



Academic Program Assessment Report: 2008-2009

Assessment & Institutional Research
Viterbo University

The Academic Program Assessment Report: 2008-2009 presents an analysis of assessment work accomplished in Viterbo University's academic programs from Oct. 2008 – Sept. 2009 and is based on the annual update in TracDat. The report tracks progress made in assessment processes and practices, analyzes the use of assessment for improvements in majors, minors, and licensure programs, and interprets results regarding assessment of general education. Achievements in institutional support for academic assessment include successful faculty development workshops and assessment sessions, the establishment of the Academic Assessment Task Force for 2009-2010, and the launching of annual awards in academic assessment for 2009-2010.

I. Summary of Achievements in Academic Program Assessment

Viterbo University students are experiencing the benefits of enriched learning as a result of fully developed outcomes-based assessment. The most significant gain in assessment is in the number of programs which have confirmed improvements in student learning.

Of the 46 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- 96% (44) have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- 83% (38) have articulated action taken to improve student learning.
- 57% (26) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action;
- 52% (24) have documented improvements in student learning on TracDat.

The academic programs (majors and minors) have made excellent progress in moving from 9 programs to 24 programs which have documented improvements in student learning.

Our institutional ratio of direct to indirect measures is 77% to 23%, which is indicative of a productive focus on direct assessment. Indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

Eleven new programs launched assessment plans in 2009-2010 and several more will be launching assessment plans in 2010-2011. Of the eleven, ten have collected actionable results, and three have taken action to improve learning.

	Sept. 2008	Sept. 2009	
		Goals	Actual
1) Establish a plan: outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods	100%	11 new programs developed assessment plans and are collecting data.	
2) Collect actionable data and draw conclusions through analysis	92%	100%	96% (44/46) Did not meet goal; up from last year
3) Take action to improve learning	73%	90%	83% (38/46) Did not meet goal; significant increase.
4) Test the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action	18%	50%	57% (26/46) Exceeded goal
5) Tell the performance story	Viterbo University Annual Assessment Report		

Examples of improvements made in student learning through curricular changes include gains in critical thinking in the Master of Business Administration and in Social Work, confirmation of learning in communication in Dietetics, Nursing, and Biology, strengthening of sight singing in the three Music programs, and gains in problem solving in Chemistry.

II. Summary of General Education Assessment

The focus of the 2009 report is on assessment of core abilities in undergraduate academic programs. The report has two foci: 1) an inventory of core ability assessment in the majors; 2) an analysis of results and improvements made in written communication.

Although the focus of the report is on use of the core abilities for undergraduate program-level assessment, it is erroneous to conclude that the presence or absence of core ability learning outcomes is an indicator of the quality of assessment in the programs. Faculty were not and are not expected to

assess the core abilities in their majors; therefore, there is much nuanced and productive assessment work occurring in the undergraduate programs which does not utilize the core abilities as learning outcomes.

A limitation of the core abilities assessment study stems from its descriptive nature. The primary source of the report is the annual updates on TracDat, Viterbo's repository of assessment reports, and the extraction of information for the inventory is limited to the classifications explicit in the repository.

Inventory of Core Ability Assessment

The following inventory includes the 42 established undergraduate programs. It does not include the programs launched in 2009-2010.

Core Ability	Number / Percentage	Results	Action or Criteria Met	Learning Confirmed
Thinking	29/42—71%	18/29—62%	18/18—100%	15/18—83%
Ethical Decision Making	23/42—56%	12/24—50%	12/12—100%	11/12—92%
Communication	31/42—76%	26/31—84%	25/26—96%	22/26—87%
Aesthetic Sensitivity	8/42—20%	7/8—86%	7/8—86%	7/8—86%
Cultural Sensitivity	11/42—27%	11/11—100%	11/11—100%	9/11—82%
Community Involvement	4/42—10%	4/4—100%	4/4—100%	4/4—100%

Numerous programs have elected to assess core abilities in the majors and minors. The core abilities most commonly assessed in the majors are communication (76% of programs), thinking (71% of programs), and ethical decision making (56%). The data shows that the core ability of communication is assessed and confirmed in most majors. Although only eleven programs articulate Cultural Sensitivity as one of the learning outcomes in their majors, those programs are rigorous in collecting results, taking action, and working to confirm learning. Ethical Decision Making appears to present some challenges for assessment in the programs. While 23 programs articulate Ethics as a learning outcome, only 50% have results on this outcome. Of the 12 which have collected results, 100% have either confirmed learning or have taken action to improve learning.

Improving Written Communication through Assessment

The second focus of the General Education Assessment Report for 2009 is on student achievement in written communication as demonstrated in the majors. This portion of the report aggregates the assessment results on written communication in the majors and presents an analysis of the ways programs are strengthening written communication.

- Twenty-two programs have confirmed learning in written communication, many after following up on changes made to strengthen learning.
- Eighty-three percent of Viterbo's undergraduates are in programs that have confirmed learning in written communication—either by following up on improvements made or through repeated, meaningful assessment results. Out of the total of 1,903 undergraduate, degree-seeking students in academic programs, 1,586 students are in programs which have confirmed learning in written communication—either by following up on improvements made or through meaningful assessment results.

Understanding student achievement in written communication at the program level has led many programs to make pedagogical or curricular changes. Follow-up results have shown improvement in students' abilities in written communication. Examples of improvements in student learning—from the Sciences, Social Sciences, the Humanities, and from a professional program—provide a glimpse of Viterbo University's effectiveness in preparing students for life and work in the 21st century.

Table of Contents

Part 1. Progress in Assessment Process and Practices	5
Part 2. Majors and Stand-alone Minors	8
Chapter 1: Summary of Progress.....	9
Chapter 2: Example of Improvements	10
Chapter 3: An Overview of Assessment Work	15
Part 3. General Education	21
Chapter 4: Inventory of Core Abilities Assessment	23
Chapter 5: Using Assessment Results to Improve Written Communication	41
Chapter 6: General Education Assessment and Redesign.....	46
Appendix	49

Part I: Progress in Assessment Process and Practices

The mission of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research is to be a trusted provider of relevant, unbiased institutional information to support decision-makers in strategic planning, policy formulation, and external reporting. The office also serves as the responsible unit for regulatory reporting of institutional data to the National Center for Educational Statistics, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, and the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Assessment and Institutional Research supports the continuous improvement of student learning by providing planning, training, and support for assessment processes; conducts or assists with assessment-related research; and maintains a framework for reporting outcomes assessment on an annual cycle.

In 2008-2009, several initiatives were taken to further Viterbo University's goal to strengthen the continuous improvement of student learning. An Academic Assessment Task Force was established for 2009-2010 for the purpose of providing oversight for program-level assessment while researching permanent structures for continued oversight. A second initiative was to establish annual awards for excellence in assessment as a way of highlighting and disseminating improvements made in student learning.

Assessment Development

Two all-faculty assessment workshops were held, one in January 2009 and one in May 2009, with excellent participation and positive evaluation.

On January 7, 2009, a one-hour session on assessment, "Closing the Loop: Improving Student Learning Through Direct Assessment," was attended by 101 participants, with a full-time faculty body of 102. 90% of respondents expressed satisfaction in achieving the outcomes of the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to communicate with faculty about unfolding assessment progress, to reiterate the goals of assessment, to exemplify best practices, and to lift up excellence. Participants strengthened their understanding of the principles that guide work in assessing and improving student learning; further developed an understanding of the best practices in assessing and improving student learning; and clarified their understanding of the next steps in program-level assessment.

On May 14, 2009, a half-day assessment workshop was held with 106 participants, with a full-time faculty body of 102. The goals of the workshop were that participants would 1) understand how direct, authentic, summative assessment can be manageable as well as meaningful; 2) apply an understanding of using assessment to improve learning in their particular context. Eighty-nine percent of respondents indicated that the design of the workshop supported the objectives. Overall, there was a 87% positive response to the evaluation survey.

Additional training sessions and workshops given during the 2008-2009 academic year included:

- Workshop on Assessment and TracDat for Graduate Studies in Education, Sept. 24, 2008
- Workshop on Assessment for new full-time faculty, Nov. 4, 2008
- "Closing the Loop" for Dietetics Department, Jan. 8, 2008
- "What's Next?" for Psychology Department, Jan. 22, 2009
- Assessment Coordinator Labs, Jan. 27 and Feb. 9, 2009

Academic Assessment Task Force

The Academic Assessment Task Force was put in place for 2009-2010.

Purpose: to provide faculty oversight of and support for program-level assessment at Viterbo University. This oversight and support is expressed in the functions listed below.

Academic Assessment Task Force Functions:

1. To create paradigms, procedures and policies for ongoing program-level assessment;
2. To review annual assessment reports on TracDat;
3. To offer consultation to faculty regarding assessment work;
4. To assist director in faculty development workshops;
5. To recognize and reward faculty work in assessment.

Academic Assessment Task Force Members: Alissa Oelfke, Anna Sanders-Bonelli, Timothy Schorr, Michael Smuksta, Judy Talbott

Meets 3-4 times per semester.

The Academic Assessment Task Force is chaired by the Director of Assessment and reports to the Academic Vice President. The Task Force will be in place for 2009-2010 while further evaluation of a permanent structure takes place.

Annual Academic Assessment Awards

During the May 2009 Assessment Day, the creation of the Annual Awards for Excellence in Program Assessment was announced.

