

**The School of Liberal Arts (SLA) Report
for the Program Review and Assessment Committee
October 2015**

**Prepared by Kristina Sheeler, Associate Dean for Academic Programs,
with generous assistance from Andy Buchenot, Herbert Brant,
Erin Engels, Beth Goering, Sue Hyatt, Scott Weeden, and Elee Wood**

School of Liberal Arts at a Glance

The School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI is a diverse public liberal arts college, with its emphasis on teaching and research in the social sciences and the humanities. Education in the liberal arts is both theoretically-rich and practically-driven, as we seek to create knowledge in our disciplines and programs and with our community partners that will positively effect change on local, national, and global levels. We house 12 academic departments, 26 academic programs, and several research centers and institutes. We have over 20 undergraduate majors, several undergraduate certificates and minors, over 25 MA degrees and certificates, and two PhD programs as well as PhD minors.

This report will proceed as follows:

- I. Indirect Measures of Student Learning
 - A. Continuing Student Survey
 - B. SLA Graduating Student Survey
 - C. Reflection on Indirect Measures of Student Learning
- II. Direct Measures of Student Learning
 - A. Communication Studies: R110 Basic Public Speaking Oral Communication Pilot
 - B. English: Senior-Level Writing Direct Assessment
 - C. Reflection on Direct Measures of Student Learning
- III. Curricular Responses to Ongoing Assessment Efforts
 - A. Anthropology: Capstone Requirements and ePortfolios
 - B. Museum Studies: Curriculum Revision and Portfolios
 - C. Paralegal Studies: Course, Program, and Graduation Ongoing Student Learning Assessment
 - D. World Languages and Cultures (WLAC): Capstones, ePortfolios, and Exams
 - E. Reflection on Curriculum Efforts Related to Assessment
- IV. School-level Plans for Ongoing Assessment
- V. Appendices

Each sub-section will present baseline data and curriculum improvement efforts, with the final sub-section in each reflecting on that information as we move toward building a cohesive plan for our assessment efforts across the school.

I. Indirect Measures of Student Learning

A. Continuing Student Survey

111 Liberal Arts juniors and seniors responded to the Continuing Student Survey in 2014, which is roughly 5% of our total undergraduate majors. The survey was conducted by the Office of Data, Analysis, and Evaluation (SDAE) and includes information about student satisfaction with a variety of experiences at IUPUI as well as items on the PULs, diversity, and high-impact practices. Two areas of interest that can be gleaned from the Continuing Student Survey include self-report ratings of PUL effectiveness and satisfaction with and participation in the “Big Six” college experiences.

First, Liberal Arts students generally self-report high levels of effectiveness on the Principles of Undergraduate Learning. As you can see from the summary chart below, average ratings for the four years surveyed are 3.2 – 3.6 (on a 4-point scale, where 4 is “very effective”) with the exception of quantitative skills.

PUL	2010 mean	2011 mean	2013 mean	2014 mean
Communication Skills	3.52	3.45	3.53	3.47
Information Literacy Skills	3.45	3.49	3.48	3.46
Values and Ethics	3.48	3.58	3.60	3.44
Understanding Society and Culture	3.43	3.52	3.51	3.41
Critical Thinking	3.36	3.39	3.44	3.34
Intellectual, Depth, Breadth and Adaptiveness	3.28	3.27	3.35	3.27
Integration and Application of Knowledge	3.22	3.30	3.38	3.27
Quantitative Skills	2.77	2.81	2.95	2.88

In particular, areas of opportunity related to helping our students increase their perceptions of effectiveness with quantitative skills include:

	SLA mean (4-point scale)	IUPUI mean (4-point scale)
Solve mathematical problems	2.78	3.06
Understand a statistical report	2.54	2.74

Second, according to the recent Gallup-Purdue University study¹, only 3% of students nationwide surveyed in the Gallup-Purdue study indicated that they took advantage of opportunities to participate in all the “Big Six”—the six college experiences that best prepare students for life and are tied to workplace engagement and overall well-being. The experiences include:

- Working on a project that took a semester or more to complete
- Completing an internship that emphasized application of classroom learning

¹ Julie Ray and Stephanie Kafka, Life in College Matters for Life after College, May 6, 2014, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/168848/life-college-matters-life-college.aspx>.

- Participating actively in extracurricular activity
- Having at least one professor who made me excited about learning
- Having professors who cared about me as a person
- Having a mentor who encouraged me to pursue my goals and dreams

Although we don't have direct measures of SLA students' participation in each of the "Big Six," the following items from the Continuing Student Survey (loosely connected to the 4th and 5th bullet points above) may help us consider whether we are doing all we can to incorporate these sorts of experiences in a liberal arts education at IUPUI.

