



*Report on Assessment of Student Outcomes 2013-2014
(PRAC Annual Report)*

I. Learning Outcomes

The Center for Service and Learning (CSL) works to support the development of “**civic-mindedness**” in students at IUPUI. We define a *civic-minded graduate* (CMG) to be a person who has completed a course of study (e.g., bachelor’s degree), and has the capacity and desire to work with others in a democratic way to achieve the common good. “*Civic-mindedness*” refers to a person’s inclination or disposition to be knowledgeable of and involved in the community, and to have a commitment to act upon a sense of responsibility as a member of that community (Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, 2011). Thus, we are interested in evaluating a student’s orientation toward the community and others.

As an academic support unit, CSL works directly with faculty, staff, students, and community partners to support the development of curricular and co-curricular programs that foster civic-mindedness in students. CSL regularly assesses the extent to which students within our programs develop civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and have behavioral intentions to be civic-minded. Historically, the CSL has relied upon student self-reported evidence of civic-mindedness using the 30-item *Civic-Minded Graduate (CMG) Scale* and more recently the 6-item CMG short form developed for campus-wide days of service.

This past year, CSL focused on assessing authentic evidence of students’ civic learning. To this end, students in our Sam H. Jones (SHJ) Community Service Scholarship programs were asked to create a digital story. Digital storytelling is an innovative reflection technique that challenges students to critically reflect, organize their ideas and experiences, and results in deeper learning (Microsoft, 2010; Schank, 1995). Digital storytelling uses ‘storyboarding’ to enhance the reflection process. The final product conveys student learning through a ‘YouTube’ video that employs still images, music, and student narration. Storyboarding, a unique and important step in the process, requires the student to examine their written reflection to identify important words or phrases then visually represent that idea or concept using a still image. The music selected enhances the students’ ability to convey the message and tell a richer story.

II. Assessment Measures

To assess the elements associated with civic-mindedness (Steinberg, et al., 2011) --civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and behavioral intentions-- CSL used the *Civic-Minded Graduate (CMG) Rubric* (Appendix A) and the *AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Civic Engagement* (Appendix B). These rubrics will be referenced as CMG and AAC&U Rubrics. Both of these rubrics were developed in 2009-2010, the CMG Rubric was developed by CSL staff and the

AAC&U Rubric was developed by a team of faculty experts representing colleges and universities from across the United States, including one staff member from CSL. The CMG Rubric resulted from a content analysis of CMG Narrative Prompt reflections collected from 38 students in service-learning courses (Steinberg, et al., 2011). So while distinct, these two measures informed each other.

Within the AAC&U Rubric, civic engagement is defined as “working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivations to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes”. The AAC&U Rubric was altered so that both used a 7-point measure ranging from Novice (1) to Distinguished (7) to evaluate differences (CMG maximum score=35, AAC&U maximum score=42).

To further test the CMG Rubric for validity, the research team applied the rubric to student products created in a co-curricular context. The AAC&U Rubric was used in this assessment as a means for comparison.

The students’ digital stories were assessed for evidence of the following student civic learning goals:

- Knowledge of how organizations address social issues (CMG)
- Understanding of the root causes of social issues (CMG)
- Intentions to be active participants in society (CMG & AAC&U)
- Developing sense of a civic identity (CMG & AAC&U)
- Ability to work across difference (CMG & AAC&U)
- Recognizing the benefit of their education to address social issues (CMG)
- Apply knowledge gained from college experiences to experiences in civic life, politics, government (AAC&U)
- Understanding of diverse communities and cultures (AAC&U)

At the end of the scholarship award period, students were given several reflection prompts (see Appendix C) designed to coincide with the CMG Rubric to foster responses that contained evidence of civic-mindedness.

III. Learning Opportunities

The CSL, in partnership with the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of Student Involvement, support co-curricular civic engagement through shared service programming and scholarship opportunities, professional positions, and assessment endeavors. The Sam H. Jones (SHJ) Community Service Scholarship Program is an exemplar of this collaboration. The purpose of the SHJ program is to recognize service contributions to the community and foster student leadership and continued involvement in the community. These service-based scholarship programs integrate a curriculum that is intentionally designed to foster student civic growth (e.g., students are trained in modes of reflection, they research societal issues, spend a significant amount of time in the community, and learn what it means to be civic-minded).