Great Strides: one department each year

Criteria:

1. The assessment work of the department is based on good assessment practice: it has clearly articulated outcomes thoughtfully aligned with assessment methods; it has systematically gathered information about student learning, has used the evidence to make changes to improve learning, and has followed up on the changes with further results, working to confirm student learning.
2. Through authentic, ongoing assessment work, student learning has been strengthened. It is evident that the program faculty is committed to improving student learning through ongoing assessment work that is based on inquiry into learning for the purpose of strengthening learning.
3. The ongoing work of strengthening learning involves the department as a whole. Assessment practices are focused on direct methods with authentic measurements.
4. The department has made significant improvements in assessment practices or in the use of assessment to improve learning.

Best Practices: up to two departments each year

Criteria:

1. The assessment work of the department is based on good assessment practice: it has clearly articulated outcomes thoughtfully aligned with assessment methods; it has systematically gathered information about student learning, has used the evidence to make changes to improve learning, and has followed up on the changes with further results, working to confirm student learning.
2. Through authentic, ongoing assessment work, student learning has been strengthened. It is evident that the program faculty is committed to improving student learning through ongoing assessment work that is based on inquiry into learning for the purpose of strengthening learning.
3. The ongoing work of strengthening learning involves the department as a whole. Assessment practices are focused on direct methods with authentic measurements.
4. The work of this program is exceptionally innovative or effective.

Part II: Majors and Stand-alone Minors

Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Principles and Practices

The central goal of the Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Framework is to provide a structure for the continuous improvement of academic program quality. The framework is designed to accomplish three results for academic programs: 1) to gather information about the knowledge, abilities, and values of program graduates; 2) to use that information to improve teaching and learning in the program; and 3) to communicate assessment results with stakeholders (students, faculty, administrators, and advisory boards).

(See the Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Framework in the Appendix.)

Best Practices of Program Assessment

Program assessment is an on-going process designed to monitor and improve student learning. The assessment plan focuses on authentic, summative assessment with at least two direct methods of assessment.

Faculty:

- Develop explicit statements of what student should learn
- Align pedagogy with methods and outcomes
- Collect empirical data that indicate student attainment
- Reach a conclusion (faculty are satisfied or disappointed with student learning)
- Use these data to make curricular or pedagogical changes
- Test the effectiveness of the changes
- Confirm student learning

1. Assess, confirm, and improve student learning through systematic collection and analysis of information about learning.
2. Tell the story of assessment through documentation of evidence-based assessment.

Chapter 1: Summary of Assessment Progress Reflected in 2009 TracDat Reports

Achievements of 2008-2009 Assessment in Academic Programs (Majors and Minors):

Of the 46 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- 96% (44) have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- 83% (38) have articulated action taken to improve student learning.
- 57% (26) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action;
- 52% (24) have documented improvements in student learning on TracDat.

The academic programs (majors and minors) have made excellent progress in moving from 9 programs to 24 programs which have documented improvements in student learning. Our institutional ratio of direct to indirect measures is 77% to 23%, which is indicative of a productive focus on direct assessment. Indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

Eleven new programs launched assessment plans in 2009-2010 and seven more will be launching assessment plans in 2010-2011. Of the eleven, ten have collected actionable results, and three have taken action to improve learning.

	Sept. 2008	Sept. 2009		Goals for Sept. 2010
		Goals	Actual	
1) Establish a plan: outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods	100%	11 new programs developed assessment plans and are collecting data.		7 new programs have a plan
2) Collect actionable data and draw conclusions through analysis	92%	100%	96% (44/46) Did not meet goal; Up from last year	100%
3) Take action to improve student learning	73%	90%	83% (38/46) Did not meet goal; Up ten percentage points from last year.	90%
4) Test the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action	18%	50%	57% (26/46) Exceeded goal	70%
5) Tell the performance story	Viterbo University Annual Assessment Report	1) Viterbo University Annual Assessment Report		1) VU Annual Assessment Report 2) Annual Assessment Awards

Chapter 2: Examples of Improvements

As a result of rigorous work in assessment, academic programs are confirming the impact of improvements made. Twenty-four of the forty-six programs (52%) have now confirmed learning following evidence-based pedagogical or curricular changes.

The programs are:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Management | 13. English |
| 2. Marketing | 14. Servant Leadership (MASL) |
| 3. Business Administration (MBA) | 15. Natural Science |
| 4. Management and Information Systems--Online | 16. Psychology |
| 5. Art | 17. Social Work |
| 6. Music | 18. Women's Studies |
| 7. Music Education | 19. Education Leadership—Principal (graduate licensure) |
| 8. Music Performance | 20. Education (MAED) |
| 9. Biology | 21. Dietetics |
| 10. Biopsychology | 22. Nursing |
| 11. Broad Field Social Studies | 23. Nursing Completion |
| 12. Chemistry | 24. Nursing (MSN) |

Examples of Improvements in Student Learning in Eight Programs: 2008-2009

1. Master of Business Administration

Students in the Master of Business Administration program have benefitted from increased student learning for several of the program's six learning outcomes. For example, for Critical Thinking, the program has tracked results from three direct methods (legal case briefs; submission of the research project (specifically evaluation of alternatives and details of methodology and analysis); synthesis of literature and data analysis; and one indirect method—an exit survey. Although the criteria have been met for all the methods, in several instances, faculty in the program were not satisfied with the depth of achievement and made several changes designed to deepen critical thinking. In 2007, faculty noted that procrastination appeared to be an issue in student learning for critical thinking. As a result, faculty modified the research project to include assessment of and feedback on the literature review. Follow-up results in 2008 were higher. In 2008, faculty went on to send students a recommended timeline for work in addition to several examples of research projects. Follow-up results in 2009 indicated that the revised process benefitted student learning.

2. Music, Music Performance, and Music Education

The three music programs share several components of a common assessment plan, with each program adding learning outcomes for its particular emphasis. One of the four common learning outcomes is Music Performance: "Students demonstrate skills requisite for artistic self-expression in voice or piano and proficiency in keyboard, sight reading, and conducting." As a result of assessment workshops in 2005, faculty identified a weakness in sight reading as an element of learning in their programs. In Spring 2006, two new courses in Sight Singing

(MUSC 116 & 117) were developed to address this need. The courses were first offered in 2006-2007 as pilots and became required for all music majors beginning in 2007-2008. Assessment results in Spring 2008 met the criterion; however, faculty identified a need to define the criteria for “fluency” in sight reading and to develop a more rigorous Sight Singing exam. In Spring 2009, the new rubric was used to assess the more rigorous exam, and the criterion was met.

(See the Music Sight Singing Rubric in the Appendix.)

3. Biology

The Biology program continues to improve student learning through assessment: the framework of clearly articulated and understood outcomes is followed by alignment with teaching strategies and assessment methods. The department works together on an ongoing basis to collect and analyze results, take action, and follow up on the action. Biology exemplifies the depth of improvement that comes from ongoing, collaborative efforts to improve learning.

One example of improved learning through department-wide efforts:

Although the criterion for the **Bio 251** lab report was met, discussion revealed dissatisfaction in the achievement in communication in upper division courses. Two levels of action were taken: 1) the development of the rubric; 2) faculty work on mapping out the development of lab writing in four core courses leading up to and including 251. There were two levels of follow-up results: in 2008, 92% of student in 499 got 80% or higher in communication and in 2009 results in 251 confirmed student learning.

(See the Biology Writing Rubric and Biology Report in the Appendix.)

4. Chemistry

The basis for assessment in Chemistry is seven clearly articulated learning outcomes. Each outcome is aligned with at least two methods of assessment. The program is on a timeline for assessing outcomes, collecting results, taking action, and seeing improvement in student learning. One person coordinates assessment (the chair); however, the department as a whole is involved in assessment work and reflection.

Chemistry made a significant improvement in assessment practice in 2008 when faculty shifted from analyzing the scores on the entire ACS exam to collecting and analyzing selected exam questions that align with the learning outcome of Problem Solving: “Students apply theory, laws, and experimental information to solve chemical problems.” This shift made the assessment more authentic and actionable. When they made the shift, some of the criteria were not met.

For example in 2008 results for one area, 34 percent of students scored above the fiftieth percentile. Faculty concluded that although they were not surprised at the results, they were disappointed in them. The department concluded, “It points out the need for more problems of this nature to practice on throughout the two semesters. It also indicates the need to bring bonding structural ideas into the second semester course.”

After the 2008 results and analysis, the instructors made pedagogical changes, giving students more opportunity to develop problem solving.

Follow-up results in 2009 showed improvement in student learning: 56% of Chem/BioChem majors scored above the fiftieth percentile on selected questions on the ACS normalized national exam.

5: Social Work

Social Work has responded to the challenges of rigorous assessment expectations from their accrediting body by aligning its expectations with the broader best practices of assessment. The department works together in a cohesive assessment plan and is making ongoing improvements in pedagogy and curriculum to strengthen student learning.

