

**Report on Assessment of Student Outcomes 2010-11  
(PRAC Annual Report)**

**IUPUI Center for Service & Learning**

**I. Learning Outcomes**

The Center for Service and Learning (CSL) seeks to develop the outcome of “**civic-mindedness**” in students graduating from IUPUI, focusing on those who are involved with our center through a variety of programs. From the perspective of higher education, we define a **civic-minded graduate** 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 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. Thus, we are interested in measuring a person’s orientation toward the community and other people in the community, as distinct from an internal or self orientation, family orientation, or a corporate/profit orientation. For our purposes at IUPUI, we are interested in student involvement in a local community, although this could also be expanded to include community at the state, regional, national, or global level (Bringle, Hatcher, & Jones, 2010; Plater, Jones, Bringle & Clayton, 2010).

Through an extensive literature review we have developed a conceptual framework for the construct of civic-minded graduate that is comprised of a set of students’ knowledge outcomes (cognitive), dispositions (affective), skills, behaviors and behavioral intentions. This includes ten elements that we have identified as student learning outcomes to be manifested in a civic-minded graduate, and which can be fostered through undergraduate education that includes service learning. The concept of civic-minded graduate incorporates the following civic learning outcome areas (see Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Steinberg, Hatcher & Bringle, in press):

Assessed with the CMG Scale (described in Section II):

- Knowledge:
  - *Volunteer Opportunities:* Describe ways in which a person can become involved in the community, such as through community organizations and volunteer opportunities
  - *Contemporary Social Issues:* Identify community or social issues that need to be addressed
  - *Academic Knowledge and Skills:* Apply academic knowledge and technical skills to help address community or social issues
- Skills:
  - *Listening/Communication Skills:* Display effective listening as well as other oral and written communication skills to help understand others’ opinions and ideas
  - *Diversity:* Give examples of how they are able to work in settings with a diversity of people (culture, ethnicity, religion, social & economic background)

- *Consensus Building*: Give examples of how they have used consensus-building skills to resolve problems or controversial issues
- Dispositions:
  - *Valuing Community Engagement*: Explain the value of being involved in service or other forms of community engagement
  - *Efficacy*: Articulate an optimistic yet realistic assessment of the personal impact they can have on social issues
  - *Social Trustee of Knowledge*: Integrate the connection between their education and their responsibility to help address social issues
    - Display a commitment to service that is well-integrated with his/her self-identity as a result of his/her education
- Behavioral Intentions:
  - *Future Intentions*: Articulate intentions to remain involved in service or community engagement after graduation from college.

Assessed with the CMG Narrative Prompt and Rubric (described in Section II):

- Express a civic identity, in which commitment to service is well-integrated into his/her self-identity
- Describe ways in which social issues are addressed in society
- Actively participate in society to address social issues
- Give examples that demonstrate the ability to collaborate with others and show respect for their differences
- Discuss the benefit of his or her education to address social issues

CSL is not an academic unit, so we do not directly measure the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs); however, we believe that the learning outcomes associated with civic-mindedness relate to all of the PULs. For example, listening and consensus-building skills relate well to PUL 1, “Core Communication Skills”. Knowledge of Contemporary Social Issues connects to PUL 5, “Understanding Society and Culture.” The CMG Academic Knowledge and Skills relates to PUL 4, “Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness.” CSL works with faculty in a variety of departments to connect student learning outcomes (PULs) to civic learning outcomes in their courses. This year we offered several different types of faculty development grants and workshops to assist in this process.

Students at IUPUI have a plethora of opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of a civic-minded graduate. For example, students can participate in community service through campus student clubs and organizations, athletic teams, volunteering for events on campus, service-based scholarships, community-based work study, and service learning courses.

