

Program Review and Assessment Committee

Thursday, April 19, 2007

UL1116

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Karen Johnson, Chair

Joshua Smith, Vice Chair

AGENDA –

1. Approval of the minutes of the March meeting..... K. Johnson
2. Assessment Presentation..... Joe DeFazio
3. Data for Program Review: Options and Strategies G. Pike
4. Course Evaluations Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report..... E. Rubens
H. Mzumara
M. Palmer
5. Committee Reports
 Advanced Practitioners M. Hansen and J. Smith
 Performance Indicators G. Pike
 ePortfolio S. Kahn
6. Adjournment..... K. Johnson

MINUTES –

Members Present:

Drew Appleby, Rachel Applegate, Kate Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Karen Black, Polly Boruff-Jones, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Joseph Defazio, Janet Fulton, Michele Hansen, Karen Johnson, Susan Kahn, Hea-Won Kim, Allison Martin, Melinda Meadows, Howard Mzumara, Gary Pike, Elizabeth Rubens, Katherine Schilling, Joshua Smith, Randi Stocker, Mark Urtel, Marianne Wokeck

Minutes from the March meeting were amended to indicate that Allison Martin attended.

Assessment Presentation

J. Defazio began by talking about the opportunities and challenges of bringing different disciplines together to develop a new curriculum. He referred to the handout (syllabus NEWM N475) for this upper-level undergraduate and lower division graduate research course, which he teaches. His students are free to select a topic and appropriate research methods (e.g., the future of interactive game controllers, media technology in archaeology, interactive video, and so on). His major assessment question is: How does one engage undergraduate students in researching creativity issues in the field of Media Arts and Sciences? Key themes include: (a) student learning experiences; (b) excellence in learning, teaching, and assessment; and (c) the research and teaching nexus. Ability to select topics related to their own interests promotes students' sense of ownership of their projects. Other behaviors and processes targeted in the course include: (a) the use of knowledge relevant to context; (b) improvement of attitudes toward research; and (c)

the use of a constructivist framework. Students complete mini-papers representing various components of a research paper, and they submit multiple drafts of their work. Each mini-paper is peer-reviewed and each step is built upon the previous step in the process. The course emphasizes critical thinking and other outcomes, including knowledge of research methodology, writing skills, and the ability to create a viable research paper. Assessment focuses on content, organization, and format, including skills in use of sources, as well as mechanics and spelling.

D. Appleby asked about the data collected thus far and changes made to improve the course. Defazio responded that this is the second semester that the course has been offered and that research findings are forthcoming. The data will include comparisons across semesters as well as aggregated data from both semesters. K. Johnson noted that the project could serve as a good capstone experience. She also suggested that data be used from earlier in the students' careers to see how they have progressed. Defazio commented that the New Media and Informatics programs will have their first program review in Fall 2007. His goal is to expand the field of New Media as an academic discipline, rather than as an application-based field. He continued that the current curriculum requires less writing than it did the first semester the course was offered. Johnson asked him to compare the course objectives to the PULs. W. Crabtree asked about the feedback from the students. Defazio indicated that students were generally positive, especially about the peer review process and multiple draft writing. E. Rubens asked if Defazio had asked for advice from OPD. He responded that he would welcome additional collaborations. PRAC members talked about the need to assess student mastery of outcomes more thoroughly.

Data for Program Review: Options and Strategies

G. Pike began with some cautions and caveats for "telling people how to use data for program review." He indicated that his recommendations are suggestions, not rules. He explained that the information that he would be presenting was most applicable to general, rather than focused, reviews, and added that his approach to program review includes discussion of program quality and efficacy. He began by noting that IMIR can provide accurate and timely information on student and faculty demographics and offers workshops to help faculty compare outcome data with peer institutions for the school or program. Under "program processes," one can provide some evidence of outcomes (i.e., retention) and indicators of quality. Pike used SPEA as an example of comparing number of degrees granted to numbers of degrees in similar programs. He mentioned that PRAC grants could help support graduate students in facilitating this work. He cited a book called *Once upon a Campus*, which emphasizes the importance of beginning projects with the end in mind. In building goals for the report, programs should have in mind the questions that need to be answered. The most useful part of the program review is the self-study. External reviewers confirm and make recommendations for improvement. Self-study makes an argument that provides reviewers with a framework and context. Pike's suggestions about the process included: collecting data, organizing these data around the goals, thinking about the data, deciding what conclusions to draw, and using data to support the conclusions. Instead of putting the data at the end of the report in the appendices, he encouraged weaving data into the narrative.

E. Cooney asked Pike to clarify the statement, "Collect more than you need." Pike explained that an inductive process that looks at multiple data points can provide ample information. T. Banta helped to clarify Cooney's situation in the School of Engineering and Technology. She explained that Cooney is having difficulty getting faculty to provide

the information that she needs. Pike asked if there was overlap between grading and assessment. Cooney responded that data are stored and archived in different ways. Banta suggested using surveys and grades based on the use of rubrics to help pinpoint potential problems that can be addressed and re-assessed to see whether modifications make a difference. R. Applegate asked about the assessment of student learning and the use of ePort. She also inquired about the difference in functions between IMIR and ePort. Banta mentioned various vendors who have data management capabilities. S. Kahn mentioned that ePort will have data management capabilities in the future. K. Black reminded us that we make decisions about what data to collect and try to ensure that the data are answering the relevant questions. Johnson noted similarities to the research process that Defazio presented and the importance of explaining the process in language that faculty can understand. Crabtree agreed that knowing goals and clearly articulating the data that are useful for moving toward those goals are important. Cooney concurred, but explained that accreditors in the past did not look at the vast amounts of data resulting from assessment.