One example of improvements in student learning is related to Critical Thinking: “Students demonstrate critical thinking in social work practice.” One of the direct methods of assessment is a course-embedded assignment in SOWK 441, the Policy Analysis Paper. The criterion established by faculty is that 80% of students will score 80% or better on the critical thinking rubric. In 2007, 66.67% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on this assignment: the criterion not met. Faculty reflected on the results and decided on two courses of action. In Fall 2008, 1) The instructor spent more time explaining this assignment to students and met one-on-one when asked. The action is focused on helping student understand the expectations of the assignment and the critical thinking processes required for the assignment; and 2) Policy analysis is introduced in SOWK 331 Policy I, and the instructor added additional content on the purpose and process of policy analysis. Follow-up results in 2008 confirmed learning: 93.33% of student achieved a score of 80% or better. Faculty then decided that although they had seen dramatic improvements, they wanted to gather results again in 2009-2010 because the cumulative measure from the two classes still fell below the program benchmark.

(See the Social Work Critical Thinking Policy Analysis Rubric in the Appendix)

6: Women’s Studies

Interdisciplinary programs such as the Women’s Studies minor face particular challenges in assessment work because courses are taught out of several different departments and there are no faculty dedicated exclusively to the interdisciplinary program. The Women’s Studies program has a vigorous assessment plan in place and has made improvements based on changes made following assessment results. One of the learning outcomes for Women’s Studies is Gender and Diversity: “Students understand how systems of privilege and inequality affect women’s lives.” The program tracks results from four methods—three of them direct and one indirect (an exit survey). In 2007, results for the understanding of Gender and Diversity were disappointing: 71% of the final research papers reveal satisfactory understanding of gender difference in relation to their major field of study. The Women’s Studies committee decided on an immediate change: they would build in “better advising prior to admission to the 400-level course. Several students had recently changed majors and were not really prepared to write papers related to their major fields even though they had enough credits to be classified a juniors.” A second change was to design a clear rubric for Gender and Diversity,

and when this was shared with students and applied, all results met the criterion. Students demonstrated a satisfactory level of understanding regarding systems of privilege and inequality and their effect on women's lives.

(See the Women's Studies Gender Diversity and Interdisciplinary Study Rubric in the Appendix.)

7. Nursing

The Bachelor of Science in Nursing responded to the challenges of a large number of majors and a large number of faculty by creating a committee on assessment. The committee then brings results to the faculty as a whole for reflection and action. The process of improvement in student learning is transparent and involves the faculty as a whole. A particular strength is the persistence of taking action to strengthen learning over a period of years.

One example of improvements in learning is for the outcome, "Uses therapeutic and professional communication skills." There are five course-embedded methods and one indirect method (a survey). This outcome was assessed in 2007 as part of the regular cycle of assessment. Criteria were met for all but two of the methods. One of the methods is selected exam questions related to therapeutic communication in N452. In 2007, 70% of the therapeutic communication questions were answered correctly and the criterion was not met. The assessment committee, in consultation with the instructor, decided to focus on the design of the exam. The committee reflected, "There were 35 communication questions on the A exams, 21 communication questions on B exams, and 28 communication questions on C exams. This is not equal distribution of communication questions in the sections." In 2008, the instructor used the statistics variance, Kuder-Richardson, difficulty and discrimination to assist in developing more reliable exam questions and distributed the communication questions more equally in all exams.

In 2008, follow-up results were still not satisfactory: "66% of the therapeutic communication questions were answered correctly. Not met." Faculty reflection is as follows: "There are 30 communication questions on exams A & C, 27 on exam B. The statistics on the exam questions have improved." Further action was taken: "The instructor plans to include communication strategies for students to analyze. She will forward her findings to the program assessment committee by 5/09."

In 2009, follow-up results showed improvement, as if reflected in the TracDat update: "82% of the students scored 79% or higher on therapeutic communication questions. This is close to the 80% benchmark. Each year there has been slow steady improvement on exam questions. By the final exam the students perform at a higher level." The program will follow up in 2009-2010.

(See the Nursing BSN Therapeutic Communication Rubric in the Appendix.)

8) Dietetics

Faculty in the Dietetics program work closely on ongoing assessment, and students have benefitted from improvements as a result of carefully-aligned efforts to strengthen learning. A

particularly innovative method of assessment is a longitudinal study on outcomes conducted in tandem with course-embedded outcomes. For the Communication outcome, five course-embedded methods provide a wide variety of methods at different levels. Results for the five course-embedded methods were collected in 2007 and 2008. Where criteria were not met, action was taken within the parameters of the course. One example of a change was in NUTR 400, on a written testimony assignment. When the criterion was not met, the instructor built in more time for planning, drafting, and revision as ways of strengthening written communication. Students were required to write an outline of the paper, and a system of guided peer response was designed. In 2008, program faculty designed a longitudinal study to gain an understanding of the value added to student abilities in written communication. Data was collected in a junior course and in a senior course, using a common rubric for this outcome. In 2008, the junior mean was 3.3 and the senior mean was 4.51. In 2009, the junior mean was 3.98 and the senior mean for 4.47. Faculty reflected on the value their program has added for students in written communication: "The 2009 graduating class (n=13) mean communication skills were 3.98 in Nutr 371 and 4.47 in Nutr 476. Student writing and speaking scores increased by 0.49 points from the beginning of supervised practice to graduation. For the 2008 graduating class, communication scores increased by 1.21 points from fall of junior year to graduation."

(See the Longitudinal Report in the Appendix.)

Chapter 3: An Overview of Assessment Work in Academic Programs

Assessment Report for Dahl School of Business: Sept. 2009 Updates

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
Bus. Admin. (minor)**										New
4+1 BBA to MBA**										New
Accounting*	4	12	8	4	24	19	0	met & pending		
CIS*	5	5	5	0	4	1	0	met & pending		
Legal Studies (minor)**										New
Management*	5	12	12	0	22	14	6/15/2009	met & pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Marketing*	4	6	6	0	7	4	10/2009	met	Yes	
MBA*	6	22	16	6	20	14	8/10/2009	met & pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
MGIT*	7	37	19	18	12	0	0	mostly met		
MGIT Online*	7	36	17	19	8	1	0	mostly met		Excellent move in doing a separate online program assessment
OMGT*	7	37	17	20	9	1	10/15/2008	mostly met		
OMGT Online*	7	37	17	20	7	0	0	met		Excellent move in doing a separate online program assessment
Sport Management & Leadership**										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11

* One of the 46 academic programs established in assessment as of 2008-2009.

** A new program.

Assessment Report for the School of Fine Arts: Sept. 2009 Updates

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
Art*	7	7	7	0	13	15	9/25/2009	met & pending	Yes	Good work with one direct method: adding a senior-level method.
Arts Administration*	12	39	30	9	44	2	0	met & pending		
BA Music*	4	12	10	2	21	15	5/14/2009	met & pending	Yes	Strengthening learning through assessment.
BM Music Education*	5	21	19	2	40	26	5/14/2009	met!	Yes	Strengthening learning through assessment.
BM Music Performance*	5	21	19	2	40	27	5/14/2009	met!	Yes	Strengthening learning through assessment.
Music Theatre*	7	13	13	0	3	0	0	2 met & 1 not met		
Theatre - Acting*	6	22	22	0	1	1	0	not met		
Theatre - BA*	8	23	23	0	0	0	0	no results		
Theatre - Design Tech*	22	38	28	10	36	0	0	1 met & 32 not met		
Theatre - Ed*	13	11	11	0	0	0	0	no results		
Theatre - Stage Management*	9	21	21	0	4	0	0	4 met		

* One of the 46 academic programs established in assessment as of 2008-2009.

** A new program.

School of Letters and Sciences: Report from Sept. 2009 Updates

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
Assoc Arts/Science*	3	24	19	5	13	4	0	mostly met		
Biochemistry*	8	11	10	1	8	3	0	6 met, 2 not met	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Biology*	8	16	14	2	30	9	8/9/2010	met or action taken	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Biopsychology*	8	14	11	3	24	7	9/29/2009	met or pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Broad Field S.S.*	21	28	28	0	25	19	8/20/2009	met or pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Chemistry*	7	12	8	4	69	4	9/9/2009	met or pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Clinical Lab Science**										New in 09-10
Comm - Organizational Communication**										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11
Comm - Visual Communication**										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11
Criminal Justice*	7	19	12	7	8	1	0	met or pending		
English*	6	14	14	0	9	6	0	met or pending	Yes	Using assessment to make improvements
Environmental Studies*	5	11	9	2	18	1	0	all met		
Individualized Learning*	3	14	10	4	18	5	0	mostly met		
Latin American Studies (minor)**										New plan in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11

School of Letters and Sciences: *continued*

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
Liberal Studies*	3	3			0	0	0			The plan was on hold for task force decisions.
Master's of Art in Servant Leadership*	9	16	11	5	21	14	8/17/2008	met and pending	Yes	
Mathematics*	6	6	6	0	18	1		met		
Ministry*	8	11	11	0	41	84	5/23/2009	mostly not met		
Natural Science*	6	20	15	5	14	1	9/9/2009	met	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Philosophy**										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11
Psychology*	7	30	27	3	92	77	9/23/2009	met or pending	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Social Work*	13	70	31	39	37	10	8/18/2009	met or pending	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Sociology*	7	18	10	8	7	2		met or pending		
Spanish*	8	13	12	1	6	2		all met		
Sport Science & Leadership**										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11
Women's Studies*	3	10	8	2	21	14	8/7/2009	met after changes	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements

* One of the 46 academic programs established in assessment as of 2008-2009.

