



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

## Assessing the Profiles through Written Reflections of Engaged Learning Experiences Using the AAC&U Written Communication and Integrative Learning VALUE Rubrics

August 18, 2021

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes an assessment activity within the IUPUI Institute for Engaged Learning (IEL) for students participating in IEL programs and the Life Health Sciences Internship (LHSI) Program during AY 2020-2021. The IEL Assessment Workgroup assessed written reflection artifacts of 124 students from 14 co-curricular programs. Using selected rows from the Written Communication and Integrative Learning VALUE Rubrics, the raters assessed the Communicator and Problem Solver Profiles of Undergraduate Learning. For **Written Communication**, overall results indicate that all of the student reflection artifacts at least met the benchmark for Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Nearly all (123 of 124) of the student reflection artifacts at least met the benchmark for Content Development. Overall, 99.6% of the scores for Written Communication met the benchmark. For **Integrative Learning**, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (122 of 124) at least met the benchmark for Connections to Experiences. Likewise, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (123 of 124) at least met the benchmark for Reflection and Self-Assessment. Overall, 98.8% of the scores for Integrative Learning met the benchmark.

### OVERVIEW

As part of the strategic planning process within Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE), IEL articulated an assessment plan that included direct assessment of student learning within its engaged learning programming. Specifically, the focus in this year's assessment was on the "[Communicator](#)" and "[Problem Solver](#)" profiles within the [Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success](#). To that end, this assessment applied two rows from each of the following 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

The learning outcomes assessed were the following: By participating in engaged learning, 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.*



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

The IEL Assessment workgroup implemented the recommendations for the AY 2019-2020 Workgroup raters. These include the following:

Recommendation	Implementation*
Each of the programs administer a common prompt	Done.
In addition to the Written Communication VALUE Rubric, rows from another VALUE Rubric should be employed.	Done. Rows from the Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric were employed.
Require a minimum and maximum length for all reflection essays	Instructed students to write 150 to 300 words per reflection prompt.
Share the rubric with students when they are given the reflection prompt	Rubric was shared with students when they were give the prompts.

\*Done for all programs, except the Life Health Sciences Programs, which elected to use its own reflection prompt

## METHOD

### Participants

The reflection artifacts reviewed were created by students from various programs (see Table 1) within IEL and DUE.

**Table 1**

	Reflective Papers assessed	Total Students	Percent of Total
Ambassador	4	4	100%
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program Year 1 *	6	11	55%
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program Year 2 *	8	11	73%
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program Year 3 *	4	11	36%
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program Year 4 *	3	8	38%
Community Engagement Associates **	20	92	22%
Diversity Scholars Research Program (DSRP)***	7	16	44%
Family School and Neighborhood Scholarship Program (FSNE)*	2	4	50%
Fugate Scholarship Program*	1	6	17%
Jaguar Leadership Network****	30	95	32%
Life Health Sciences Internship Program (LHSI)*****	14	71	20%
Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Institute (MURI) ***	10	51	20%
Paws Scholarship Program (Paws)*	4	5	80%
Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) ***	10	19	53%
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>30%</b>

\* Information for these programs can be found at: <https://csl.iupui.edu/programs/scholarships/index.html>

\*\*Information for this program can be found at: <https://csl.iupui.edu/resources-support/grants/faculty-staff/cea-program/application-eligibility-criteria.html>

\*\*\*Information for these programs can be found at: <https://crl.iupui.edu/studentprograms/crlprograms/index.html>

\*\*\*\*Welcoming its first cohort in fall 2020, program information can be found at: <https://getengaged.iupui.edu/jag-leadership-network/index.html>

\*\*\*\*\* Information on the LHSI program is located at [www.lhsi.iupui.edu](http://www.lhsi.iupui.edu)



## **The AAC&U VALUE Rubrics Used in this Assessment**

Beginning in 2007, the AAC&U convened teams of faculty experts and other educational professionals from its membership to conceptualize, draft, and refine the [16 VALUE rubrics](#). VALUE stands for *Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education*. The faculty experts examined several extant rubrics and related documents in creating the rubrics (VALUE, 2009).

### Written Communication VALUE Rubric

The AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric defines written communication as “the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.” (VALUE, 2009).

### Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric

The AAC&U Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric defines integrative learning as “an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

## **Review Team**

The review team, comprised of 7 staff members from IEL and 1 graduate student, directly assessed 124 students’ written reflection artifacts of their experiences in AY 2020-2021.

In preparation for the subsequent calibration meeting, each review team member scored three written reflection artifacts.