Student participation in SHJ scholarship programs involves multiple opportunities for training and reflections intended to foster student civic learning. The method of creating digital stories was integrated into the programs as a meta-level reflection that encouraged SHJ participants to communicate about their experiences and learning over the course of the academic year.

IV. Assessment Plans

An initial review of the digital stories (n=39) was conducted by one member of the research team to categorize them as “Low,” “Medium,” or “High” in terms of evidence of civic-mindedness. Five digital stories from each category were randomly selected for further analysis, for a total of 15 digital stories.

To analyze the digital stories for content indicative of civic-mindedness, a four-person research team was trained to use the CMG and AAC&U Rubrics. Several steps were taken to strengthen inter-rater reliability. First, the research team participated in a training session that consisted of a norming activity and an orientation to the rubrics. Second, the viewing order of the digital stories was randomly assigned for each reviewer. This approach also helps to prevent rater fatigue and bias. Third, each reviewer rated the digital stories on their own and made notes and were unable to see how the other raters had scored. Lastly, the research team adhered to the practice of having regular discussions throughout the assessment process (n=7).

V. Assessment Findings

The findings (See Tables 1) include the descriptive statistics that were used to examine the extent to which students in the SHJ programs demonstrate authentic evidence of civic-mindedness through a digital story. One digital story was unable to be reviewed due to incompatibility with Atlas, a qualitative analysis software used for this assessment. The mean scores for the remaining digital stories (n=14) using the CMG Rubric and the AAC&U Rubric fell along a normal bell curve indicating the rubrics are able to capture variation. The overall mean for the CMG Rubrics and AAC&U was 3.20 (46%) and 3.77 (54%), respectively. Students demonstrated high levels of civic identity on both rubrics with 57% (CMG) and 50% (AAC&U) achieving a score of ‘6’ or ‘7’ out of a possible 7. Similarly, 52% (CMG) and 45% (AAC&U) of students achieved a Proficient (5) or higher score when demonstrating a commitment to being an active participant in society and identifying intentional ways of working within the community towards the common good. Domains that had the lowest scores include “Civic Communication” (AAC&U), “Analysis of Knowledge” (AAC&U), and “Understanding of How Issues are Addressed in Society” (CMG).

Table 1 – Results from the CMG and AAC&U Rubrics

Civic-Minded Graduate Rubric	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Scores ≥ 6	Percentage of Scores 5-2	Percentage of Scores ≤ 1
Civic Identity	5.36	1.8	57%	41%	2%
Benefit of Education to Address Social Issues	4.11	2.54	36%	43%	21%
Active Participant in Society to Address Social Issues	4.21	1.56	18%	75%	7%
Collaboration with Others Across Difference	2.86	1.97	9%	59%	32%
Understanding of How Issues are Addressed in Society	2.3	1.89	7%	52%	41%
Overall (7-point scale)	3.77				

AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Civic Engagement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Scores ≥ 6	Percentage of Scores 5-2	Percentage of Scores ≤ 1
Civic Identity and Commitment	5.02	1.84	50%	36%	7%
Civic Action and Reflection	3.62	1.37	13%	77%	4%
Civic Contexts/Structures	3.96	1.42	9%	77%	7%
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	3.12	1.48	4%	75%	14%
Civic Communication	1.28	1.65	2%	25%	66%
Analysis of Knowledge	2.18	1.77	0%	54%	39%
Overall (7-point scale)	3.20				

The length of the digital story and type of scholarship program was taken into consideration and found to have no correlation with evidence of civic-mindedness. The average length of the digital stories was 3 minutes and 14 seconds, which is on the lower end of the standard length, which is 2 to 10 minutes (Robin, 2014).