** A new program.

Assessment Report for the School of Education: Sept. 2009 Updates

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
LIC: WI - Specialist Reading	8	9	9	0	0	0	0			
LIC: WI - Teacher Reading	4	5	5	0	4	5	0	met & pending		
LIC: IA - 5-12 Teacher Reading	4	4	4	0	1	0	0	met		
LIC: IA - Early Childhood	6	9	9	0	2	0	0	met		
LIC: IA - Ed Leadership	6	6	6	0	3	3	0	met		
LIC: IA - K-8 Teacher Reading	4	4	4	0	1	0	0	met		
LIC: IA - Middle School	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	met		
LIC: IA - Specialist Reading	8	8	8	0	1	0	0	met		
LIC: WI - Dir Instruction	7	21	14	7	21	0	0	met & not met		
LIC: WI - Dir Special Education & Pupil Services										New in 09-10: will collect results in 10-11
LIC: WI - Early Childhood	5	9	9	0	2	0	0	met		
LIC: WI - Ed Leadership - Principal*	7	21	14	7	42	9	10/30/2009	met & pending	Yes	Use of assessment to strengthen learning.
LIC: WI - Post Bac Teaching	11	23	23	0	35	1	2/24/2010	all met		
Master's of Art in Education*	2	3	2	1	5	8	9/24/2008	met	Yes	Use of assessment to strengthen learning.
Undergrad Program*	11	23	23	0	46	0	0	met & not met		

* One of the 46 academic programs established in assessment as of 2008-2009.

** A new program.

Assessment Report for the School of Nursing: Sept. 2009 Updates

Program Name	Outcomes	Methods	Direct Methods	Indirect Methods	Results	Actions	Last Follow-up	Learning confirmed	Improvements made through assessment	Notes
BSN*	9	47	40	7	57	34	9/22/2009	met & pending	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
BSNC*	9	54	47	7	90	78	11/19/2009	met & pending	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Dietetics CP*	11	41	40	1	64	12	2/2/2009	met & pending	Yes	Use of assessment to make improvements.
Dietetics DI										
MSN*	7	31	13	18	29	26	9/24/2009	met & pending	Yes	Use of assessment for improvements; adding iWebfolio portfolio as direct assessment method.

* One of the 46 academic programs established in assessment as of 2008-2009.

** A new program.

Part III: General Education Assessment

The focus of the 2009 report on General Education Assessment is on assessment of core abilities in undergraduate academic programs. The overarching purpose of the report is to understand how the core abilities are currently brought to fruition in academic program assessment. The report has two foci: 1) an inventory of core ability assessment in the majors; 2) an analysis of improvements made in written communication through assessment. The 2009 report is based on assessment work accomplished during the 2008-2009 academic year, with some follow-up results from fall 2009.

Inventory:

The inventory of core abilities assessment answers the following questions:

- 1) To what extent are the core abilities incorporated into learning outcomes for majors and minors?
- 2) What can we learn about the current assessment practices employed in assessing general education core abilities in the majors?

The core ability focused on in the 2008-2009 assessment work is Written Communication and is based on the Sept. 2009 updates in TracDat, the software utilized by Viterbo as a repository of assessment results, analysis, and improvements.

Analysis of Written Communication Assessment:

The analysis of assessment results for Written Communication answers the following questions:

- 1) What is the level of student achievement in Written Communication as revealed in assessment in the academic programs?
- 2) What are some examples of how Written Communication has been strengthened through evidence-based action in disciplinary-based assessment?

The overarching purpose of the report is to understand how the core abilities are currently brought to fruition in academic program assessment. This descriptive study straddles ongoing educational aims of the current general education program and the emerging redesign of the general education curriculum. It is anticipated that conclusions will inform the assessment plan for the redesigned general education program.

Limitations of the Report:

Although the focus of the report is on use of the core abilities for undergraduate program-level assessment, it is erroneous to conclude that the presence or absence of core ability learning outcomes is an indicator of the quality of assessment in the programs. Faculty were not and are not expected to assess the core abilities in their majors; therefore, there is much nuanced and productive assessment work occurring in the undergraduate programs which does not utilize the core abilities as learning outcomes. The fact that 31 out of 42 established undergraduate programs include a learning outcome on communication indicates nothing negative about the eleven programs which do not have an explicit program-level learning outcome on communication.

A second limitation of this study stems from its descriptive nature. The primary source of the report is the annual updates on TracDat, Viterbo's repository of assessment reports, and the extraction of information for the inventory is limited to the classifications explicit in the repository. This limitation is readily apparent in the extraction of information related to the core ability of Thinking. Many programs have an explicit learning outcome with the heading of "Critical Thinking." Others do not. The study also includes learning outcomes which explicitly align with the core ability outcome, "Students engage in the process of inquiry and problem solving." Learning outcomes with the descriptors of reasoning, problem-solving, or analysis were also included in the inventory of program-level outcomes which align with the core ability of Thinking. Learning outcomes which were primarily focused on knowledge of content were not included under the classification of Thinking for the purposes of this inventory.

Chapter 4: Inventory of Core Abilities Assessment

The following inventory includes the 42 established undergraduate programs at Viterbo University. It does not include the programs launched in 2009-2010.

Core Ability	Number / Percentage	Results	Action or Criteria Met	Learning Confirmed	Notes
Thinking	29/42—71%	18/29—62%	18/18—100%	15/18—83%	
Ethical Decision Making	23/42—56%	12/24—50%	12/12—100%	11/12—92%	
Communication	31/42—76%	26/31—84%	25/26—96%	22/26—87%	22 of the 31 programs assess oral communication; 29 of the 31 programs assess written communication. Most programs have developed rubrics which are well aligned with the learning outcome.
Aesthetic Sensitivity	8/42—20%	7/8—86%	7/8—86%	7/8—86%	This core ability is assessed primarily in programs in the School of Fine Arts and the School of Nursing
Cultural Sensitivity	11/42—27%	11/11—100%	11/11—100%	9/11—82%	The eleven programs that have articulated a Cultural Sensitivity or Diversity outcome demonstrate a commitment to understanding student learning. These programs are improving learning through assessment.
Community Involvement	4/42—10%	4/4—100%	4/4—100%	4/4—100%	While departments require community service, only four articulate a program-level learning outcome related to the core ability.

With 76% of programs assessing communication and 87% of these programs confirming learning through assessment practices, Communication is a core ability that is well developed in students' major programs. There were numerous rubrics used, and there are commonalities between rubrics.

The eleven programs that articulate Cultural Sensitivity as one of their learning outcomes are rigorous in collecting results, taking action, and working to confirm learning.

Ethical Decision Making evidently presents some challenges for assessment in the programs. While 23 programs articulate Ethics as a learning outcome, only 50% have results on this outcome. Of the 12 which have collected results, 100% have either confirmed learning or have taken action to improve learning. There were few rubrics posted in TracDat.

Aesthetic Sensitivity is articulated as a program-level learning outcome by programs in the School of Nursing and in the School of Fine Arts. This core ability is infused through many of the learning outcomes at the program level in the School of Fine Arts and is articulated at the sophisticated disciplinary level.

Examples of Inquiry into Student Learning

I. Communication

Students speak and write to suit varied purposes, audiences, disciplines, and contexts.

School	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
DSB	Management	Comm. (W)	MGMT 243 Writing Assignment (grid)	2 rounds of results – not met	Changes in course	Not yet met; more action	Yes
SFA	Art	Comm. (W&O)	Soph review	2008 results- not met	Address in FY & SO courses	2009 results, met	Yes
SFA	Arts Admin	Comm. (W)	AADM 300 written assign & oral pres.	2009- met for both parts		Learning Confirmed	Yes
SLS	Biology	Comm. (W)	251 Lab report	2007- met, not satisfied	Develop rubric; Map out development of lab writing in four core courses (159,161,250,251)	2008: 92% in 499 got 80% or higher (loop closed) 2009-met in 251	Yes
SON	BSN	Comm. (O)	432 oral presentation	2007: 100% scored 80% or higher		Learning Confirmed	Yes
SON	BSN	Comm.	432 exam questions	2007: 70% of Qs were correct, not met	2007: develop more reliable Qs; distribute Qs more equally in all exams 2008: add comm.. strategies for students to analyze in class 2009: Will reassess.	2008: 66% of Qs were correct, not met. Action on Qs is successful. 2009: 82% scored 79% or higher. Close.	Yes
SON	DIET	Comm.	Longitudinal Study In NUTR 371 and NUTR 476	2008: Jr. Mean: 3.3 Sr. mean: 4.51	Various changes in particular courses. I.e.: in NUTR 400, require student to write an outline and include peer editing activity.	2009: Jr. mean: 3.98 Sr. mean: 4.47	Yes

Articulation of the Outcome at the Program-Level

Management: Learners demonstrate the ability to apply communication skills in a practical business setting

Art: Write, speak, and research effectively: Students will write, speak, and research effectively about art, art criticism, and art history.

Arts Administration: Students will be able to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing

Biology: Experimental design: design and implement experiments independently, and analyze and present data to the faculty and peers in a competent and professional manner. Two of the sub-outcomes are: present the completed research project in a written form based on departmental guidelines; effectively communicate results of research project to faculty and peers orally.

