



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

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

AY 2021-2022

### 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 2021-2022. The IEL Assessment Workgroup assessed written reflection artifacts of 100 students from 10 co-curricular programs. Using selected rows from the Written Communication, Integrative Learning, and Civic Engagement VALUE Rubrics, the raters assessed the Communicator, Problem Solver, and Community Contributor Profiles of Undergraduate Learning.

**For Written Communication**, all of the student reflection artifacts except one at least met the benchmark for Content Development. Likewise, all but one of the student artifacts at least met the benchmark for Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Overall, 99% of the scores for Written Communication met the benchmark and 95% at least met the milestone.

**For Integrative Learning**, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (98 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Connections to Experience. Likewise, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (99 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Reflection and Self-Assessment. Overall, 98% of the scores for Integrative Learning met the benchmark and 93% at least met the milestone.

**For Civic Engagement, specifically, Diversity of Communities and Cultures**, a majority of student reflection artifacts (84 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Diversity of Communities and Cultures, while 78% met the milestone.

When examining mean scores for each by class standing, the scores tended to get higher by class year. However, surprisingly, the mean scores for Diversity of Communities and Cultures were highest for First-Year students.

### 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”, “Problem Solver”, and Community Contributor](#) profiles within the [Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success](#). To that end, this assessment applied selected rows from each of the following AAC&U VALUE Rubrics:

- 1) [Written Communication VALUE Rubric](#)
  - Content Development
  - Control of Syntax and Mechanics



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

## 2) [Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric](#)

Connections to Experience  
Reflection and Self-Assessment

## 3) [Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric](#)

Diversity of Communities and Cultures

### Learning Outcomes Assessed

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.*
- 3) *Demonstrate evidence of respectful engagement with their own and other communities and cultures*

The IEL Assessment workgroup implemented the recommendations from the AY 2020-2021 Workgroup raters. These include the following:

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
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.	Done
The prompts will be administered earlier in the spring of 2022 on the same date.	Done

**Table 1**

	<b>Reflective Papers assessed</b>
Ambassador	2
Bonner Leader Scholarship Program	23
Community Engagement Associates	6
Diversity Scholars Research Program (DSRP)	12
Fugate Scholarship Program	5
Jaguar Leadership Network	10
Life Health Sciences Internship Program (LHSI)	9
Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Institute (MURI)	15
Paws Scholarship Program (Paws)	3
Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP)	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

**Note:** Additional information about these programs can be found at <https://getengaged.iupui.edu/>



# IUPUI INSTITUTE FOR ENGAGED LEARNING

## **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.

### Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric

The AAC&U Civic engagement VALUE Rubric defines civic engagement as "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

## **Review Team**

The review team, comprised of 6 staff members from IEL, divided and directly assessed 100 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 six 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? For whom/what was this project/program important? Why was it important? (150- 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? (150-300 words)
- 3) Describe the extent to which your experience provided opportunities to engage and learn from different communities and cultures and to the extent this influenced your attitudes and beliefs. (150-300 words)
- 4) 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? (150-300 words)

The review team used the following 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
- 3) Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric
  - Diversity of Communities and Cultures



## RESULTS

**Table 2: Overall**

Dimension N=100	Mean SD	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does not meet (0)
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>						
Content Development	2.92 .79	22 22%	52 52%	23 23%	2 2%	1 1%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.99 .88	30 30%	46 46%	18 18%	5 5%	1 (1%)
<b>Average/Total</b>	<b>2.96</b> <b>.78</b>	<b>52</b> <b>26%</b>	<b>98</b> <b>49%</b>	<b>41</b> <b>21%</b>	<b>7</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>2</b> <b>1%</b>
<b>Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric</b>						
Connections to Experience	2.68 .88	15 15%	48 48%	29 29%	6 6%	2 2%
Reflection and Self-Assessment	2.62 .79	12 12%	44 44%	39 39%	4 4%	1 1%
<b>Average/Total</b>	<b>2.65</b> <b>.75</b>	<b>27</b> <b>14%</b>	<b>92</b> <b>46%</b>	<b>68</b> <b>34%</b>	<b>10</b> <b>5%</b>	<b>3</b> <b>2%</b>
<b>Civic Engagement</b>						
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	2.15 1.2	11 11%	31 31%	36 36%	6 6%	16 16%

**For Written Communication**, all of the student reflection artifacts except one at least met the benchmark for Content Development. Likewise, all but one of the student artifacts at least met the benchmark for Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Overall, 99% of the scores for Written Communication met the benchmark and 95% at least met the milestone.

**For Integrative Learning**, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (98 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Connections to Experience. Likewise, nearly all of the student reflection artifacts (99 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Reflection and Self-Assessment. Overall, 98% of the scores for Integrative Learning met the benchmark and 93% at least met the milestone.

**For Civic Engagement, specifically, Diversity of Communities and Cultures**, a majority of student reflection artifacts (84 of 100) at least met the benchmark for Diversity of Communities and Cultures, while 78% met the milestone.