Course Evaluations Ad Hoc Subcommittee Report

Rubens and H. Mzumara provided two handouts that summarized responses and provided sample items from course evaluations. Twelve people said that they were dissatisfied with the feedback. Some cited items that did not align with course goals, while others saw the need for norms. M. Meadows mentioned online programs that allow one to customize course evaluation delivery. The responses are available right away and one may look within the modules and at the aggregate. Active course directors, as well as chairs, provide feedback, particularly for new faculty. At the School of Dentistry, there is a captive audience, which yields a 100 percent response rate. At orientation, the responsibility to participate in course evaluations is discussed, as are the ways in which the data are used to improve the course and/or program.

A question was asked about identifying students who gave particular responses. Pike said that some programs detach the responses from log-in data. Members discussed software used to help facilitate the administration of surveys and evaluations via the Web and emphasized the importance of examining response rates when implementation on the Web goes live. K. Schilling has used Oncourse CL to keep track of student completion of surveys; she noted that one or two students per semester have expressed some concerns about being required to submit an evaluation. That is, they expressed some irritation on their evaluations because they were required to complete the evaluation as part of the course.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

WHEN WORLD'S COLLIDE

• Ideas and motivations

- Vision and imagination – the selection of topics...examples of areas of research
 - The Future of Interactive Game Controllers
 - Media Technology in Archaeology
 - The Educational Impact of Role-Playing (Text-Based) Games
 - 2D vs. 3D Animation: A Battle for Survival
 - Interactive video
- Ownership of a project: the way it is personalised and made interesting and relevant to the student

WHEN WORLD'S COLLIDE

• Behaviours and processes

- Manifestations of particular skills and abilities
 - Writing skills (grammar, spelling, sentence structure, clarity, etc.)
- Use of knowledge and understanding relevant to context
 - Awareness of media technology and issues that apply to research
- Attitudes
 - Engaging students in the research approach through examples of current articles
- Constructivist approach
 - Building upon previously learned knowledge: a demonstration of the research method

WHEN WORLD'S ...

Building the Research Paper

1. Introduction – mini paper
Multiple Drafts and student peer reviews of work
2. Literature Review – mini paper
Multiple Drafts and student peer reviews of work
3. References (15-20 works cited)
APA Style Format
4. Methods – mini paper
Multiple Drafts and student peer reviews of work
5. Findings – mini paper
Multiple Drafts and student peer reviews of work
6. Summary
7. Abstract
8. Cover Page, Table of Contents, Figures, Tables

WHEN WORLD'S ...

Students demonstrate critical thinking by:

- Conducting literature reviews on their research topic
- Using deduction, induction, and the Toulmin method (Claim, Evidence, Warrant, Qualifier, Backing) to the analysis of material
 - Induction: examine evidence for sufficiency
 - Deduction: examine and deduce findings toward a position
- Presenting representations of their own creative process through reflective accounts that retrace experience (in light of reflection, conceptualisation, applied theory) show critical reflection and thought about
How? Why? When? Where?

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

• Outcomes and results of creative endeavour

- Produce findings and conclusions to their research objective
- Take a unique approach to research (standing out from the crowd)
- Representations e.g. ability to write clearly and concisely; drawings and models; performance
- Drawing previously unrecognised parallels between models, topics, situations through articles, journals, books, online content, etc.
- Student's engage in sense making
- Review, analyze, and write about how previous research has been applied to a problem

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Course Outcomes

- Develop a sound knowledge of research methodology
- Demonstrate the logical progression of practical research
- Develop and demonstrate effective writing skills
- Define the types of research
- Identify viable research areas
- Create a readable and viable research paper with the potential of publication

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Assessment

Content – Organization – Format Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor
50 - 46 45 - 42 41 - 38 38 - 0

Introduction is engaging and pertinent to the research or thesis statement

Text organization follows thesis; logical; clear

Writing style is formal and appropriate for a journal style article

Clear transitions connecting sentences and paragraphs

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Assessment

Use of Sources Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor
25 - 23 22 - 21 20 - 19 18 - 0

Sources provide adequate information

Research was properly documented

Mixture of writer's own words with paraphrases and quotes from sources

Citations used correctly

Works cited page is in APA Style and formatted correctly

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Assessment

Mechanics/Spelling/Format Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor
25 - 23 22 - 21 20 - 19 18 - 0

Proper presentation of paper (cover Page, table of contents, page numbers)

Sentence structure

Clarity

Spelling and Grammar

Totals from all three categories = Final Grade for this Research Paper

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Textbooks

Title: The Craft of Research 2nd. Ed.
Author: Booth, Colomb, and Williams
Publisher: University of Chicago Press
ISBN: 0-226-06568-5

Title: Logical Argument in the Research Paper
Author: Russ Ward
Publisher Heinle & Heinle Thomson Learning
ISBN: 0-15-502648-8

WHEN WORLD'S CONVERGE

Questions?