Bachelor of Science in Nursing: Uses therapeutic and professional communication skills

Observation: Program-level outcomes relate to the Core Abilities to differing degrees of disciplinary specificity. Four of the five examples introduce the disciplinary lens into the articulation of the outcome. For Biology, oral and written communication are sub-levels of the program outcome, Experimental Design. Management specifies the setting, “in a practical business setting,” while Nursing specifies the type of communication, “therapeutic and professional communication skills.” Arts Administration’s articulation of the core ability is more general. These same variations are seen in all 33 programs with this outcome.

Alignment between Outcome, Method, and Assessment Tool

At the intermediate level, **MGMT 243**, the outcome is assessed through a Writing Assignment Scoring Grid using a course-embedded written assignment. The grid is organized by the following criteria: clarity, grammar and punctuation, sentence and paragraph structure, word choice, and showing trust and respect. The criterion is 80% will receive 80% on the scoring rubric.

For Art, the intermediate level is the Sophomore Portfolio review. The criterion is a 2: student sometimes articulates ideas clearly; is developing a historical context of art; exhibits adequate writing skills. Each faculty member evaluates the portfolio using the descriptor for “Write/Speak/Research” on the commonly-developed rubric.

One of the assessment methods **for Biology** for this outcome is at the sophomore level in 215, using a course-embedded lab report. Although the criterion of 75% of students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the grading rubric was met in 2007, discussion about the results led to the realization of dissatisfaction with written and oral performance in upper-level courses. One of the changes made was to develop the rubric, which now specifies the following criteria: introduction, methods, results, discussion, presentation, overall aims.

Arts Administration assesses communication at the proficient level in AADM 300 through a written and oral presentation and uses an oral presentation rubric (non-verbal skills, verbal skills, and content) and a writing rubric (organization, structure, content knowledge, global importance, historical context, grammar and spelling, style, format, citations). The criterion is that 80% of students will score 75% or higher. It appears that the score is on the rubric as a whole, not exclusively on particular aspects of the rubric.

For **Nursing**, a proficient level of assessment for oral communication is in 432 through an oral presentation, which is scored with an oral presentation rubric (content, thoroughness, research, clarity, delivery, media). The criteria is that 80% of students will achieve a score of 80 or higher on the rubric. In the same course, selected exam questions are used to assess the achievement level of student learning related to therapeutic communication.

Use of Assessment Results for Improvement in Student Learning

Intermediate-Level Assessment Results Required Action

Initial assessment results for the three intermediate-level methods—in Management, in Art, and in Biology—all resulted in faculty dissatisfaction and further action to improve learning. The inquiry into student learning using thoughtful assessment methodology and the good practice of faculty reflection, resulted in meaningful action to strengthen learning.

Although the criterion for the **Bio 251** lab report was met, discussion revealed dissatisfaction in the achievement in communication in upper division courses. Two levels of action were taken: 1) the development of the rubric; 2) faculty work on mapping out the development of lab writing in four core courses leading up to and including 251. There were two levels of follow-up results: in 2008, 92% of student in 499 got 80% or higher in communication and in 2009 results in 251 confirmed student learning. Learning is confirmed.

In Management, results in 2007 did not meet the criterion: 55% received an 80% or higher in a course-embedded writing assignment. Follow-up results in 2008 still revealed a deficit: 67% received an 80% or higher. The action taken was to refine the assignment and to revise the lesson plan to address the dissatisfaction. Further follow-up results in 2009 indicated a down-turn when 53% scored higher than 80%. Three action plans were set in motion: 1) use outline format; 2) make first draft mandatory since in Spring 09, the average score of those submitting the first draft was 80%; those not submitting the first draft was 68%; 3) take class time to review the writing grading rubric assuring more attention to detail. Faculty plan to follow up on results in the 2010-2011 year.

In Art, the results of sophomore review of 2008 for the communication outcome were not satisfactory to Art faculty. While the criterion is 80% of sophomores should score “2” or higher on the sophomore review, only 67% of students scored above “2”. The action taken was to develop faculty seminars to enhance professional development in order to then address this outcome in freshman and sophomore courses. Follow-up results in 2009 showed an improvement: 80% of students (10 out of 12) scored above 2. The average score was 2.3. Faculty are now considering adding a senior-level review process.

Proficient-Level Assessment Results: Confirmation in Two and Action in One

Of the three examples from the proficient level of student learning, two results were satisfactory to faculty and learning was confirmed.

Nursing:

Method: N452 Exam questions related to therapeutic communication.

Criterion: 80% of the students will score 80% or better on the sum of the exam questions.

Results from 2007: 5/17/2007: 70% of the therapeutic communication questions were answered correctly. Not met.

Reflection: There were 35 communication questions on the A exams, 21 communication questions on B exams, and 28 communication questions on C exams. This is not equal distribution of communication questions in the sections.

Action: 5/17/2007: Use the statistics variance, Kuder-Richardson, difficulty and discrimination to assist in developing more reliable exam questions. Distribute the communication questions more equally in all exams.

Follow-up Results: 4/10/2008: 66% of the therapeutic communication questions were answered correctly. Not met.

Reflection: There are 30 communication questions on exams A & C, 27 on exam B. The statistics on the exam questions have improved.

Action: 4/10/2008: The instructor plan to include communication strategies for students to analyze. She will forward her findings to the program assessment committee by 5/09.

Follow-up Results: 4/16/2009: 82% of the students scored 79% of higher on therapeutic communication questions. This is close to the 80% benchmark. Each year there has been slow steady improvement on exam questions. By the final exam the students perform at a higher level.

Action: 4/23/2009: will be reassessed in the 09-10 academic year.

Method: Class Presentation (with rubric)

Criterion: 80% of students will achieve a grade of 80 or higher on the class presentation assignment.

2007 Results: 5/17/2007: 83 students out of 83 scored 80% and higher on the small group class presentation on violence and abuse. Criterion Met.

Dietetics: Communication: Students will effectively communicate both orally and in writing with a wide variety of audiences.

Course-embedded assignments (both oral and written) in Nutr 341, 373, 476, 400, 473, 470.

Results: Data collected in 2007 and 2008. Where criteria not met, action taken within the course.

For example: in Nutr 400, on a written testimony assignment: 37.5 had low scores for organization of the speech and 25% forgot to include their claim in their speech. Two students (24%) showed poor writing mechanics, and three students forgot to attach their references. Criterion not met.

Action: 2/11/2008: Require students to write an outline of the paper before writing a final draft.

Make time for a peer editing activity before the paper is turned in.

Longitudinal Study: In NUTR 371 and NUTR 476

2008: Jr. Mean: 3.3; Sr. mean: 4.51

2009: Jr. mean: 3.98; Sr. mean: 4.47

05/13/2009 - 2009 graduating class (n=13) mean communication skills were 3.98 in Nutr 371 and 4.47 in Nutr 476. Student writing and speaking scores increased by 0.49 points from the beginning of supervised practice to graduation.

For the 2008 graduating class, communication scores increased by 1.21 points from fall of junior year to graduation

II. Ethical Decision Making

Students respond to ethical issues, using informed value systems.

School	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
DSB	Management	Ethics	Field Pract.	Met criterion; not satisfied, 83% receive 35/50	Add ethics comp. to field prac. course, 481	Improvement: 100% receive 35/50	The rubric is aligned with guideline for project; not with outcome
SLS	Broad Field Studies	Ethics	Written short answer in 370	75% will score a 2: not met in 2008 2 scored 1 and 1 scored 0.	2008: identify and clarify arguments and require written resubmission	2009: 2 scored 2. Loop closed.	Yes
SLS	Ministry	Ethics	Reflection paper for portfolio	2007: 75% of student claims are demonstrated.	2009: 1) enhanced rubric; 2) add unit in RLST440; 3) guide majors through self-assessment process		Yes
SLS	Psychology	Ethics	Case study	2007: met 2008: not met	2007: continue 2008: add case studies that are based on research. Use an evaluation instrument that includes research & therapy scenarios.	2009: met	No rubric for case studies provided

Articulation of the Outcome at the Program-Level

Management: Ethical Decision Making: Learners demonstrate sound ethical decision making skills to resolve workplace problems.

Broad Field Studies:

- Ethics: articulate an understanding of the ethical aspects of historical issues.
- Professional Ethics: practice the professional ethical standards of the discipline of history.

Ministry: 3.4: Conduct self in a manner consistent with the professional codes of ethics in ministry and provisions of civil and Church law

Psychology: Ethics: identify, describe, and apply ethical guidelines, principles and standards of the APA in their understanding of research and practice in psychology and related fields.

Observation: Many program-level outcomes related to Ethics apply the framework of the professional or disciplinary code of ethics. Psychology, Ministry, and Broad Field Studies all articulate an outcome in terms of the professional ethical standards. Management is focused on resolving workplace problems through an ethical framework.

Use of Assessment Results for Improvement in Student Learning

Ministry: Ethics: Conduct self in a manner consistent with the professional codes of ethics in ministry and provisions of civil and church law.

Criterion: 100% of students will articulate a clear understanding of the code of ethics.

2007: 75% of student claims are demonstrated through appropriate documentation. Not met.

2009: None of the four portfolios contain theological grounding, there was a lack of intellectual inquiry, and a lack of gratitude on the part of the student. There seems to be a disconnect between coursework and their portfolio.

Action: 1) Develop a plan for encouraging students to point to specific examples in their coursework. This will be developed in common courses, such as Theology of Pastoral Ministry in Fall 2009. 2) The student reflection tool will be revised to ask for course-specific references for this outcome. Students will continue to complete a self-assessment twice each semester. As we meet with students regarding their portfolios, we will be discussion with them their strengths, growth areas, and lack of integration between ideas and experience.