CSL administers 10 types of service-based scholarships through the Sam H. Jones Scholarship program, all of which provide opportunities for students to develop the attribute of civic-mindedness. CSL also houses the Community Work Study Program, which coordinates the America Reads/America Counts program. Another subunit of CSL, Community Service,

coordinates alternative spring breaks, providing students opportunities for educationally meaningful service in various locations across the country. CSL also coordinates Democracy Plaza and annually provides approximately 35 campus-wide service opportunities for students, faculty and staff, including the United Way Day of Caring, MLK Day of Service, and the Jags in the Street program, among others. Additionally, CSL assists faculty to develop, implement, and improve service learning classes. Students have opportunities to develop civic skills directly in service learning courses, and also by serving as faculty assistants for service learning courses or community-based research.

In all of the programs administered by CSL, students are involved in training and leadership development opportunities through orientations, workshops, readings, discussions, and written reflections. These activities help students develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of civic-minded graduates of IUPUI.

## **II. Assessment Measures**

We have developed two instruments that we use to measure the construct of civic-mindedness. We use these instruments with students involved in our programs (scholarship programs, America Reads/Counts, service learning assistants) to assess their development in regard to civic learning outcomes. The *Civic-Minded Graduate Scale (CMG Scale)* is an indirect, quantitative self-report measure. It includes 30 Likert-type items that are linked to the first set of learning outcomes listed above.

We use a second measure, the *Civic-Minded Graduate Narrative Prompt and Rubric (CMG Narrative)*, to obtain direct evidence of student learning outcomes. The *CMG Narrative* is a qualitative approach, which we use to assess the second list of outcomes described above. The *CMG Narrative Prompt* is stated as follows:

*I have a responsibility and a commitment to use the knowledge and skills I have gained as a college student to collaborate with others, who may be different from me, to help address issues in society. Considering your education and experiences as a college student, explain [in 1 – 2 typewritten pages] the ways in which you agree or disagree with this statement and provide personal examples when relevant.*

The *CMG Narrative* plays an important role in the student application for the William M. Plater Medallion each year. The Plater Medallion recognizes graduating students who have demonstrated exemplary commitment to their communities during their years as an IUPUI student. Most (but not all) of the recipients of the Plater Medallion have been involved in service through one or more of CSL's programs, so this gives us an important "benchmark" for our highest-achieving students in the area of civic-mindedness. The *CMG Narrative* has proved a useful measure for this purpose.

However, based on assessment results from last year, we decided that we needed more specific prompts to better assess outcomes from our scholarship programs. Hence, this year we developed and piloted several *Sub-prompts* for the *CMG Narrative*. Each sub-prompt

corresponds to one of the learning outcomes in the second list above. We are currently in the process of clarifying the rubric and sub-prompts based on results from the pilot study, so we have limited results so far from this assessment tool.

In addition to being used for CSL programs, the *CMG Scale* and the *CMG Narrative* have been made available to faculty on our website, as well as through an OnCourse/ePort site and Survey Central. Faculty members can adapt and use these instruments to assess student achievement in civic learning outcomes in their courses. We have included questions relating to the PULs on the *CMG Scale*, allowing faculty to measure both civic outcomes and the PULs appropriate for their contexts.

Finally, although this report focuses on student learning outcomes, all of the CSL initiatives include a program evaluation component. For example, all of the scholarship and other student programs include regular student reflection activities, as well as post-event, mid-year, and/or end-of-year program evaluation surveys. Many programs include student focus groups, team leader surveys, and surveys with community site contacts/supervisors. Program coordinators also conduct regular site visits to gain feedback on student success and program implementation. This year students and faculty involved in the Service Learning Assistant program completed ePortfolio activities (including the *CMG Scale and Narrative*). Students in the Alternative Break program completed pre- and post-trip surveys and video interviews. CSL also conducts a bi-annual satisfaction survey with all community partners. In addition, all faculty development workshops include a post-event evaluation survey. Faculty members receiving professional development grants also provide copies of pre- and post-program syllabi and reflection or assignment materials.