## **Calibration**

Led by a facilitator from the Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support, the group reconvened a few weeks later to discuss and calibrate the scores. The purpose of calibration is to ensure that the group evaluates the scores consistently and in alignment with the rubric. This process increases the reliability of the assessment data. As the group members shared their scores, the facilitator encouraged group members to consider where the differences in the scores occurred and why group members scored differently, especially the highest and lowest scores. Group members then explained and justified scores by referencing specific language in the rubric and evidence in the student artifacts. The group discussed each of the three reflections and scores, resolving issues around either the meaning of the rubric language or the quality and validity of the evidence in the student work. This process continued until the group reached consensus. The eight group members then divided into groups. Each group was randomly assigned reflection artifacts to score.

## **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?*



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

*For whom/what was this project/program important? Why was it important? (Please write between 150 to 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? (Please write between 150 to 300 words)*

*3) 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? (Please write between 150 to 300 words)*

The review team used two 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

## RESULTS

**Table 2: Overall**

<b>Dimension N=124</b>	<b>Mean SD</b>	<b>Capstone (4)</b>	<b>Milestone (3)</b>	<b>Milestone (2)</b>	<b>Benchmark (1)</b>	<b>Does not meet (0)</b>
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>						
<b>Content Development</b>	2.59 .82	15 12.1%	53 42.7%	47 37.9%	8 6.5%	1 .8%
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	2.61 .71	10 8.1%	62 50.0%	46 37.1%	6 4.8%	0 (0%)
<b>Average/Total</b>	<b>2.60 .67</b>	<b>25 10.1%</b>	<b>115 46.4%</b>	<b>93 37.5%</b>	<b>14 5.6%</b>	<b>1 .4%</b>
<b>Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric</b>						
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	2.19 .89	10 8.1%	31 25.0%	58 46.8%	23 18.5%	2 1.6%
<b>Reflection and Self-Assessment</b>	2.27 .88	11 8.9%	35 28.2%	55 44.4%	22 17.7%	1 .8%
<b>Average/Total</b>	<b>2.23 .83</b>	<b>21 8.5%</b>	<b>66 26.6%</b>	<b>113 45.6%</b>	<b>45 18.1%</b>	<b>3 1.2%</b>

**For Written Communication**, all of the student reflection artifacts at least met the benchmark for Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Nearly all (123 of 124) of the student reflection artifacts at



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

least met the benchmark for Content Development. Overall, 99.6% of the scores for Written Communication met the benchmark and 94% at least met the milestone.

**For Integrative Learning**, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (122 of 124) at least met the benchmark for Connections to Experience. Likewise, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (123 of 124) at least met the benchmark for Reflection and Self-Assessment. Overall, 98.8% of the scores for Integrative Learning met the benchmark and 80.7% at least met the milestone.

**Table 3: Scores by Gender of Students**

Written Communication	Gender	N	Mean	SD
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>				
<b>Content Development</b>	Female	86	2.63	.81
	Male	38	2.50	.83
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Female	86	2.69	.69
	Male	38	2.45	.72
<b>Average</b>	Female	86	2.66	.67
	Male	38	2.47	.68
<b>Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric</b>				
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	Female	86	2.22	.91
	Male	38	2.13	.84
<b>Reflection and Self-Assessment</b>	Female	86	2.26	.88
	Male	38	2.29	.90
<b>Average</b>	Female	86	2.24	.84
	Male	38	2.21	.80

For Written Communication, there were no significant differences between male and female scores for both Content Development and Control of Syntax and Mechanics.

For Integrative Learning, there were no significant differences between male and female scores for both Connections to Experience and Reflection and Self-Assessment.



**Table 4: Score by Ethnicity of Students**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
<b>Content Development</b>	Asian	14	2.57	.76
	Black	21	2.57	.81
	Latinx	14	2.57	.94
	Mixed	12	2.42	.90
	White	59	2.66	.78
	International	4	2.25	1.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>.82</b>
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Asian	14	2.79	.58
	Black	21	2.29	.56
	Latinx	14	2.50	.76
	Mixed	12	2.42	.67
	White	59	2.78	.72
	International	4	2.25	.96
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>.71</b>
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	Asian	14	2.29	.73
	Black	21	2.19	.75
	Latinx	14	1.93	.83
	Mixed	12	2.08	1.1
	White	59	2.31	.93
	International	4	1.50	1.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>.89</b>
<b>Reflection and Self-Assessment</b>	Asian	14	2.36	.75
	Black	21	2.33	.58
	Latinx	14	2.21	.98
	Mixed	12	2.00	1.1
	White	59	2.34	.92
	International	4	1.50	1.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>.88</b>