Action: 5/05/2009 1) An additional unit has been added to RLST 440 due to the issues of codes of ethics and working with children.

Broad Field Studies: Ethics: Students articulate an understanding of the ethical aspects of historical issues.

In History 370, History of modern Asia, a course which is required of all History majors, a written response is assigned with the following prompt: You are the new British Governor General of a province in imperial India. Do you stop the practices of widow burning and female infanticide, or allow these practices to continue? Rubric: Zero (0) if the response shows no understanding of the ethical aspects of the issues; one (1) if the response demonstrates a basic understanding of the ethical aspects of historical issues; and a two (2) if the essay has a nuanced understanding of the ethical aspects of historical issues. Criterion: 75% of the BFSS majors will score a 2 for a nuanced understanding of the ethical aspects of historical issues.

In Spring 2008, two students scored a 1 and one student scored a 0. Not met.

Action: 7/22/2008: In follow-up class discussion, identify and clarify arguments and require written resubmission.

Follow-up: Fall 2009: Two students scored a 2. Criterion Met. Will continue assesses this outcome.

Psychology: Ethics: identify, describe, and apply ethical guidelines, principles and standards of the APA in their understanding of research and practice in psychology and related fields.

Method 1a: Students will address ethical issues in PSYC 351 in a case study format.

Criterion: 75% of students will be average or better in their understandings of the ethical issues presented in a case study format; they will identify the ethical concerns that occur within the case study.

Method 1b: Student will assess/evaluate their ethical decision-making skills before and after PSYC 351 with a multiple-choice test.

Criterion: 75% of students will increase their ethical decision-making skills by the end of PSYC 351.

2007 Results for Method 1a:

9/21/2007: 8 out of 9 students (88%) were able to adequately describe 2-3 potential ethical problems embedded in a case, and this included accurately identifying and applying APA principles and guidelines, explaining what the potential ethical violation was, and describing the best practice (possible solutions). Criterion met.

Action: Repeat the case study learning strategy in the spring 2008 semester. Introduce Method 1b: the pre- and post-test in 351.

2008 Results for Method 1a:

9/30/2008: Students in groups successfully identified three to five ethical practices in the case study scenarios. All groups found/identified at least four ethical violations and were able to articulate steps toward a resolution. The case studies were limited to therapy related ethical issues.

2008 Results for Method 1b:

9/30/2008: There was very little difference between the pre- and post- test. No students performed at the 75% level.

Analysis: The case studies were intended to not only provide students with some sense of real world ethical problems but to increase their scores on the multiple choice examination.

Unfortunately, the case studies that were origination by the Wisconsin Psychological Association (WPA) were used. The strength of these case studies is that they were field tested and based on real-life situations drawn from the WPA ombudsman. The weakness of the case studies was that they were all therapy based. Our assessment tool (pre-and post-test) was largely research based. Criterion not met.

Action: We will use the WPA case studies but add case studies that include research-based ethical dilemmas. We will also use an evaluation instrument that includes both research and therapy scenarios.

2009 Results for Method 1b:

9/23/2009: 82.3% of students earned average scores or higher in addressing the ethical issues presented in the case study format. More specifically, 52.9% of students were above average in this area, and 29.4% of students were average. 11% of students were below average (one student did not do well and one student did not do the assignment). Criterion Met. The loop is closed. Learning was confirmed. This method will continue.

2009 Results for Method 1a:

100% of students increased their ethical decision-making skills by the end of the PSYC 351 per a self-assessment measure. More specifically, at the beginning of the semester, 11.8% rated themselves as having ethical decision-making skills somewhat, 23.5% thought they had average ethical decision-making skills, 47% believed they had above average ethical decision-making skills, and 17.6% rated themselves as having excellent ethical decision-making skills. At the end of the

semester, 29.4% of students rated themselves as above average in ethical decision-making skills and 70.6% believed their ethical decision-making skills reached the level of excellent. Criterion met. This method will continue along with other methods of evaluating ethics. The learning has been confirmed with this method.

III. Thinking

Students engage in the process of inquiry and problem solving.

School	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
SLS	Biopsychology	Critical Thinking	Oral Pres. On internship/research experience in 448	2008: met: 5/5 received 80%+ on presentation. 2009: not met 5/6 received 85%+ on pres.	2009: Criterion of 90% may be too high based on small class sizes; therefore change criterion to 80% in future		Rubric (not clearly aligned with critical thinking)
SLS	English	Read critically (analysis)	SoPo & GradPo	2007: av. Score: 1.55 not met	2007: created 255 2008: dept. developed rubric and instructions.	2008: av. Score for SLO1: 1.95, not met, but better.	Yes
SLS	Social Work	Critical Thinking	Policy Analysis Paper in 441	2007: 66.67% scored 80%+, not met	2008: more time explaining assign. & 1-1 sessions with students. 2008: added content on policy analysis in 331	2008: 93.33% scored 80%+. Monitor for one more semester	Yes
SLS	Natural Science	Scientific Reasoning	Oral Pres. In 397	2008: 100% of Bio students in 397 scored 80%+		2009: 100% of student in 397 scored 80%+ (1 nat sci major)	

Program-level Outcomes:

English: Critically read and analyze a variety of texts.

Natural Science: Correctly analyze and interpret scientific data based on sound scientific reasoning.

Biopsychology: Demonstrate critical thinking skills in writing and verbal communication in core classes.

Social Work: Demonstrate critical thinking in social work practice.

English:

Nov. 2007: 100% of SoPos reviewed showed evidence of ability to critically read and analyze a variety of texts at a beginning or developing level. Criterion met.

Action taken to address general weaknesses in program-level learning outcomes: Nov. 2006 – Feb.

2007: Create Engl 255, Sophomore Colloquium: to develop a community of scholars and to develop skills required for the SoPo.

Action taken to address weaknesses in the assessment process: June 2008: department developed descriptions for all four levels for all six SLOs. The chair used these description in English 227 and 427, spring course in which students collect material for their portfolios and draft the essay that reflects on their development of the SLOs and supports claim with documents in their portfolios.

Oct. 2008:

Using the new rubric, 2007 average SoPo score for SLO1: 1.55

2008 average SoPo score for SLO1: 1.95

Criterion not met.

Reflection: Sample size makes large claims difficult to defend, but 2008 students who has taken the new English 255 did have better scores for this SLO.

Action: Follow up with results from students who have taken English 255.

Follow-up: 9/14/2009: Average SoPo score for SLO 1: 2.3. Criterion met. Will continue to measure this SLO.

Natural Science:

Method: Oral research proposal presentation in BIOL/CHEM 397.

Criterion: 80% of students will “meet or exceed expectations” in two descriptors on a rubric: 1) Student reasons through and/or answers questions well from panel members on background information of proposal” and 2) “Student can effectively discuss modifications and improvement to proposed methods with panel members.”

9/08/2008: 100% (16/16) of Biology student in BIOL 397 received a score of 80% of higher on their final student oral presentation.

8/10/2009: 100% of student in BIOL 397 (13/13) receive of score of 80% of higher on the final student oral presentation. (One nat sci major)

Criterion met.

Social Work:

Method: SOWK 441 Policy Analysis Paper

Criterion: 80% of students will score 80% or better.

2007 Results: 66.67% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on this assignment. Criterion not met.

Action in Fall 2008: 1) The instructor spent more time explaining this assignment to students and met one-on-one when asked. The action is focused on helping student understand the expectations of the assignment and the critical thinking processes required for the assignment.

2) Policy analysis is introduced in SOWK 331 Policy I, and the instructor added additional content on the purpose and process of policy analysis.

2008 Results: 93.33% of student achieved a score of 80% or better. Criterion met.

Action in 2009-2010: While the cumulative measure from the two classes still falls below the program benchmark, there has been dramatic improvement. We will again collect and analyze results in 2009-2010.

IV. Aesthetic Sensitivity

Students engage in and critically reflect upon artistic experiences.

School	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
SFA*	Arts Admin	Aesthetic Sensitivity	Indirect: Alumni Survey	7/2008: 85.7% of alumni were "extremely" or "quite" confident	Criterion met		None provided NB: only one method, the survey.
SFA	Music Performance	Performance: Demonstrate skills requisite for artistic self-expression in voice or piano.	Five direct methods (performance juries & exams) and one indirect method (survey)	Results from 2007 – 2008 were met	The criteria for the direct methods were raised	2009-2010 results are mixed, with two of the methods not meeting criteria.	Rubrics for each of the methods, commonly designed and used
SFA	Theatre Design Technology	For example, Outcome 5: demonstrates a working knowledge of two-dimensional and three-dimensional design aesthetics.	Two direct methods: portfolio review and senior thesis	Senior Thesis: Average 3.75 on Question 1 and 3.5 on Question 6 Portfolio Review: criterion met Portfolio: Senior average, 4: criterion not met	No actions articulated		Rubrics included
SON*	BSN	Aesthetic Nature: values the unique aesthetic nature of persons and the environment	Four direct methods: synthesis paper, clinical evaluation, and mid-level paper	Results from 2008-2009: criteria met	Action taken to revise the rubric	Rubric revised and applied	Rubric attached

Program-level Outcomes:

Arts Administration: Student will be able to compare and evaluate the aesthetic value within and across various arts disciplines.