	SLA mean (5-point scale, 5 = very satisfied)	IUPUI mean (5-point scale)
Satisfaction with the quality of the faculty at IUPUI	4.09	3.93
Satisfaction with general helpfulness of faculty	4.17	4.08
Satisfaction with availability of faculty for discussions outside of class	4.03	3.96
Satisfaction with opportunity to participate in faculty members' research	3.35	3.32
My experiences at IUPUI have prepared me to live and work in a diverse society.	3.38 (5-point scale, 5 = strongly agree)	3.33

According to the Continuing Student Survey, the percentage of liberal arts respondents who participated in a specific educational experience (loosely connected to the first and second bullet points above) is:

	SLA %	IUPUI %
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	8.7	8.4
Work on a culminating senior experience (capstone, senior project or thesis, or comprehensive exam)	17.5	13.2
Completing an internship that emphasized application of classroom learning	22.1	25.4
Participating in community service or volunteer work	56.7	54.4
Participating in study abroad	9.9	5.3

On all of the items listed above, SLA students indicate a higher level of satisfaction than IUPUI students generally, and on most items, SLA students have a slightly greater rate of participation

than IUPUI students generally. While these ratings and percentages are encouraging, when compared with campus numbers, we still have many opportunities to integrate the “Big Six” into our liberal arts curriculum.

B. SLA Graduating Student Survey

As a complement to the Continuing Student Survey, the School of Liberal Arts conducts a Graduating Student Survey every year. The most recent survey includes responses from 314 students. Similar to the above, we can glean information about students’ self-report of their levels of effectiveness with the PULs and the “Big Six” experiences.

PUL	Mean (5-point scale, 5 = very well)
Critical Thinking	4.5
Core Communication	4.39
Values and Ethics	4.39
Intellectual, Depth, Breadth and Adaptiveness	4.38
Quantitative Skills	4.31
Understanding Society and Culture	4.28
Information Literacy Skills	4.23
Integration and Application of Knowledge	4.21

Quantitative skill in this instance is based on one item: Identify and propose solutions for problems using quantitative tools and reasoning. This item is more encouraging than that reported in the previous section.

How satisfied are students with opportunities to engage in the “Big Six” experiences? The following items correspond with bullet points 1, 3, 4 and 5 above:

	Mean (5-point scale, 5 = very satisfied)
Quality of teaching by faculty in your major area	4.43
Personal attention from those in your major department	4.14
Opportunities to participate in co-curricular and extracurricular activities	3.79
Opportunities to participate in faculty members’ research	3.51
Opportunities to engage in service learning	3.94
Opportunities to pursue international studies	3.65

In the next section we will reflect on what this information tells us.

C. Reflection on Indirect Measures of Student Learning

Upon reflection, these survey responses indicate that continuing students perceive a high level of effectiveness with each of the PULs with the exception of quantitative skills. By the time students near graduation, their perceived level of effectiveness with quantitative skills improves as well. Possible reasons include:

- Liberal Arts students may delay taking required math and research methods courses until their senior year. They may also have to take the course more than once, which impacts students' level of confidence with quantitative skills.
- Liberal Arts students may not be taking advantage of the resources available such as the Math Help Center.
- Liberal Arts curricula may emphasize other kinds of knowledge represented in the PULs more intentionally than quantitative reasoning.
- Liberal Arts students are less likely than their counterparts in science to take advantage of social science research outside the classroom.

Opportunities for further reflection:

- How can we develop in our curricula the scaffolding necessary such that liberal arts students complete general education math requirements early in their career? Would it be beneficial to explore options such as pre-requisites more intentionally? Could we look carefully at degree maps to see when students complete these foundational courses and make adjustments?
- Are we doing everything to make sure our students take advantage of the Math Help Center and other resources on campus? How do we talk to our students about math? Are faculty members fueling students' "fear" of math and quantitative skills. How well do we emphasize the value of quantitative skills in humanities and social science work?
- How can we emphasize quantitative learning more effectively across our curricula, outside the required math classes?
- What can we do to incentivize students to increase participation in faculty research?
- Are we asking the right questions in our Graduating Student Survey?

II. Direct Measures of Student Learning

As a complement to these indirect efforts, we will highlight two of our gateway programs that have developed robust programs of ongoing assessment to gather direct measures of student learning.