**Table 5: Mean Scores Across Programs**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
<b>Content Development</b>	Ambassador	4	2.75	.50
	Bonner Year 1	6	2.67	.82
	Bonner Year 2	8	2.88	.64
	Bonner Year 3	5	2.80	.84
	Bonner Year 4	3	2.67	.58
	CEA	20	2.30	.92
	DSRP	7	1.57	.78
	FSNE	2	3.00	1.4
	Fugate	1	1.00	0
	JLN	30	2.43	.63
	LHSI	14	3.14	.66
	MURI	10	2.50	.97
	Paws	4	3.00	0
	UROP	10	3.10	.57
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>.82</b>
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Ambassador	4	3.25	.50
	Bonner Year 1	6	2.67	.52
	Bonner Year 2	8	2.62	.74
	Bonner Year 3	5	2.40	.55
	Bonner Year 4	3	2.67	.58
	CEA	20	2.45	.69
	DSRP	7	1.86	.90
	FSNE	2	3.00	1.4
	Fugate	1	2.00	0
	JLN	30	2.40	.56
	LHSI	14	2.93	.83
	MURI	10	2.70	.48
	Paws	4	3.00	.82
	UROP	10	3.20	.42
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>.71</b>
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	Ambassador	4	2.00	1.4
	Bonner Year 1	6	2.67	.82
	Bonner Year 2	8	2.38	.92
	Bonner Year 3	5	2.40	.89
	Bonner Year 4	3	2.33	.58
	CEA	20	2.10	1.0
	DSRP	7	1.57	.79
	FSNE	2	3.00	1.4
	Fugate	1	1.00	-
	JLN	30	2.03	.67
	LHSI	14	2.43	1.0
	MURI	10	2.00	.82
	Paws	4	2.25	.96
	UROP	10	2.60	.84
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>.89</b>



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

<b>Reflection and Self-Assessment</b>	Ambassador	4	2.25	.96
	Bonner Year 1	6	2.50	.84
	Bonner Year 2	8	2.38	.92
	Bonner Year 3	5	2.60	.55
	Bonner Year 4	3	2.67	.58
	CEA	20	1.70	.80
	DSRP	7	1.57	.98
	FSNE	2	3.00	1.4
	Fugate	1	1.00	-
	JLN	30	2.27	.58
	LHSI	14	2.57	1.02
	MURI	10	2.10	1.1
	Paws	4	2.50	.58
	UROP	10	3.00	.82
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>.88</b>





**Table 6: Mean Scores by Class Year**

Dimension	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>				
<b>Content Development</b>	First-Year	8	2.50	.76
	Sophomore	57	2.58	.80
	Junior	29	2.59	.95
	Senior	19	2.63	.68
	Graduate	10	2.60	.97
	Professional	1	3.00	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>.82</b>
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	First-Year	8	2.38	.74
	Sophomore	57	2.61	.68
	Junior	29	2.59	.87
	Senior	19	2.68	.58
	Graduate	10	2.70	.68
	Professional	1	3.00	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>.71</b>
<b>Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric</b>				
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	First-Year	8	2.38	.92
	Sophomore	57	2.23	.87
	Junior	29	2.14	.92
	Senior	19	1.95	.91
	Graduate	10	2.40	.97
	Professional	1	3.00	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>.89</b>
<b>Reflection and Self-Assessment</b>	First-Year	8	2.38	.92
	Sophomore	57	2.28	.86
	Junior	29	2.24	.95
	Senior	19	2.32	.95
	Graduate	10	2.00	.82
	Professional	1	3.00	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>.88</b>

For Written Communication, the means across all class years were above Milestone.

For Integrative Learning, the means across all class years were above Milestone, with the exception of seniors for Connections to Experience (1.95), which, while above Benchmark, was surprising. We believe this decline is likely a product of data collection. These reflection artifacts were collected at different points in the spring semester. Next year we will administer the prompts on the same date.



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

## Future IEL Direct Assessment

Following discussion with the raters, the following recommendations were made for the AY 2021-2022 Assessment.

- An additional prompt will be added to assess Diversity of Communities and Cultures to assess the Community Contributor Profile. The workgroup will use one row from the AACU Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric.
- The prompts will be administered earlier in the spring of 2022 on the same date.

## References

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). *Written communication VALUE rubric*. Retrieved from [www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/written-communication](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/written-communication)