### **III. Assessment Findings**

**Table 1** (page 6) presents direct evidence of student outcomes, i.e. faculty ratings of student narratives produced through ePortfolios in the Service Learning Assistant program. Faculty rated 84.5% of the narratives at the Proficient level or higher. We were surprised by this result, as this was a somewhat higher percentage than we had expected.

**Table 2** (page 7) presents indirect evidence of outcomes, i.e. results of the *CMG Scale* with students involved in CSL programs in 2010-11. Scores indicate averages on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate a higher perceived level of civic knowledge, skills and dispositions. Green cells indicate areas of program emphasis last year that will continue into the new academic year (2011-12). Yellow cells indicate new areas of program emphasis for 2011-12.

Overall, the results indicate that students in the CSL programs report high levels of civic-mindedness. Our hope is to have mean scores for freshmen above 3.5 (out of 6.0), scores for mid-level students above 4.0, and for advanced students we like to see scores above 5.0.

The results indicate that these benchmarks were met in all programs. Looking at the bottom row in Table 2, the Overall Average scores for all programs met the relevant benchmarks. The program with the lowest score (4.11) includes many freshmen. The highest scores were obtained by programs that are designed for advanced students (primarily upperclassmen and graduate students).

Looking at the right-most column in Table 2 (Total across all programs except Service Learning Assistants), we noted that the lowest score was in “Knowledge of Contemporary Social Issues.” Service Learning Assistants were not included in this column because some of the scores were calculated differently than for the other programs, and thus are not directly comparable.

#### **IV. Actions Taken in Response to Findings**

Based on our assessment work from the previous year, we decided that we needed more specific narrative prompts to better assess outcomes from our scholarship programs. Hence, in 2010-11 we developed and piloted several *Sub-prompts* for the *CMG Narrative*. We are currently in the process of clarifying the rubric and the sub-prompts, based on results from the pilot study. As noted above, we did obtain faculty ratings of narratives by students in the Service Learning Assistant program (Table 1). The results were surprising to us, as faculty gave higher ratings than we had expected. This coming year (2011-12) we plan to provide more guidance to faculty in how to effectively use the rubrics.

As noted above, across programs the lowest score on the *CMG Scale* (Table 2) was “Knowledge of Contemporary Social Issues.” Our program coordinators have determined additional ways to focus on this topic in the coming year (2011-12) in ways that are appropriate for each program. For example, the America Reads\*Counts and Fugate Scholarship programs, which place college students in K-12 schools for community service, will focus student trainings around social issues commonly encountered in elementary and secondary educational settings. The Community Service Scholars program will have a strong emphasis on social justice issues. Service Learning Assistants will respond to reflection prompts that link their program experiences with knowledge of social issues and how to address them. Likewise, the other programs will have trainings, student discussions and reflections designed around the topic of contemporary social issues.

**TABLE 1:**  
**Spring 2011--Service Learning Assistants--Faculty Ratings of CMG Narratives**  
Ratings are on a scale of 1 (Novice) to 7 (Proficient)

| <b>Ratings</b>  | <b>Count</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1-Novice        | 1            | 1.3%           |
| 2               | 0            | 0.0%           |
| 3-Apprentice    | 5            | 6.3%           |
| 4               | 6            | 7.6%           |
| 5-Proficient    | 29           | 36.7%          |
| 6               | 22           | 27.8%          |
| 7-Distinguished | 16           | 20.3%          |
| Total           | 79           | 100%           |
|                 |              |                |
| mean rating     | 5.4          |                |
| median          | 5            |                |