A. Communication Studies: Basic Public Speaking Assessment Pilot

In the spring 2015 semester, R110 Public Speaking faculty members were asked to report information on authentic student learning as demonstrated on three of the five speeches students present in the class. Under review were the second informative speech, the speech of fact or value (the first persuasive), and the final (persuasive) speech of policy. Approximately 225 student speeches for each category were evaluated (12.5% of our spring 2015 population) using the standard rubric developed by faculty based on the oral communication VALUE rubric. The criteria reported for this pilot were:

Informative Speech	Fact or Value (Persuasive)	Policy (Persuasive)
Content development, support of thesis	Content development, support of thesis	Defining the problem
	Argumentation	
Use of source citations	Use of source citations	Use of source citations
Organization	Organization	Organization
Language	Language	Language
Delivery	Delivery	Delivery

These items map to course outcomes, PULs, and statewide speaking and listening competencies as follows:

R110 Fundamentals of Speech Communication Theory and practice of public speaking; training in thought processes necessary to organize speech content for informative and persuasive situations; application of language and delivery skills to specific audiences. A minimum of 5 speaking situations.			
Pilot Criteria from above	R110 Learning Outcomes	PULs	Statewide Competencies
Content development, language	Understand the importance of audience analysis and to be able to conduct worthwhile audience analyses and apply the result.	1A, 2	2. Adapt an oral message for diverse audiences, contexts, and communication channels.
Organization	Master different systems of organization and apply appropriate organization to different types of speeches.	1A	1. Use appropriate organization or logical sequencing to deliver an oral message.
Argumentation, Defining the Problem	Develop and exhibit critical thinking and logical reasoning in speech preparation, delivery, and evaluation.	1A, 2	4. Advance an oral argument using logical reasoning. 5. Provide credible and relevant evidence to support an oral argument.
Language	Improve (achieve) clarity of oral and written ideas.	1A	7. Summarize or paraphrase an oral message to demonstrate comprehension.
Argumentation, Defining the Problem	Learn and use appropriate principles of persuasion in speaking assignments.	1A, 2	4. Advance an oral argument using logical reasoning. 5. Provide credible and relevant

			evidence to support an oral argument.
Delivery	Practice and demonstrate appropriate delivery skills.	1A	3. Identify and demonstrate appropriate oral and nonverbal communication practices.
Content Development, Support of thesis, use of source citations	Use credible research tools.	1A, 2	5. Provide credible and relevant evidence to support an oral argument.

Using our standard rubric, faculty evaluated each speech, in each of the areas listed above, using four ratings: exemplary, satisfactory, needs development, deficient. Ratings were converted to a 4-point scale, with 4 corresponding to “exemplary” to 1 corresponding to “deficient.” A score of 3 is “satisfactory,” and ideally we hope that the majority of our students are able to demonstrate satisfactory in each area. The table below shows the average scores for each area.

Informative Speech	Average	Fact or Value (Persuasive)	Average	Policy (Persuasive)	Average
Content development, support of thesis	2.8	Content development, support of thesis	2.8	Defining the problem	2.82
		Argumentation	2.62		
Use of source citations	2.62	Use of source citations	2.74	Use of source citations	2.8
Organization	2.8	Organization	2.77	Organization	2.8
Language	2.8	Language	2.79	Language	2.94
Delivery	2.72	Delivery	2.81	Delivery	2.83

The majority of our students are performing at a “satisfactory” level or better on each criterion. The lowest average on the informative speech, use of source citations, found 66% of students performing at least satisfactory, which improved to 75% on the final persuasive speech. We are pleased to see the overall improvement from the informative speech to the final persuasive speech. However, the average of each category is still below 3, or just below satisfactory, and we would like to find ways to continue to help our students succeed.

Importantly, we learned that not all faculty members teaching R110 evaluate language. The N in that category dipped from approximately 225 to 155 on the first persuasive speech, for example. This suggests that more professional development opportunities may be necessary to train faculty in using the rubrics.

The assessment effort described here was developed to complement the Pilot program some of our instructors and student speeches were involved in over the summer to develop a way to assess the IUPUI General Education core using the VALUE rubrics. We wanted to make sure we

had direct evidence, as evaluated by faculty and our own rubrics, as a point of comparison. We will have comparative information later this semester as the Pilot project wraps up.

B. English: Senior-Level Writing Direct Assessment

On July 23, the English department conducted a formal assessment of student writing. Under review were essays composed by English majors with senior standing. Twenty seven essays from five semesters were evaluated using criteria adapted from the department’s Student Learning Outcomes (SLO), an articulation of learning objectives shared across all English courses. The criteria were:

- Interpreting language and texts critically
- Demonstrating critical reading/thinking
- Producing clear and purposeful prose
- Constructing a reasoned argument integrating expert and personal voices

For each criterion, readers assigned a score between “0” and “4.” A score of “0” indicated that the reader found “no evidence” of a criterion while a “4” indicated “extensive evidence.” Ideally, essays should earn a score of “3” (“sufficient evidence”) or better across criteria. The table below shows the average scores for each criterion along with the average all criteria combined.

