address and really promote their missions. There are multiple missions to their multiple publics. And if you think about where higher education has come in the last quarter century, urban universities are very special and unique type of institution. We serve a very different market than legacy or traditional or land-grant institutions might serve. We really are engaged in at the cutting edge of work that occurs in economic development, educational attainment, outreach and growth. So, Susan was partnering with lots of colleagues across the country to really try to represent what urban universities were doing and really try to educate the public, including policymakers and other decision-makers.

Second, and what most of us are probably familiar with the E in portfolio, the electronic portfolio that Susan lead and championed at IUPUI from a very fledgling pilot project that began in the late 90s, early 2000s, to really a very sophisticated high-

impact practice that is widely recognized across the country and around the world. Susan provided leadership to the ePortfolio initiative at IUPUI and has really been the glue that has held that initiative together through changes of people, technology, platforms, and even the understanding of the pedagogy is associated with the use of electronic portfolios for a variety of purposes and audiences to include, but not limited to the assessment of student learning. Susan's leadership of this work not only took place at IUPUI. She carried this message wide, widely around the world, including through her leadership of something known as the Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning (AAEEBL). Susan was a board member, she was a past president, and really disseminated the work of ePortfolio practice theory, research in that particular venue. She also led the ePortfolio track for a number of years at the Assessment Institute.

And more recently, she's had a portfolio of responsibilities in the Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement that really exemplify the "other duties as assigned" bullet point of the job description. She's provided leadership to the Assessment Institute as we've talked about. She provided leadership and editing for the *Trends in Assessment* book. And if you want a copy of that, we've got a few in the office for you and we'll even probably be able to get a few autographed copies by Susan before she goes. She's also provided leadership to *Assessment Update* as the associate editor and made contributions to that product.

I will conclude my remarks on the portfolio of Susan conned by mentioning two other things. One, she's been very instrumental in helping the campus to represent itself to various audiences, including not only scholars and practitioners in higher education, but also to the Higher Learning Commission. She's been very keen on really encapsulating and reflecting what we're doing in that way to our accreditor.

What you may not know about Susan, the other portfolio of information that is very appropriate to recognize and celebrate is she is pretty darn terrific at finding interesting, enjoyable, innovative, and very, very tasty restaurants. So if you ever want a good meal, Susan Kahn is the person you want to have as your travel companion. She will find a restaurant. It will be a lovely, leisurely, really expensive proposition. But it is one that you will be better for that experience. So Susan, I want to thank you. I've known you for a long time and I've had the great privilege of working with you in our office, in our very kind of intimate office setting in Planning and Institutional Improvement for the last few years. I enjoyed working with you and getting to know you. But we're also going to keep you involved in the Assessment Institute and any other ways that are appropriate.

I'll turn the microphone over to you.

SK: That was a little bit overwhelming, Steven. I was thinking the other day that I've been on PRAC for 20 years, which is almost a third of my life. I've been at IUPUI for 23 years, which is almost exactly a third of my life. I would have a hard time summing it up as concisely as Steven did. But he certainly hit on a key point when he noted that I'm retiring just in time to avoid the reaffirmation of accreditation, I resolved that I was not going to be involved in a third one of those. I'm very grateful for my career at IUPUI. IUPUI is amazing institution at the cutting edge of so many different things. And having served in a couple of offices at IUPUI and been involved in directing



international project and participating in a bunch of other national projects, I have had the opportunity to engage with many of the higher education issues of the day, ranging from very high level policy to questions of classroom pedagogy and curriculum. And it has been incredibly interesting.

I'm going to cut back on my writing about IUPUI when I retire, I may not completely stop, but the volume will be less and it will be on a voluntary basis. I'm very proud to have been associated with this institution that has changed to an amazing degree over the years that I've been here. And it's been a real phenomenon to witness. And I'd like to thank you all for your collegueship and friendship. I've had various relationships with all of you. Many of you contributed to the *Trends in Assessment* book—for which I thank you, to the Assessment Institute, to the ePortfolio initiative and this this committee has kind of been the bedrock, my service at IUPUI when I had that kind of constant element in it. And thank you all and thank you, Stephen, for that tribute. I truly appreciate it.

[NOTE: There were many comments in the Zoom chat congratulating Susan and wishing her well.]

8. Announcements and adjournment (5 minutes)

Tom Hahn adjourned the meet at 3:03 PM.