Nursing: Students will value the unique aesthetic nature of persons and the environment.

Arts Administration

The one method for measuring this learning outcome in the Arts Administration program is an alumni survey which is deployed every two years. Seventeen alumni responded. In July 2008, 85.7% of alumni were "extremely" or "quite" confident in "the depth and thoroughness of their experiences in 'comparison between arts disciplines.'"

Nursing

Four direct methods:

N461: Synthesis Paper, with the criterion of 80% of the student will score 80% or better using the rubric. Results from May 2009: 100% of the students scored 90% or higher on the synthesis paper.

N482: Clinical Evaluation, with the criterion of 100% of students will demonstrate satisfactory performance using a clinical evaluation form. Results from May 2009: 100% of student in a sample size of 16, demonstrated satisfactory performance.

N322: Mid-level assessment Course Assignment, with the criterion of 80% of student will score 80% or greater on the assignment using the rubric. Results from Sept. 2008: Assessment committee reviewed the assignment and made recommendations to lead faculty for the course; the lead faculty submitted changes. Results from April 2009: 80% of the students scored 80% or greater.

V. Cultural Sensitivity

Students understand their own and other cultural traditions and demonstrate a respect for the diversity of the human experience.

School	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
SLS	Psychology	Biopsychosocial & Multicultural Perspectives	For example: embedded exam questions in 351.	2007: 100% described 4 to 5 cultural factors that may influence test results. 2009 76.4% identified three or more cultural issues that affect psychological testing in the form of an answer to an essay question.	Criterion met	For other methods, for which the criteria have not been met, action is focused on the collection of results.	For other methods, yes.
SLS	Social Work	Diversity	For example: Cross Cultural Interview	Sept. 2008: 88% of students achieved a score of 80% or better.	Criterion met.		Rubric included
SLS	Women's Studies	Gender and Diversity	Three direct methods. One example: 400 Research paper	Sept. 2007: 71% achieved the benchmark. 2009 results?	Criterion not met	1. Better advising about experience in major before taking the course; 2. Design rubric	Rubric included
SON	BSN	Cultural Sensitivity	Three direct methods in N452: Exemplar paper, clinical evaluations, and case study.	Results of 2008 and 2010 confirm learning in exemplar paper and clinical evaluations. 2008 for case study: not submitted 2010: 37.5% of students successfully answered Qs 1&2. Not met.	1. Questions will be strengthened; 2. More detailed instructions will be given; 3. Case studies will be reevaluated prior to fall 2010.		Rubric included

Program level Outcomes:

Nursing: Cultural Sensitivity: displays cultural sensitivity in promoting health of individuals, families, and groups.

Women's Studies: Gender and Diversity: Students will understand how systems of privilege and inequality affect women's lives.

Social Work: Diversity: Practice with respect and skill related to clients' age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation, and demonstrate knowledge of regional special populations including the elderly, Hmong, physically or mentally challenged and persons living in rural areas.

Psychology: Biopsychosocial and Multicultural Perspectives: students will be able to analyze and evaluate issues and events from biopsychosocial and multicultural perspectives.

Nursing:

Methods:

1. *Exemplar Paper in N452*: 80% of students will successfully demonstrate cultural sensitivity, scoring 80% or better using the rubric.

Results of April 2008: 80% of students scored 80% or greater on the assignment. Criterion met.

Results of March 2010: 80% of students scored 80% or greater on the assignment. Criterion met.

2. *Clinical Evaluation in N452*: 80% of students will earn a satisfactory on 7.A.

Results of April 2008: Greater than 80% of students earned a satisfactory on the clinical evaluation. Criterion met.

Results of March 2010: 100% of students earned a satisfactory grade in clinical performance of cultural sensitivity. Criterion met.

3. *Case Study in N452*: 80% of students will successfully answer questions 1 & 2 on the case study guide

Results of March 2010: 37.5% of students successfully answered questions 1&2. Criterion not met. Action: 1. Questions r/t case study will be strengthened to more directly measure student evaluation criteria (see attached). 2. More detailed instructions will be given to students at the time of the administration of the case study. 3. Ethical/Cultural diversity case studies will be reevaluated prior to fall 2010. This outcome will be reassessed in second rotation 2010-2011 because faculty member will be on sabbatical the third rotation.

Results of Sept. 2009: Results not forwarded to Program Assessment Committee. Faculty teaching content within N452 no longer at the university. Criterion not met. Action: By Oct. 2009, the committee chair will talk with faculty teaching N452 about providing a measure for cultural sensitivity.

Women's Studies:

Examples of Methods:

Gender Diversity Assignment in WMST 100: 75% of students will score 80% or better.

Results from Aug. 2009: 100% of students scored 80% or better. Criterion met.

Journal Assignment in WMST 400: 75% of students will reveal a satisfactory understanding of gender difference based on the Diversity rubric.

Results from Aug. 2009: 100% of WMST 400 journal reveal a satisfactory (21 points out of 35) or better. Criterion met.

Final Research Paper in WMST 400. 75% of students will reveal a satisfactory understanding of gender difference in relation to their major field of study.

Results from 2001, 100%; from 2003, 80%; from 2005, 87%. Criterion met.

Results from 2007: 71% of research papers met the criterion. Criterion not met. Action: 1) Provide better advising prior to admission to the 400 level course. The student who failed this course had recently changed majors and were not prepared to write papers related to their major fields even though they had enough credits to be classified as juniors. 2) Design a rubric.

Social Work:

Examples of Methods:

1. *SOWK 280 Social Work Interviewing Cross Cultural Interview Assignment.* The class mean score for this assignment will be 80% or better.

Results from Sept. 2008: 88% of students in Fall 2007 achieve a score of 80% or better. Criterion met.

2. *Student Exit Survey* (items D1, D13, D22, D30). Scores will meet or exceed national norms. Results from Jan. 2009: All five classes (2004-2008) rated their ability to practice with respect and skill related to client diversity higher than the national averages. Criterion met. Results included.

3. *Employer Survey* (item 2). Graduates will meet or exceed national norms.

Results from Jan. 2009: Two of the classes of 2003, 2005, and 2006 exceed national norms, while ratings by employers from the class of 2006 fell below the national norms. Criterion not met. Action: Survey data will be examined again in the 2009-2010 academic year to monitor this outcome.

Psychology:

Methods:

1. *Reaction Paper:* 75% of students will be able to identify two compelling reasons why the standard middle class white perspective is limited in human development.

Results of Sept. 2008: In PSYC 220/EDUC 220, students wrote reaction papers to a multicultural article; however, official data was not collected and kept. Criterion not met. Action: Move the method to a major course, PSYC 149.

Results of Sept. 2009: All students discussed and wrote a paper on a Multicultural article in PSYC 149; however, it is unknown just how many students addressed two reasons. Criterion not met. Action: The criterion and/or the article used needs to be reevaluated. Changes will be made to one or both by the next time the class is taught.

2. *Essay on the integration of multicultural perspectives in 449.*

Results of Sept. 2008: The essay was not done, but the information was completed by incorporating it into the posters presented at a Viterbo Poster Session. Criterion not met.

Action: Most discussion needs to occur within the department about several items needing to be accomplished in 449.

Results of Sept. 2009: The method was implemented and students addressed multicultural issues in their posters; however, more specific data needs to be collected in the future. Criterion not met. Action: more specific data will be collected regarding students' understanding of multicultural issues.

3. *4-6 Multiple choice test questions on biopsychosocial perspectives.* Delayed in 2008 because of adjunct faculty member teaching the course. Action: New full-time faculty member will be providing assessment data from the biopsychology courses.

4. *Embedded exam questions in PSYC 351.* 75% of students in 351 will identify three out of five or more cultural issues that affect psychological testing in the form of an essay on a test. Results of Sept. 2009: 76.4% of students in 351 identified three or more cultural issues that affect psychological testing in the form of an answer to an essay question. Criterion met. Results of Sept. 2007: 100% of students were able to accurately identify suitable tests for working with children, adults, and a geriatric population. They were also able to explain what these tests measure, and also they were able to describe 4 to 5 cultural factors that may influence test results. Criterion met.

5. *Weekly quizzes in PSYC 340.* Students will respond correctly at 60% or higher. Results of Sept. 2007: Students have responded at an 80% level on weekly quizzes. Criterion met. [Apparently, this method has been discontinued as there have been no further results.]

VI. Community Involvement

Students demonstrate social responsibility by serving their communities.

	Program	Outcome	Method	Results	Action	Follow-up	Rubric
SFA	Art	Community Service	Sophomore review	2008: Median score 1.7, criterion not met	Faculty seminars will enhance professional development in order to address this outcome in freshman and sophomore classes	Pending	Yes
SFA	Arts Administration	Community Involvement	Self assessment of 10 hours of community service per year	2008: 100% of students completed service to the arts community during the 2007-2008 year			
SLS	Sociology	Service	Pre-test and post-test administered in SOCL 149/249	2007 and 2008: criterion not met	2009: Add discussion board component to both courses. SOCL 149 to be completed in groups; SOCL 249 to be completed independently with career-focused placements	Pending	NA
			Exit survey administered to graduating seniors in SOCL 465	2007 and 2008: aggregated average score on this survey item was 4.75, with a criterion of at least 4.0 on the 5.0 scale	Criterion met		
SLS	Women's Studies	Service	Activism Project in WMST 100	2009: 100% of students received a minimum of 90% on their report	Criterion met		Service rubric
			Service Learning Project in WMST 400	Results from 2001,2003,2005, 2007, and 2009	Criterion met, 2001-2005 Not met in 2007.	In 2007, action taken to improve rubric for students and assessment 2009: 100% score 94% or above	Service rubric

Program Learning Outcomes:

Art: Community Service: Students will become arts advocates and participate in community arts and service. A) Positively represents self as an active artist; B) Effectively speaks and educates the public about art and art making; C) Aids in the creative development of others; D) Provides artistic services to the community.