The high prevalence of Civic Identity as an element of civic-mindedness could be indicative of several important factors. First, digital stories as a means of facilitating reflection fosters creativity and expression of self more than traditional reflection strategies (Gregori-Signes & Pennock-Speck, 2012). Second, the digital stories were created within a co-curricular context, which tends to focus on personal or identity development as opposed to academic content (e.g., knowledge of social issues) (Komives & Woodard, 2003). And lastly, it is easier for students to focus on themselves and their passion or desires to address societal issues than it is for them to articulate what knowledge, skills, or abilities they possess that would also serve as evidence of their civic-mindedness (e.g., ability to collaborate with others, knowledge of organizations that address social issues).

Beyond evidence of student learning, this assessment enabled us to examine the similarities and differences in terms of how the CMG Rubric and the AAC&U Rubric measure civic learning and capture variance in student civic-mindedness. There is value in knowing the appropriateness of each rubric for CSL, and the larger field of work (e.g. service-learning faculty, practitioners, and student affairs professionals) as well. Take for example, “Civic Communication” (AAC&U), which was rated extremely low among the sample (mean = 1.28). Aspects of civic communication are alluded to in the CMG Rubric (Collaboration with Others Across Difference), but the ability to “effectively express, listen, and adapt ideas” is implied and not as clear in the CMG Rubric nor apparent in the digital stories reviewed. Another area of distinction between the two rubrics is greater emphasis on students’ ability to exhibit curiosity, show initiative, and team leadership towards civic action in the AAC&U Rubric.

In summary, the digital stories gathered from the SHJ programs represented broad understanding of civic-mindedness as evidenced by each digital story getting at least a rating of Novice (1) for each domain of the rubrics with the exception of “Civic Communication” (AAC&U). Digital storytelling proved to be an effective means for capturing authentic evidence of civic-mindedness, especially civic identity.

V. Actions Taken in Response to Findings

These findings have implications for the use of digital storytelling as a critical reflection strategy in the curriculum and co-curriculum. Most interesting is that the very *process* of creating a digital story fosters deep learning. Because the very method of creating a visual and audio product (i.e., a digital story) the students are asked to not only reflect through writing, but to think about what was important in their reflection by visually representing those ideas as images. This unique process engages students more deeply with the content and contributes to deeper clarity of their thoughts and communication of their learning (Gregori-Signes & Pennock-Speck, 2012).

CSL staff will convey to others that these rubrics measure both the depth and breadth of the students' experiences detailed in the digital stories. It should not be considered a shortcoming of the experience if a student does not exhibit depth of understanding in all of these categories. Indeed, only one digital story achieved a rating of Proficient (5) or higher in each of the measures for both rubrics.

Implications for Practice

First, CSL will continue and expand the use of digital storytelling in 2014-2015 by making the creation of a digital story a program expectation for Alternative Spring Break Trip Leaders (ASBTLs). And based upon these findings, we will narrow the focus of the digital story by further refining the reflection prompt. During these multi-day service experiences, students have multiple opportunities for learning (i.e., group reflection, on-site discussions with community members, journaling), but the ABSTL Program Directors have identified one aspect of civic-mindedness as the focus for the digital story, "Collaboration with Others Across Difference" (Keen & Hall, 2009).

One of the challenges of integrating digital storytelling into the co-curriculum is motivating students when there is no grade at stake. So, for this endeavor the Program Directors selected a learning outcome that students would recognize as having value to them as a future professional. An emphasis will be placed on the importance of having knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable them to work in diverse settings with diverse populations.

Second, other CSL Program Directors will continue to use digital storytelling as in the past, but will reevaluate the reflection prompts and consider using a single broad prompt or narrowing to focus on one or two rows of the CMG Rubric. Given this shift in program design, we will again evaluate a selection of digital stories to see if civic identity is still the highest rated domain of the rubric or if altering the reflection prompt produces different results.