Criterion	Average Score
Interpreting language	2.60
Demonstrating critical thinking	2.54
Producing clear prose	2.86
Constructing argument	2.35
Combined	2.58

On average, readers found some evidence of the SLO-based criteria in all of the student writing. Unfortunately, the readers did not consistently find “sufficient evidence” of any criteria in all essays. These data suggest that, while there are indications of student engagement with the SLO, the quality of this engagement does not match fully the faculty’s expectations for graduating seniors.

The student writing included in the assessment was taken from several different English courses, each with its own topical focus. Given this variety of courses, it is impressive that readers found evidence of the department’s SLO in nearly every essay. This trend suggests that instructors are working to remain connected to the department’s shared learning outcomes. The department plans to strengthen this connection by experimenting with “signature assignments” that seek to normalize the language instructors use to articulate their course goals. The department plans to conduct another assessment of student writing following the introduction of these assignments into the curriculum.

The assessment efforts described here are a continuation of a project started by André Buchenot in 2011 to collect electronic copies of student writing via the university’s learning management

system. As of this writing Buchenot has collected 2,405 pieces of student writing. Metadata about each piece of writing has been entered into a database that simplifies the process of assembling targeted samples of student texts based on specific criteria. For example, the database might be used to locate essays written by students with senior status taking an online course. Recently, Buchenot has been joined by Scott Weeden, an expert in the design of “signature assignments,” to develop curricular innovations described above. Data from these innovations will be examined in an assessment reading planned for the summer of 2016. These are the early steps of a robust, technologically-sophisticated assessment initiative.

C. Reflection on Direct Measures of Student Learning

The Departments of English and Communication Studies may be leading the School of Liberal Arts in authentic assessment of student learning (along with the Paralegal Studies Program, discussed in the next section), and their efforts provide a model for the school and the campus. Currently assessment efforts in R110 Public Speaking must deal with the challenge of how to collect authentic evidence of student learning in the form of speech recordings. Classroom technology makes the recording process possible, but difficult, and camera placement and audio and video quality in each classroom are a barrier to assessment efforts that do not take place in real-time in the classroom. Communication Studies would like to be able to collect a database of products of student learning, similar to that of English, in the future. Current efforts in Communication Studies, however, prioritize faculty training using the rubrics.

In terms of the results of assessment efforts in Communication Studies and English, neither department achieved the desired average of “satisfactory” when evaluating products of student learning. While Communication Studies was slightly closer to this desired mean than English, both programs will continue to reflect on ways to enhance student learning efforts at the gateway and capstone levels.

III. Curricular Responses to Ongoing Assessment Efforts

In previous SLA reports to the Program Review and Assessment Committee, the departments and programs listed below identified ongoing curricular reform efforts in which they were involved. This section reports examples of how those efforts have progressed over the last two years and what departments have done (and hope to continue to do) to close the assessment loop.

A. Anthropology: Capstone Requirements and ePortfolios

The Anthropology Department just completed an external review, and one of the comments of the review team had to do with a change in the capstone requirement. Previously students completed a capstone experience in an independent study fashion, rather than enrolling in a capstone course. The problem with this approach was that students took too long to complete the project. In response, the Anthropology Department developed a two-semester, 4 credit hour capstone course experience, offered for the first time in fall 2014 and spring 2015.

The review team wrote:

Some students and members of the Anthropology Program Review Committee (APRC) are concerned about the recent change (enacted fall 2014) in the capstone experience. Previously this was a research-based senior thesis, but many students had difficulty completing this requirement and did not graduate on time. The department is now trying another approach that is not so research focused. Additionally, this year there is a formal class associated with the capstone, unlike previous years when this was more of an independent study format. Several of the students interviewed by the APRC expressed concern that the current format would not provide as much preparation for graduate school as the previous format. Similar concerns were voiced within the APRC. Two possible suggestions would be to continue to offer the research based thesis to those students who wish to pursue this option. Alternatively, the department might consider returning to the old format but have a class associated with senior thesis that meets weekly and sets deadlines relating to the thesis along the way. This approach could provide the research focus for students and still markedly increase successful completion of individual theses on a timely basis.

