

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, March 9, 2023

1:30 – 3:00 pm

Meeting Minutes and [Video Recording](#)

Attendees: Adams, Heather; Altenburger, Peter; Bozeman, Leslie; Brehl, Nicholas; Daday, Jerry; Davis, Julie; DesNoyers, Lisa; Garcia, Silvia; Giddings, Anita; Haberski, Ray; Hahn, Tom; Hassell, John; Helling, William; Hurt, Amelia; Keith, Caleb; Kondrat, David; Lowe, Sara; Macy, Katharine; Montalbano, Lori; Ninon, Sonia; Rao, Anusha S.; Rust, Matthew; Sheehan, Cari; Sheeler, Kristy; Sosa, Teresa; Wager, Elizabeth; Walker, Maria; Wang, Suosheng; Weeden, Scott; Williams, Jane; Yan, Jingwen; Zahl, David; Zheng, Lin

Guest: Adam Maksl

1. Welcome, review, and approve February 2023 meeting minutes (5 minutes) – Jerry Daday, PRAC Chair

Jerry Daday welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes of the February 16, 2023 minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Assessment (45 minutes) – Adam Maksl, Associate Professor of Journalism & Media at IU Southeast; Faculty Fellow for eLearning Design & Innovation with the Learning Technology Division of UITS, Indiana University

Jerry Daday introduced Adam Maksl who noted he was not an expert in the technical side of Artificial Intelligence (AI). His focus is more on the meaning of generative AI in teaching and learning. He shared a resource page with the group. That page can be accessed by clicking on the link below:

<https://express.adobe.com/page/G6R4wo4at7zrT/>

Adam Maksl asked how many people used AI. A few members of the committee did. Generative AI is a subset of AI that is creating data. Examples are ChatGPT and DALL-E. Other companies are looking at other forms of this. AI is trained on a large set of data, and it is making statistical predictions based upon the input. There are concerns about what data it is being learned on. It is creating data based on a prediction of what is likely to come next in a sentence, or what is likely to be the image when you create all these prompts.

Concerns for teaching and learning

Can AI generate output that can be passed off as human generated? How can we address this in our learning outcome activities and assessments? Can the content be trusted or is it likely to create biased output? On the DALL-E tool for example, he put a prompt of a photograph of a college professor. Three of the four options they gave him were middle-age white guys. These are things we have to be mindful of.

AI and assessment can mean many things. How can AI/machine learning help us find insights in large data (e.g., Canvas)? Adam Maksl demoed ChatGPT and encouraged us to create a free account to play around. He shared examples of prompts he used in his class. Two people can write the same prompts and get somewhat different responses.

He also demoed the creation of a rubric. This is what he had shown Jerry Daday in preparation for this meeting.

David Kondrat: Is there a way for us to detect this?

Adam Maksl: It depends on who you ask. It is new data. There are attempts at detecting that. It is not full proof. Turnitin is a company you can use to detect plagiarism. IU has a contract with Turnitin.

Anita Giddings: Can you tell this software to include grammatical errors and mistakes?

Notes from the breakout room discussions were captured in the Google doc available by clicking on the link below:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HnSsFcm3ZtAI4HfcaLQq6_lzBgqswfSLIYj5TRIFR-4/edit

What are your thoughts and reactions based on Adam Maksl's remarks and demonstration? How does generative AI impact assessment at the program level and at the level of a course or experience (e.g., internship, community engagement, and research)?

Anita Giddings: Get students started with writing. Suggestion to revisit this conversation when we have time to experiment with it ourselves or with our students. The ethical question of the use of this and that works. Impressed with producing rubrics. If we are going to use it, we can expect our students will be using it as well.

Maria Walker: Matt Rust typed in a prompt asking how AI could be incorporated into my course structure (radiology course).

Lori Montalbano: I have many more questions than I have suggestions. How can we recognize this and use this? Matt Rust was talking about using it as a tool to construct assignments and use it in real time with students, flip the classroom and move away from lectures.

Leslie Bozeman: One of the things we talked about is that the unfortunate consequence of this tool is losing the ability to use our thinking and analytical skills (for students and society as a whole).

Adam Maksl demoed DALL-E and shared the link below to take us to additional useful resources: <https://express.adobe.com/page/G6R4wo4at7zrT/>.

Adam Maksl ended his presentation with the following remarks. Calculators do not create data. This tool is creating data. ChatGPT is not human. It is a tool that is more than what we are used to. It is useful to think about this generative AI as co-collaborator. It does not have agency. It can be a partner with us and with our students. If the ultimate value of a university

is to help individuals participate in the workforce, in civil society, how can we help them using this tool. Maybe, this allows us to do things that are distinctively human. It provides an opportunity for us to rethink our outcomes and think more about the process.

3. Direct Assessment of Student Learning and the Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success (20 minutes) – Tom Hahn, Director of Research and Assessment, Institute for Engaged Learning

Jerry Daday introduced Tom Hahn who provided an overview of a rubric used to assess 100 written artifacts across 10 programs in AY 2021-2022. This was his third year doing this report. He collaborated with a team of six colleagues. Tom Hahn also thanked Steve Graunke who helped the team calibrate the scores on the rubric. The calibration session is an initial meeting where everybody gets on the same page. Each person comes up with a score, then the team decides on a comprehensive score later, and reports it to Tom Hahn.

We ask four questions to students. We have three learning outcomes across all IEL programs. We used elements of the AAC&U VALUE rubrics.