Considerations for the CMG Rubric

The CSL is interested in developing tools that effectively measure civic-mindedness and to advance the field of research on civic outcomes. The CSL staff sees potential uses for the CMG Rubric beyond digital stories (e.g., award application essays, eportfolios). For this reason, we will engage the CSL staff and Senior Scholars (i.e., Bob Bringle, Barbara Holland, Patti Clayton, Katie Stanton) to explore potential refinements to the CMG Rubric. The following is a list of topics the research team has taken into consideration:

- Scaffolding within each row of the rubric. Several rows of the CMG Rubric lack alignment across the row which resulted in a disconnect and was frequently mentioned by the researchers as a challenge during our regularly scheduled meetings.
- Consider concepts such as "curiosity" and "leadership". They are mentioned in the AAC&U Rubric. The CMG Rubric has little or no connection to personal growth through changes in attitudes or beliefs, due to displays or demonstrations of curiosity.

- Explore the importance of critically reflective practice in relation to the development of a civic identity. The AAC&U Rubric includes not only the values and beliefs that inform one's sense of a civic identity, but also how those have been affirmed or altered when considering other perspectives as well as being critically reflective.
- Examine each row of the CMG Rubric for statements that seem out of place. For example, does a student need to be able to describe "privilege or opportunity" in order to recognize the benefit of their education? Similarly, is it necessary to be able to name a social issue in order to be an active participant in society?

Appendix A

IUPUI Center for Service and Learning Rubric for Civic-Minded Graduate Narrative

	N/A	Not Present	1—Novice	2	3—Apprentice	4	5—Proficient	6	7--Distinguished
Self-Identity; Civic Identity (includes self-reflection on responsibility and personal commitment to service)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Simply restates the prompt * “Not my responsibility and I have no commitment to service” * Limited evidence of personal examination 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Expectation for involvement comes from external source or authority (e.g., faith, parents, teacher, clubs) * Commitment to service is based on compliance to external norms * States socially desirable position with little or no personal examination * States that “I can/will/want to make a difference” without elaboration on complexities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Commitment to service is derived from personal experience * Examines personal values and motivations to make a difference in society * Wrestles with difference between responsibility and personal commitment to service * Identifies personal frustrations, limits, barriers in addressing social issues and serving others 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Personal values clearly align with civic actions * Commitment to service is well-integrated into his/her self-identity * Demonstrates strong commitment to continued service involvement in their future * Endorses the responsibilities and active role of citizens in society * Describes optimistic yet realistic assessment of the personal impact they can have on social issues * Integration of personal abilities and limitations to address social issues and to serve others
Understanding How Social Issues Are Addressed in Society			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Simply restates the prompt * Little or no mention of social issues * Society is described as an external entity, totally separate from self *No mention of stakeholders[#] 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Demonstrates awareness of social issues (e.g., lists or describes social problem) *Mentions stakeholders[#] that address social issues * States own opinion on a social issue(s) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Recognizes alternative roles and perspectives of stakeholders[#] in addressing social issues *Recognizes legitimacy of alternative opinions on social issues *Recognizes public policy as a means to address social issues *Articulates system causes and solutions for social issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * In-depth or complex understanding of stakeholders[#] in society and how they work together across differences to address social issues *In-depth or complex understanding of social issues, interrelationships among problems and solutions *Analyzes interrelationship between local, national and global issues *Works within the realistic context that social change occurs over time. *Values community voice in addressing social issues

#--Stakeholders may include nonprofit organizations, government agencies, student clubs, community organizations, grassroots initiatives, community residents, and those who are impacted directly by a social issue.