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

	Gender	N	Mean	SD
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>				
Content Development	Female	66	2.95	.75
	Male	34	2.85	.86
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Female	66	2.98	.85
	Male	34	3.00	.95
<b>Average</b>	Female	66	2.97	.75
	Male	34	2.93	.85



Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric				
Connections to Experience	Female	66	2.62	.91
	Male	34	2.79	.81
Reflection and Self-Assessment	Female	66	2.59	.80
	Male	34	2.68	.77
Average	Female	66	2.61	.78
	Male	34	2.74	.68
Civic Engagement				
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Female	66	2.21	1.1
	Male	34	2.03	1.3

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

Dimension	Race	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Content Development	Asian	8	2.50	1.2
	Black	10	2.70	.68
	Latinx	18	2.83	.62
	Mixed	9	2.67	.87
	White	52	3.08	.77
	International	3	3.33	.58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.79</b>
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Asian	8	2.50	1.2
	Black	10	2.90	.74
	Latinx	18	2.89	.90
	Mixed	9	2.78	1.1
	White	52	3.12	.81
	International	3	3.67	.58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>.88</b>
Connections to Experience	Asian	8	2.13	.99
	Black	10	2.30	.95
	Latinx	18	2.72	.83
	Mixed	9	2.11	.78
	White	52	2.87	.79
	International	3	3.67	.58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>.88</b>
Reflection and Self-Assessment	Asian	8	2.25	1.0
	Black	10	2.60	.70
	Latinx	18	2.61	.85
	Mixed	9	2.22	.67
	White	52	2.71	.75
	International	3	3.33	.58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>.79</b>



<b>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</b>	Asian	8	1.88	.84
	Black	10	1.30	1.3
	Latinx	18	2.56	1.2
	Mixed	9	1.44	1.4
	White	52	2.38	1.1
	International	3	1.33	1.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>1.2</b>

**Table 5: Mean Scores across Programs**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
<b>Content Development</b>	Ambassador	2	3.0	1.4
	Bonner	23	2.78	.79
	CEA	6	3.50	.84
	DSRP	12	2.75	.75
	Fugate	5	2.00	1.2
	JLN	10	3.00	.47
	LHSI	9	3.22	.67
	MURI	15	2.87	.83
	Paws	3	3.00	1.0
	UROP	15	3.13	.52
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.79</b>
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Ambassador	2	3.00	1.4
	Bonner	23	2.70	.82
	CEA	6	3.50	.55
	DSRP	12	3.00	.85
	Fugate	5	1.80	1.3
	JLN	10	3.00	.67
	LHSI	9	3.33	.71
	MURI	15	3.13	.99
	Paws	3	3.67	.58
	UROP	15	3.13	.74
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>.88</b>
<b>Connections to Experience</b>	Ambassador	2	2.50	.71
	Bonner	23	2.65	.83
	CEA	6	3.00	.63
	DSRP	12	2.50	.91
	Fugate	5	2.20	1.6
	JLN	10	2.70	1.2
	LHSI	9	3.11	.78
	MURI	15	2.73	.80
	Paws	3	3.00	0
	UROP	15	2.53	.74
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>.88</b>



Reflection and Self-Assessment	Ambassador	2	2.50	.71
	Bonner	23	2.52	.79
	CEA	6	2.67	.52
	DSRP	12	2.50	.67
	Fugate	5	1.80	1.3
	JLN	10	2.27	1.0
	LHSI	9	2.89	.60
	MURI	15	2.67	.82
	Paws	3	3.00	.58
	UROP	15	2.60	.74
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>.79</b>
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Ambassador	2	3.00	0
	Bonner	23	2.57	1.1
	CEA	6	2.83	.75
	DSRP	12	2.00	1.2
	Fugate	5	1.40	1.3
	JLN	10	1.60	1.6
	LHSI	9	1.56	1.2
	MURI	15	1.87	1.2
	Paws	3	2.67	.58
	UROP	15	2.40	.99
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>1.2</b>

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

Dimension	Class Year	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
<b>Written Communication VALUE Rubric</b>				
Content Development	First-Year	11	2.64	1.3
	Sophomore	19	2.63	.89
	Junior	34	3.00	.60
	Senior	36	3.08	.65
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.79</b>
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	First-Year	11	2.55	1.4
	Sophomore	19	2.95	.85
	Junior	34	3.00	.82
	Senior	36	3.14	.72
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>.88</b>
<b>Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric</b>				
Connections to Experience	First-Year	11	2.36	1.1
	Sophomore	19	2.68	.95
	Junior	34	2.76	.74
	Senior	36	2.69	.89
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>.88</b>
Reflection and Self-Assessment	First-Year	11	2.18	.98
	Sophomore	19	2.47	.84





	Junior	34	2.76	.78
	Senior	36	2.69	.69
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	2.62	.79
<b>Civic Engagement</b>				
<b>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</b>	First-Year	11	2.36	1.4
	Sophomore	19	2.26	1.2
	Junior	34	2.00	1.3
	Senior	36	2.17	1.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	2.15	1.2

## 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)

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000.