Upon further reflection, the new version of ANTH A412 Senior Capstone Experience (3 cr) received reasonably positive evaluations in December 2014. The overall student evaluation score was 4.6 (on a 5-point scale), with the score for the spring 1-credit ANTH A413 even higher at 4.8. In addition, students still have many opportunities for carrying out independent research. For instance, students can participate in the summer archaeology field school or in the Field Work in Ethnography class where they have the experience of honing skills in collecting and interpreting primary source data. They also have multiple opportunities to present their work in a range of forums including poster sessions and conferences. Students who hope to go to graduate school in Anthropology (a small number of students) have additional prospects to complete independent research through the programs offered by our Center for Research and Learning, such as MURI and UROP.

Moreover, the new capstone courses do include a research component; students investigate an area within anthropology, either in an academic-setting or an applied setting and produce a paper that becomes part of the e-portfolio that they create for the course.

All students enrolled in the fall 2014 capstone, with one exception, completed the 2-course sequence on time. All seemed relatively pleased by the e-portfolio assignment, which allowed them to compile not only their work from the capstone classes but also from their undergraduate training more broadly. Five students were selected to present their e-portfolios at IUPUI's first annual e-portfolio showcase. The e-portfolio can be used to showcase students' accomplishments in the major for either graduate school or job applications, thus providing benefit to students beyond their undergraduate experience.

B. Museum Studies: Curriculum Revision and Portfolios

In 2014 Museum Studies presented a series of documents on our current state of assessment and efforts to integrate changes to the curriculum based on student achievement and outcomes. Since that time we've implemented the following changes:

MSTD Outcome Mapping and Curriculum Revision:

1. Submitted the following courses for permanent course approval. As of October 2015 all are in or through remonstrance and on the schedule.
 - a. MSTD A413 Curatorial Practices
 - b. MSTD A417 Preventive Conservation
 - c. MSTD A421 Museum Theatre
 - d. MSTD A440 Cultural Heritage
 - e. MSTD A509 Applied Research in Museums
 - f. MSTD A511 Object-Based Learning
 - g. MSTD A513 Curatorial Practices
 - h. MSTD A517 Preventive Conservation
 - i. MSTD A521 Museum Theatre
 - j. MSTD A531 Critical Approaches to Museum Practice
 - k. MSTD A540 Cultural Heritage
2. Revised our selection of electives both in the program and from other departments to better align the course offerings with the anticipated student outcomes. (See Appendix A: New Curriculum Plans).
3. Begun the process to consider the relationship and articulation between the MSTD Undergraduate program and the Graduate program.
4. We will be following this same pathway as we prepare for program review in 2016.

MSTD Portfolio

The Museum Studies Program has used a portfolio system since the first cohort of MA candidates in 2006. Over the years we have revised and updated the interface and systems to best reflect student needs and support documentation. We have not used IUPUI's ePortfolio system however, because on initial implementation the portfolios were not viewable on the web. As portfolio platforms have changed dramatically over the last ten years, we've attempted to expand and update as appropriate. For example, we began with Epsilon when it was first introduced and continued that use through 2014. In 2014 we attempted to use LinkedIn, although the functionality was less than ideal for our use. In 2015 we moved to website formats through Wix.com. This proved to be rather useful and easy for students to use and looks very professional. The following links are of the 2015 graduating cohort:

Nicole Benigno <http://nicolebenigno16.wix.com/nicolebenigno>

Claire Broderick <http://claireanet.wix.com/claibroderick>

Catherine Harmon <http://catherineharmon.wix.com/portfolio>

Emily Izzo <http://izzoemilym.wix.com/portfolio>

Robin Matty <http://travelingmuseologist.wix.com/robinmattyportfolio>

Adrienne Nirde' <http://anirde.wix.com/porfolio>

Elizabeth Quay <http://elizabethquay.wix.com/portfolio>

Rebekah Ryan <http://rcryan.wix.com/portfolio>

Kelsey Smith <http://kelseyanyilee.wix.com/kelseyasmith>

Anastasia Wallace http://anastasiawallace12.wix.com/resume?fb_ref=Default

Jennifer Watson <http://jenjwats.wix.com/portfolio>

Laura Weiss <http://lauraelaineweiss.wix.com/myportfolio>

C. Paralegal Studies: Course, Program, and Graduation Ongoing Student Learning Assessment

The 2013/2014 Liberal Arts PRAC Report highlighted the assessment work conducted by the Paralegal Studies Program. Program assessment came from a mix of course-mapped student learning outcomes, surveys, and advisory board recommendations. Our program uses a detailed assessment plan to review achievement of learning outcomes. What follows is a summary of our assessment plan and examples of how measures of student learning reshaped our curriculum for 2014/2015:

Direct Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes by Course – Every Semester

Each semester, faculty collect samples of student work which demonstrate mastery of course concepts. Examples demonstrating a strong mastery and a weak performance are forwarded to the director. The director reviews the student work product and compares work in the same courses over time. Faculty and the director discuss student progress, course design, methodology and assessment each semester. When problem areas are identified faculty work together to revise course instruction to remedy the issue. Our legal writing courses utilize rubrics for grading legal memoranda and briefs. These rubrics allow for concrete assessment of student learning.