|                                                                                                            |                                                                                                     |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>TABLE 2:</b>                                                                                            |                                                                                                     |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
| <b>Spring 2011--Mean Scores on Civic-Minded Graduate Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree)</b> |                                                                                                     |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
|                                                                                                            | Higher scores indicate higher levels of knowledge, skills or dispositions related to civic outcomes |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
|                                                                                                            | Green = Area of program emphasis last year, will continue<br>Yellow = New area of program emphasis  |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
| <b>Program</b>                                                                                             | <b>America Reads* Counts (N=13)</b>                                                                 | <b>Freshman Service Scholars (N=6)</b> | <b>Community Service Scholars (N=8)</b> | <b>Community Service Leaders (N=5)</b> | <b>Service Corps (N=3)</b> | <b>Community Partner Scholars (N=2)</b> | <b>Fugate Scholar (N=4)</b> | <b>Service Learning Assistants (N=59)</b> | <b>Total: Non-SLAs Only (N=41)</b> |
| <b>Outcome</b>                                                                                             |                                                                                                     |                                        |                                         |                                        |                            |                                         |                             |                                           |                                    |
| Knowledge: Volunteer Opportunities                                                                         | 3.95                                                                                                | 5.22                                   | 4.71                                    | 5.73                                   | 5.44                       | 6.00                                    | 4.58                        | 4.85                                      | 4.77                               |
| Knowledge: Academic Knowledge & Technical Skills                                                           | 3.74                                                                                                | 5.00                                   | 4.75                                    | 5.73                                   | 5.33                       | 5.50                                    | 4.75                        | 4.81                                      | 4.67                               |
| Knowledge: Contemporary Social Issues                                                                      | 3.87                                                                                                | 4.28                                   | 4.38                                    | 5.40                                   | 5.44                       | 5.17                                    | 4.50                        | NA                                        | 4.46                               |
| Skills: Listening/Communication                                                                            | 4.58                                                                                                | 5.67                                   | 4.75                                    | 5.20                                   | 5.67                       | 5.75                                    | 4.88                        | 4.92                                      | 5.01                               |
| Skills: Diversity                                                                                          | 4.33                                                                                                | 5.28                                   | 4.58                                    | 5.00                                   | 5.33                       | 5.50                                    | 4.92                        | 4.47                                      | 4.79                               |
| Skills: Consensus Building                                                                                 | 4.03                                                                                                | 5.06                                   | 4.50                                    | 5.00                                   | 5.11                       | 5.67                                    | 4.67                        | 5.04                                      | 4.61                               |
| Dispositions: Valuing Community Engagement                                                                 | 4.15                                                                                                | 4.71                                   | 4.59                                    | 5.37                                   | 5.17                       | 5.13                                    | 4.69                        | 4.94                                      | 4.64                               |
| Dispositions: Efficacy                                                                                     | 4.10                                                                                                | 4.94                                   | 4.58                                    | 5.47                                   | 5.33                       | 5.67                                    | 4.92                        | 4.85                                      | 4.73                               |
| Dispositions: Social Trustee of Knowledge                                                                  | 4.56                                                                                                | 4.83                                   | 4.79                                    | 5.20                                   | 5.56                       | 5.67                                    | 4.92                        | 5.02                                      | 4.89                               |
| BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS                                                                                      | 3.95                                                                                                | 3.94                                   | 4.71                                    | 5.53                                   | 5.22                       | 5.33                                    | 4.67                        | NA                                        | 4.52                               |
| KNOWLEDGE                                                                                                  | 3.85                                                                                                | 4.83                                   | 4.62                                    | 5.62                                   | 5.41                       | 5.56                                    | 4.61                        | 4.82                                      | 4.63                               |
| SKILLS                                                                                                     | 4.28                                                                                                | 5.29                                   | 4.60                                    | 5.09                                   | 5.33                       | 5.63                                    | 4.81                        | 4.73                                      | 4.78                               |
| DISPOSITIONS                                                                                               | 4.26                                                                                                | 4.82                                   | 4.65                                    | 5.33                                   | 5.33                       | 5.45                                    | 4.83                        | 4.95                                      | 4.74                               |
| OVERALL AVERAGE                                                                                            | 4.11                                                                                                | 4.87                                   | 4.63                                    | 5.37                                   | 5.34                       | 5.52                                    | 4.74                        | 4.84                                      | 4.70                               |