	N/A	Not Present	1—Novice	2	3—Apprentice	4	5—Proficient	6	7--Distinguished
Active Participant in Society to Address Social Issues			*Little or no mention of involvement in the community or in serving others.		* Describes some involvement in the community through occasional or periodic service activity * Describes previous service experience *Identifies ways to take individual action (e.g., tutoring, cleaning environment)		*Demonstrates frequent involvement through their direct service, projects, or advocacy efforts *Ability to recruit others to address social issues or participate in group activities. *Personal involvement in a variety of service activities & interactions in the community		*Demonstrates sustained involvement over time through their direct service, projects, or advocacy efforts *Personal involvement in a variety of service activities has led to more depth of engagement. *Generates new ideas and is a catalyst for change *Ability to convene or lead others in addressing social issues or participating in group activities
Collaboration with Others Across Difference (includes diversity, interconnectedness, mutuality, and respect)			* Simply restates the prompt * Includes only “I” statements * “Me-ness” (orientation toward self, little or no mention of others) * Little or no mention of difference or diversity		*Awareness of being a “piece of a puzzle,” part of a whole * Describes the importance of collaboration, or gives examples of experiences with teamwork or group work * Confidence to state own opinions in groups *Mentions difference as “me” helping “them”		* Values diverse opinions or ideas in decision-making with others * Describes give-and-take in collaboration * Recognizes importance of listening skills to gain perspective of others * Expresses comfort in working with people of different backgrounds * Describes personal growth through interaction with others		*Demonstrates an understanding of mutuality or reciprocity with others * Describes the need for consensus-building to address a social issue * “We-ness” (sees and describes self in relationship with society/community) *Ability to express own perspective while valuing others’ opinions *Values cultural diversity and how it enhances society
Benefit of Education to Address Social Issues			* Simply restates the prompt * Little or no mention of knowledge and skills gained through education or experiences as a college student		* Lists relevant educational or other experiences as a college student without connecting them to social issues or serving others (e.g., class content, service learning class) * Identifies knowledge or skills they have without connecting to social issues or serving others *Describes the personal benefit of their education		* Links the purpose of education to social issues or to serving others * Identifies personal knowledge and skills to make a difference in society * Describes education as a privilege or opportunity		* Intentional choice of major or career path to improve society or to serve others * Understands how their personal knowledge and skills connect to addressing social issues and serving others * Describes education as a privilege/opportunity that places an added responsibility to act on behalf of others (societal benefit)

Appendix C Reflection Prompts

The goal of this reflection is to get you thinking about your experiences as a CPS or as AR*AC leader, and how these experiences relate to the Civic Minded Graduate model. Even more, this exercise should give you an opportunity to stop and reflect on the interviews you conducted and the social issues you encounter as a CPS or TL. Do not be afraid to share your personal views, feelings or ideals. Your reflection should be personal.

We have created questions related to 6 specific areas, please keep in mind that you are not required to answer every single question, but rather use these questions as reflection prompts. Your reflection will be the starting point for the script that you will use to create your digital story. Please keep in mind both the fall and spring interviews you conducted as well as your overall experience in your program.

As you go through these questions keep a record of the mental images that come to your mind. These “mental images” can serve as references as you collect pictures for your digital stories.

CMG component: Active participant in society to address social issues

1. In your CPS or TL experiences, in what ways did you contribute (time, resources, knowledge) to address the issues that were relevant to your site? How might your intentions to be an active participant in society changed as a result of your experience this year? How has what you learned impacted your intent to be an active participant in society?

2. Think about a time in which you encountered a challenging situation related to diversity issues, then respond to the following statement:
 - a. Before participating in this program, diversity/intercultural competence meant this to me:

 - b. After this year, my understanding of diversity/intercultural competence means this to me:

c. My scholarship involved these responsibilities:

I have seen _____

_____. I had to deal with

d. In light of my experiences, I am more (aware of / take into consideration) _____

_____ when dealing with issues related to diversity, etc.

CMG Component: Collaboration with others across difference

3. In an interview, if you were asked how your engagement in the CPS or AR*AC program has influenced who you will become and what you will accomplish in your life, what would you say?

How did your experience this year and the interviews you conducted help you to deepen the knowledge about your program, yourself, and the issues that you are passionate about?

In what ways, either directly or indirectly, are your career goals related to social issues that you feel passionate about it?

CMG Component: Civic Identity

4. I choose to become a CPS or TL scholar because....

I interviewed _____ (fall) _____ and _____ (spring) _____.

In my interviews, I was surprised to learn/learned that my site faces these issues:

How might your intention to be an active participant in society changed as a result of your interviews?