The change for next year is to hold the calibration meeting on one day (June 7). Tom Hahn also noted the definition of diversity needed to be clarified.

Tom Hahn can be reached via email at tomhahn@iupui.edu if anyone has questions.

4. RISE to Record Transition (15 minutes) – Jerry Daday

Jerry Daday noted Jennifer Thorington-Springer led the RISE program from 2014 to 2018. Courses were tagged with either an “R,” “I,” “S,” or “E.” “R” for Research, “I” for International Experience, “S” for Service Learning, and “E” for Experiential Learning. The Institute for Engaged Learning became RISE 2.0 when the Institute was created in 2017.

Tom Hahn oversees the Record. To get on the Record, you must articulate how the learning outcomes align to the Profiles, have some kind of student reflections, and an assessment plan. RISE tag courses will go away in the fall 2023 semester and the Record will officially replace it. Jerry Daday and others are working on a tool with Kim Lewis in the Registrar. We also developed a crosswalk for students who have scholarships that were tied to RISE.

We can grant students a Record designation retroactively.

5. Announcements and Adjournment (5 minutes) – Jerry Daday

The meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m. The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 13.

Direct Assessment of Student Learning and the Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success

PRAC Meeting, March 9, 2023

Tom Hahn
Director of Research and Assessment
Institute for Engaged Learning

Hine Hall 241/243
tomhahn@iupui.edu
317-274-0110



INSTITUTE for ENGAGED LEARNING

1

Direct Assessment Report

AY 2021-2022 was our 3rd year of doing this Direct Assessment Report

Reflections are scored using the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics (<https://www.aacu.org/initiatives/value-initiative/value-rubrics>)

Thanks to our team of six from IEL

This report assesses three of the four Profiles: Communicator, Problem Solver and Community Contributor

We added Community Contributor this year, specifically Diversity of Communities and Cultures

The report is available on IUPUI ScholarWorks at <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/30869>



2

Learning Outcomes

By participating in engaged learning, IEL students will:

- 1) Convey ideas effectively and ethically in oral, written, and visual forms across public, private, interpersonal, and team settings, using face-to-face and mediated channels.*
- 2) Make connections among ideas and experiences.*
- 3) Demonstrate evidence of respectful engagement with their own and other communities and cultures*



3

Reflection Prompts

- 1) Describe your experience with [specific program]. Specifically, what were your key responsibilities? What issues/needs/or critical questions did your program or project address? For whom/what was this project/program important? Why was it important? (150- 300 words)
- 2) In what ways were you able to connect your previous educational training (e.g., academic courses), extra-curricular experiences, and life experiences with the activities and professional development required of this experience to deepen your understanding of your field of study? (150-300 words)
- 3) Describe the extent to which your experience provided opportunities to engage and learn from different communities and cultures and to the extent this influenced your attitudes and beliefs. (150-300 words)
- 4) How would you evaluate your contribution to this experience? What strengths or skills did you utilize or develop while engaging in this experience? Describe at least one challenge you faced during this experience. How did you address and overcome this challenge? (150-300 words)

The review team used the following rows from each of the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics.

- 1) Written Communication VALUE Rubric
 - Content Development
 - Control of Syntax and Mechanics
- 2) Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric
 - Connections to Experience
 - Reflection and Self-Assessment
- 3) Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric
 - Diversity of Communities and Cultures

4

Written Communication VALUE Rubric (Two Rows)

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	NP
	4	3	2	1	0
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	Not present
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	Not present

5

Integrative VALUE Rubric (Two Rows)

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	NP
	4	3	2	1	0
Connections to Experience	Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.	Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.	Compare life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than your own.	Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to one's own interests.	Not Present
Reflection and Self-Assessment	Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.	Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).	Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).	Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure.	Not Present

6

Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric (One Row)

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	NP
	4	3	2	1	0
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Not Present

7

Demographics

We assessed 100 written artifacts from 10 programs

	Reflective Papers assessed
Ambassador	2
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program	23
Community Engagement Associates	6
Diversity Scholars Research Program (DSRP)	12
Fugate Scholarship Program	5
Jaguar Leadership Network	10
Life Health Sciences Internship Program (LHSI)	9
Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Institute (MURI)	15
Paws Scholarship Program (Paws)	3
Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP)	15
Total	100

Female	66
Male	34

First-Year	11
Sophomore	19
Junior	34
Senior	36
Total	100

8

Findings



9

Written Communication (Communicator)

For Written Communication, all of the student reflection artifacts except one at least met the benchmark for Content Development. Likewise, all but one of the student artifacts at least met the benchmark for Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Overall, 99% of the scores for Written Communication met the benchmark and 95% at least met the milestone.



10

Integrative Learning (Problem Solver)

For Integrative Learning, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (98 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Connections to Experience. Likewise, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (99 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Reflection and Self-Assessment. Overall, 98% of the scores for Integrative Learning met the benchmark and 93% at least met the milestone.



11

Civic Engagement (Community Contributor)

For Civic Engagement, specifically, Diversity of Communities and Cultures, a majority of student reflection artifacts (84 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Diversity of Communities and Cultures, while 78% met the milestone.



12

Diversity of Communities and Cultures tended to be the lower score across all programs, races, and genders

13

Changes for AY 2022 – 2023

We are going to conduct the calibration session and all scoring of artifacts in one day.

- Review team will meet in the IEL in the morning
- Steve Graunke will lead the calibration session
- We'll score the artifacts break for lunch and then work until 4pm

14

Question?