Assessment Application: In our Contract Law for Paralegals class, a review of course assignments showed students were not connecting contract law terms – such as consideration – with the application of these legal terms. The remedy was to integrate a contract assignment into the course that spanned the semester. Students selected a contract at the beginning of class and used their individual contract as a concrete example of class concepts. At the end of the class, students used their knowledge of contract law to improve their contracts. The newly designed assignment helps to achieve our Program Objective 4: To provide a foundational knowledge of legal principles, while also forcing students to think critically about the contracts – Program Objective 2. See Appendix B for a complete list of Program Objectives.

Review of Course Evaluations – Every Semester

The program director conducts an end-of-course review of all student evaluations each semester. The open-ended comments in the evaluations identify problems in a course. Information obtained from the evaluations is shared with the instructors to help them improve their classroom performance. The program also reviews the evaluations to determine overall student satisfaction. The Program Director addresses all student concerns mentioned on the evaluations.

Assessment Application: While student learning is not directly measured on the evaluations, they do help to reveal issues which inhibit learning. In one class, evaluations revealed the professor was frequently “off topic.” Students were not able to cover the material listed as outcomes for the program or the class. The director discussed these issues with the faculty member and helped develop a plan to focus course material.

Graduate Exit Surveys – Each Semester

The graduate exit surveys measure student perception in the program, experiences with the curriculum, course selection, faculty, facilities, and achievement of learning outcomes. The program surveys graduates during their last semester. We use the survey to identify areas of concern, course content, elective availability and the quality of our faculty.

Assessment Application: When the exit survey data revealed students did not know about career services offered by the School of Liberal Arts we increased our work with the career development office. Our required Introduction to Law course now includes a class period on career and resume building with the Career Development Office and students must now meet with this office during their studies. The change in policy helps us to achieve Program Objective 3: To prepare students for careers in the legal field.

Graduate Placement Surveys – Twice yearly

Graduates are surveyed approximately six months post-completion to determine their work or educational status. Responses demonstrate students are either finding work as paralegals or other legal positions or continuing their education. Results of the surveys are shared with faculty and our advisory board.

Assessment Application: Initial survey findings indicated students were having trouble finding employment after completion. A lengthy evaluation by our faculty and advisory board demonstrated a direct link between student internships or experience and finding employment after completion. We worked to increase student participation in our internship course by partnering with local law firms and governmental entities. We restructured our internship program to allow for more oversight of the internship provider and instituted internship prerequisite courses so students were better prepared for the legal workplace. Internship participation has quadrupled and more students are finding jobs. The feedback from our internship partners is overwhelmingly positive. Our internship partners help us achieve Program Objective 3: To prepare students for careers in the legal field.

Legal Community Involvement – Ongoing

The program spends a great deal of time analyzing the needs of law-based employers in the greater Indianapolis area. We adjust our curriculum as needed to ensure our students are exposed to course content related to the demands of the current job market. We work with our adjunct faculty, who are all practicing attorneys, consult with our advisory board, monitor trends in continuing legal education offerings and work with the local paralegal organizations. The program recently conducted a focus group consisting of employers of paralegals from our program. The group offered insight into the skills desired by those who employ our graduates. These community connections allow us to tailor student learning to meet the needs of the profession.

Assessment Application: We revised course content across the curriculum as a result of combined feedback from our advisory board. The board reviewed course syllabi and assignments for courses within their practice areas - using our student learning outcomes as a guide. After the review, board members developed recommendations for course content changes. These changes were passed on to the faculty, who in turn incorporated the changes

into their course curriculum. The end result is a paralegal program that achieves the goals of our program and the community.

D. World Languages and Cultures (WLAC): Capstone, ePortfolios, and Exams

In the past year, the Department of World Languages & Cultures has made several changes in light of internal and external assessments of its programs.