My participation in the CPS of TL program **and/or** my interviews at my site has taught me

a. About my educational goals....

a. Why did you choose your major?

b. Have your educational goals changed as a result of your participation/research? How?

b. About my career goals....

a. What are your career goals?

b. Have your career goals changed as a result of your participation/research? How?

c. About whom I want to be as a member of my community....

a. What do you see as your role in your current or future community?

b. How has your vision of yourself as a citizen changed since your participation/research?

CMG Component: Benefit of education to address social issues

5. What kind of experiences did you get out of this scholarship? What kind of skills did you learn? How did this year allow you to use and/or build on your existing talents/strengths?

How did this experience relate to your educational and career goals?

How did this scholarship fit in with what you have already learned or what you are learning in the classroom this year?

CMG Component: Understanding how social issues are addressed in society

6. What are some of the root causes of issues facing your site or your students? How are they being addressed at your site? By the community? By the government (city/state/federal)?

What resources (time, resources, knowledge) are available to your site or to your students?

Do you think these resources or intervention are effective or are they perpetuating the problems?

What future actions need to be taken for long term sustainability of your site? For your students? For Indianapolis?

Appendix D

Digital Story #	CMG					AAC&U					
	Civic Identity	Understanding of Social Issues	Active Participant in Society	Collaboration with Others	Benefit of Education	Diversity of Communities	Analysis of Knowledge	Civic ID & Commitment	Civic Communication	Civic Action & Reflection	Civic Contexts/ Structures
1	3.5	1	2.75	6.25	6.75	4	5.5	4.75	3.25	2.75	3.75
2	7	5.5	4.25	3.25	7	4.25	4.25	7	2.25	4.5	5
3	5.75	0.75	4.25	4	4.5	5.5	2.75	5.75	4.25	3	4.25
4	2.75	1.25	5.25	5.25	2.25	3.25	1	4.5	2	5	4
5	1.75	3.25	1.25	0.5	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	1.25	1.25
6	4	0	2.75	0.75	3.75	2.5	0.5	4.5	0	3.5	1.75
7	6.5	4.75	6	4.25	5.5	4.5	3.25	6.5	0.5	5	5.5
8	7	2.25	4.75	1.5	7	1.5	2.75	5.75	0	4	4.25
9	5.75	3.5	4.25	3	3.25	2	2.75	4.75	0.25	3.75	4.25
10	6.25	4.75	4.5	1	3.5	2	3.25	5	0.25	3.25	4
11	5.75	0.75	4.25	2.25	7	3.5	3	5	0.25	3	4.25
12	5.5	1.5	3.75	2.5	1.5	2	0.5	4	0.75	2.5	3
14	6.75	2.75	5.75	1.25	5.5	3.25	0.5	5.75	0.5	4.5	5.25
15	6.75	0.25	5.25	1.25	0	4.5	0	6.5	3.75	4.75	5
Total	5.36	2.3	4.21	2.86	4.11	3.12	2.18	5.02	1.28	3.62	3.96

Appendix D represents the mean score for the four reviewer ratings for each row of the rubrics. The total score represents the overall mean.

Table 1 – AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Civic Engagement (n=14)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Scores ≥ 5	Percentage of Scores ≤ 3
Civic Identity and Commitment	5.02	1.84	68%	14%
Civic Contexts/Structures	3.96	1.42	45%	30%
Civic Action and Reflection	3.62	1.37	23%	48%
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	3.12	1.48	21%	57%
Analysis of Knowledge	2.18	1.77	9%	77%
Civic Communication	1.28	1.65	7%	88%
Overall (7-point scale)	3.20/46%			

Table 2 – Civic-Minded Graduate (CMG) Rubric (n=14)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage of Scores ≥ 5	Percentage of Scores ≤ 3
Civic Identity	5.36	1.8	70%	21%
Active Participant in Society to Address Social Issues	4.21	1.56	55%	32%
Benefit of Education to Address Social Issues	4.11	2.54	46%	41%
Collaboration with Others Across Difference	2.86	1.97	27%	64%
Understanding of How Issues are Addressed in Society	2.3	1.89	16%	75%
Overall (7-point scale)	3.77/54%			