The largest program in the department, the Program in Spanish, has made major changes to its two Capstone courses (SPAN-S 487 [Internship] and S498 [Seminar], taught concurrently) in response to the ongoing evaluation of student learning outcomes. The faculty in Spanish concluded that several of the components of the courses did not serve well their ability to assess student knowledge of the content areas. As a result, they eliminated the faculty-led review sessions on Hispanic linguistics, literature, and culture, and discarded the content-knowledge exam that followed the reviews. In their place, students now lead the review sessions and give presentations on the areas that had previously been performed by faculty. The student-led presentations respond better to the ACTFL National Standards for Language Learning by providing additional presentational language use, and asks students to take a more active role in their learning process. Another significant change has been instituted as well: the Program in Spanish has embedded an external assessment into the course grade for the Capstone. The STAMP Exam (STAndards-based Measurement of Proficiency) is administered to the Capstone students to evaluate their individual language skills in the final semester or year of study in the major, and the results of the four components (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) will be included into the course grade. The Program in Spanish will monitor the results of the exam for appropriate grade cut-offs, and will make changes to curriculum in response to the results.

Additionally, the Programs in French and German have made the decision to begin use of an e-Portfolio in their Capstone courses as a way to assess their graduating majors. Following the example of the Program in Spanish, French and German will require students to create an individual learning portfolio in electronic form for easy access by faculty. The data collected in those portfolios will provide valuable information on where the programs are currently successful, and how student learning might be enhanced by changes in the curricular design and coursework in each of the programs. Furthermore, faculty in French and German have made plans to document the effects of Study Abroad on majors and minors in their programs.

Finally, the Program in Chinese will take advantage of the external HSK Exam (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi Proficiency Exam), sponsored by the Confucius Institute at IUPUI. As a result, all students studying Chinese, including the IMP majors in Chinese who have studied in China will take this test as a way to assess their learning after returning from the abroad program. The results of the exam will be studied in hopes of improving the learning experiences of students in Chinese, both on the IUPUI campus, and abroad.

E. Reflection on Curriculum Efforts Related to Assessment

During the previous two reports to the Program Review and Assessment committee, it was noted that the committee would like to know more about our efforts to “close the loop” and return

assessment information to departments so they can continue to refine assignments and improve student learning. This year we are happy to report that additional efforts are occurring, as you can see from the above, and that an assessment culture is beginning to spread across departments in the school. . . These examples demonstrate several strong pockets of student learning assessment and improvement across the School, and the commitment of faculty to respond to program reviews, accreditation standards, external advisory boards, as well as direct student evidence to provide better opportunities for students to learn and demonstrate their learning in a variety of ways. Whereas anthropology responded to a need to help students progress toward graduation in a timely manner, the Spanish language program's response demonstrates a commitment to oral and written communication in Spanish. Museum Studies curricular revision demonstrates an intentional effort to identify student learning outcomes and map those outcomes across the curriculum whereas the Paralegal Studies Program uses multiple and integrated assessment efforts, based on direct measures and external assessment as a continuous feedback process to enhance student learning.

IV. School-level Plans for Ongoing Assessment

Previously it was reported that the school would attempt to ramp up and coordinate our assessment efforts. This process is beginning to occur through the formation of an ad hoc committee consisting of Associate Dean Kristy Sheeler, Andy Buchenot, Herbert Brant, Erin Engels, Beth Goering, Elee Wood, and Scott Weeden. We also note additional departments and programs joining the assessment effort. The department and program efforts described in this report represent the commitment of these individuals to the importance of collecting authentic evidence of student learning, analyzing that evidence, and reporting back for ongoing revision. It is our hope that we will have a school-level plan in place by the end of the academic year that will facilitate ongoing improvement of student learning in the School of Liberal Arts.

V. Appendices

Appendix A: Museum Studies New Curriculum Plans

The overall program in museum studies is a mix of required courses and electives. Your plan should:

- Allow you the opportunity to **explore** ideas and approaches to museum practice
- Give you a **perspective** on the broader museum field
- Provide you **focus** on a particular area or specialization

All students must take six required classes, 6 credits of internship and 12 credits of Electives. Your internship and electives are tailored to your interests and goals and should be discussed regularly with your advisor and other faculty who share your areas of interest.

Electives (12 cr):

The 12 credits of electives can be taken from any department or program able to provide you with appropriate professional frameworks for museum work. You will work with your advisor to create the best combination of elective courses along with your internship plans to create your

program plan. You may use any of the approved electives without prior approval. Electives from other programs not on the list should be approved by your advisor.

Consider these areas of museum practice for selecting your electives.

Representation and Interpretation

- As two key practices of the museum, these terms refer to how and what stories museums and their communities tell and how those stories are told (including who tells them on staff, on the board, and in the galleries).

Research

- The structured process of gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence in order to answer a question or solve a problem.

The Role of Community

- The museum's relationship to people. More than the audience for museum programs, community includes audiences as well as neighbors, experts in related fields, and staff at similar institutions.

Interdisciplinary Proficiencies

- Visual and material analysis practices such as close looking, examination of material evidence to determine meaning
- Textual analysis practices such as close reading, determining how meaning emerges from denotations and connotations of text.
- Evaluation strategies where one applies criteria in a systematic fashion to determine whether goals have been met.
- Design strategies including visual and spatial design; learning how to conceive of and develop a project (exhibition, public program, strategic plan, etc.) as a flexible, outcome-oriented process.
- Digital proficiency: familiarity with how museums use digital tools and media to communicate with audiences, interpret collections, improve practice

Electives by Broad Areas of Practice

Museum Studies Electives	Electives from other Departments
Representation and Interpretation	
MSTD A509 Applied Research in Museums	ANTH A565 Anthropological Thought
MSTD A540 Issues in Cultural Heritage	HIST H542 Introduction to Public History
MSTD A560 Native American Representation	HIST H547 Special Topics in Public History: Historic Site Interpretation
MSTD A560 Museum Ethics	
MSTD A560 Indigenous Objects	
MSTD A560 Indigenous People and Film	
MSTD A560 Native Americans in Film	
Research	
MSTD A509 Applied Research in Museums	EDUC Y520 Strategies for Educational Inquiry
MSTD A518 Museums and Audiences	EDUC Y510 Action Research (pre-requisite Y520)
MSTD A560 Museum Education Research Methods	
MSTD A513 Curatorial Practices	
Community	
MSTD A518 Museums and Audiences	JOUR J528 Public Relations Management
MSTD A531 Critical Approaches to Museum Practice	JOUR J531 Public Relations for NonProfits
MSTD A560 Indigenous Objects	PHST P521 The Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector
MSTD A560 Native American Representation	PHST P523 Civil Society & Philanthropy
MSTD A540 Issues in Cultural Heritage	PHST P542 Ethics and Values of Philanthropy
Interdisciplinary Proficiency : <i>Visual and Material Analysis</i>	
MSTD A511 Object-Based Learning	ANTH E509 Modern Material Culture
MSTD A513 Curatorial Practices	HER H560 Visual Culture: A Visual Studies Approach
MSTD A517 Preventive Conservation	HER H610 Art Theory and Criticism
MSTD A560 Indigenous Objects	HER Z508 Issues in Art Education
	HIST H547 Special Topics in History: Preservation
Interdisciplinary Proficiency: <i>Textual Analysis</i>	
MSTD A521 Museum Theatre and Live Interpretation	HIST H 547 Special Topics in Public History: Archival Practices
MSTD A560 Museum Communication Strategies	HIST H547 Special Topics in Public History: Digital Public History
MSTD A560 Indigenous People and Film	
MSTD A560 Native Americans in Film	
Interdisciplinary Proficiency: <i>Evaluation and Management</i>	
MSTD A518 Museums and Audiences	SPEA V526 Financial Management for Nonprofit Organizations
	SPEA V557 Proposal Development and Grant Administration

Interdisciplinary Proficiency: *Design*

MSTD A513 Curatorial Practices

HER V501 Intro to Design Thinking

HER V511 People-Centered Design Research

HER R511 Visual Culture

Appendix B: IUPUI Paralegal Program Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes
Developed August, 2013

Program Objectives and accompanying Student Learning Outcomes – Developed to coincide with the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs). More information on the IUPUI PULs is available here: <http://ctl.iupui.edu/Resources/PULs>

Program Objective 1: To prepare students to communicate effectively in a legal environment. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Analyze legal situations;
- Use legal research tools or print electronic sources effectively;
- Write well researched and legally reasoned responses;
- Effectively communicate both orally and in writing.

Program Objective 2: To stimulate critical thinking in our students. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Evaluate legal situations;
- Consider legal arguments and counter-arguments and prepare a response;
- Arrive at reasoned persuasive legal conclusions and be able to support these conclusions.

Program Objective 3: To prepare students for careers in the legal field. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Behave in a professional and courteous manner;
- Develop an organizational system for accomplishing work;
- Meet strict deadlines;
- Develop General Computer and Office Skills.

Program Objective 4: To provide a foundational knowledge of legal principles. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Develop an understanding of legal concepts and structures;
- Learn legal vocabulary;
- Retain knowledge about the legal system.

Program Objective 5: To prepare students to invoke an understanding of legal rules and structures to promote fairness and civility. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Understand and apply procedural rules;
- Prepare effective and persuasive pleadings and other documents.

Program Objective 6: To prepare students to learn and apply rules of legal ethics. This objective is demonstrated by the student's ability to:

- Understand the impact of rules of professional conduct;
- Apply the rules of professional conduct.