Arts Administration: Community Involvement: Students will engage within the arts community (both on and off campus) in a volunteer capacity.

Sociology: Service: Students will demonstrate and value responsible citizenship by providing service and leadership in their communities.

Women's Studies: Service: Students learn by serving women and/or a non-profit women's organization.

Using Assessment Results to Make Improvements:**Art**

Art majors participate in a sophomore review process which is focused on the learning outcomes for the major, including Community Service. Results from 2007 and 2008 indicate the criterion was not met. In 2008, the median score was 1.7 and 50% of students scored above 2. The action taken was to hold faculty seminars in order to address this outcome in freshman and sophomore classes.

Arts Administration

Arts Administration majors complete an annual end of year self assessment of their learning progress in the arts field and their involvement in the process. Students are expected to complete a minimum of 10 hours of service to the arts community each year. In 2008, 100% of students completed service to the arts community during the 2007-2008 academic year. The criterion was met. In the self-assessment, students are asked to "list any arts-related community service projects or activities (on or off-campus)" and the time spent in each activity. Arts-related community service projects included ushering, acting, serving as stage manager or assistant stage manager or on the costumes crew.

Women's Studies

In the capstone course of this interdisciplinary minor, WMST 400, students are required to participate in a 14-hour service project that assists women and/or girls in the community. Analysis of results in 2001, 2003, and 2005 indicated that the criterion of 75% of students scoring a minimum of 80% on the service project rubric had been met. In 2007, the criterion was not met: five out of seven students (71%) completed a minimum of fourteen hours of service and turned in a completed verification form and a satisfactory self-assessment. Several actions were taken: 1) May 2007: closer faculty supervision of service projects; 2) Sept. 2007: Provide better advising prior to admission to the 400-level course to ensure that students have sufficient experience in their majors before enrolling in the capstone course for their minor; 3) redesign the service rubric and apply it to students who have completed the assignment. Follow-up results in 2009: 100% of students who completed the 14-hour service project scored 94% or above on the WMST 400 service rubric. Criterion met. Learning confirmed.

Sociology

In SOCL 149/249, a Human Services Experience pretest and posttest is administered. The criterion is that scores on relevant items will decrease by an average of at least .5 points from the pretest to the posttest and/or average at least 2 on the posttest. Results from 2007 and 2008: Scores averaged at least 2 on the posttest, with the exception of item 49 in Fall 2007 and item 42 in Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. However, scores did not decrease by an average of at least .5 points from the pretest to the posttest for any item, with the exception of item 47 in Fall 2007. The criterion was not met. Action taken in May 2009: Add discussion board component to both courses. SOCL 149 to be completed in groups; SOCL 249 to be completed independently with career-focused placements.

Chapter 5:

Using Assessment Results to Improve Written Communication

Inquiring into student learning, using that knowledge to make improvements, and relaying the information to constituents are the three primary areas of undertaking in good assessment work. The second focus of the General Education Assessment Report for 2009 is on student achievement in the core ability of written communication as demonstrated in the majors. This portion of the report aggregates the assessment results on written communication in the majors and presents an analysis of the ways programs are strengthening written communication. One of the limitations of this analysis is that it is backward-looking; that is to say that the process of institutional-level assessment was not planned before the collection of the results. This limitation is minor, however, because the understanding gained through assessment results in the majors includes a majority of the undergraduate programs at Viterbo University, and the articulation of this learning outcome shares as many commonalities as divergences. The analysis of student achievement in written communication yields valuable information to the university as a whole. Additionally, the story of improvements made in written communication on the program level offers a riveting narrative. The undergraduate programs which had established assessment plans in 2008-2009 are as follows:

Dahl School of Business

Accounting
Computer Information Systems
Management
Marketing
Management and Information Technology

Management and Information Technology
Online
Organizational Management
Organizational Management Online

School of Fine Arts

Art
Arts Administration
Music
Music Education
Music Performance
Music Theatre

Theatre: Acting
Theatre
Theatre: Design Technology
Theatre: Stage Management
Theatre Education

School of Letters and Sciences

Associate of Arts and Associate of Science
Biochemistry
Biology
Biopsychology
Broad Field Social Studies
Chemistry
Criminal Justice
English
Environmental Studies
Individualized Learning

Liberal Studies
Mathematics
Ministry / Religious Studies
Natural Science
Psychology
Social Work
Sociology
Spanish
Women's Studies

School of Education

Undergraduate Education Program

School of Nursing

Nursing

Nursing Completion

Dietetics

Undergraduate, degree-seeking students in academic programs in Fall 2008, 1,903 (For example, undeclared majors and pre-professional majors are excluded from this total.)

- Thirty-one of the 42 established undergraduate programs assess communication at the program level. (N.B.: Assessment of the core abilities in the majors was not an expectation for program-level assessment in the Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Framework.)
- The number of students in programs which assess written communication at the program level is 1,750, or 91% of the total number of 1,903.
- Twenty-six of these 31 programs have assessment results as of 2008-2009 and 25 of those 26 either confirmed learning or took action to make improvements.
- Twenty-two programs have confirmed achievements in written communication, many after following up on changes made to strengthen learning. Ninety-one percent of students enrolled in academic programs which assess communication are in programs that have confirmed written communication at the level indicated by their established criteria.
- Eighty-three percent of our total undergraduate, degree-seeking students are in programs that have confirmed learning in written communication—either by following up on improvements made or by meeting their criterion. Out of the total of 1,903 undergraduate, degree-seeking students in academic programs, 1,586 students are in programs which have confirmed learning in written communication—either by following up on improvements made or through meaningful assessment results.

Understanding student achievement in written communication at the program level has led many programs to make pedagogical or curricular changes. Follow-up results have shown improvement in students' abilities in written communication. The following examples of improvements in student learning—from the Sciences, Social Sciences, the Humanities, and from a professional program—provide a glimpse of Viterbo University's effectiveness in preparing students for life and work in the 21st century. The strengthening of student learning occurred in the context of good assessment practices: the ongoing, systematic collection of information on student learning which is then analyzed and acted upon. Inquiry into students' ability to write effectively in the disciplinary framework has led faculty to make curricular changes. One example of a curricular change at the program level is from the Biology program. Although the criterion for written communication of a research project was met, the conversation about the results prompted discussions about unsatisfactory upper-division writing. Faculty then work out a curricular plan for intentional development of lab writing in four core courses. In the History department faculty made the decision, based on assessment results, to increase the number of credits of the first of

two senior-level research courses from two to three to provide more time for development of writing skills as well as of research skills. A commonality in pedagogical improvements is that three of the four programs have focused on the process of writing. Psychology, History, and Dietetics faculty have intentionally built the process of drafting, feedback, and revision into their courses to enhance student achievement in writing. For example, in a senior-level Dietetics course, the instructor has added a submission of the outline of the paper as well as guided peer editing before the final paper is submitted. In several Psychology courses, faculty have given more time and attention to the process of writing and through the development of rubrics to guide students in their work as well as to guide faculty in their assessment of the work. As a result of these focused improvements, students in these programs are benefitting from curricula and pedagogy which supports higher achievements in written communication.

Biology:

Two of the sub-outcomes of Experimental Design are: present the completed research project in a written form based on departmental guidelines; effectively communicate results of research project to faculty and peers orally.

One of the assessment methods **for Biology** for this outcome is at the sophomore level in 215, using a course-embedded lab report. Although the criterion of 75% of students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the grading rubric was met in 2007, discussion about the results led to the realization of dissatisfaction with written and oral performance in upper-level courses. One of the changes made was to develop the rubric, which now specifies the following criteria: introduction, methods, results, discussion, presentation, overall aims.

Although the criterion for the **Bio 251** lab report was met, discussion revealed dissatisfaction in the achievement in communication in upper division courses. Two levels of action were taken: 1) the development of the rubric; 2) faculty work on mapping out the development of lab writing in four core courses leading up to and including 251. There were two levels of follow-up results: in 2008, 92% of student in 499 got 80% or higher in communication and in 2009 results in 251 confirmed student learning. Although learning has been confirmed, the department is continuing to collect results as students proceed through the program.

Broadfield Social Studies:

Communication: Students will effectively communicate historical facts, themes, interpretations, and theories.

The History department tracks student learning in communication on three levels of learning, with direct measures for each level.

1) Basic

Embedded exam question (short paper or a short essay on an exam based on a case study) in History 111. Criterion: 75% of the BFSS students will earn a score of 7.5 or better on three relevant categories of the rubric used to evaluate the paper: organization, interpretation with primary sources, and analysis with examples. In Fall 2008: 100% of the BFSS students scored 7.5 or better. Criterion met.

2) Developed

Mid-way interview, self-evaluation, and department evaluation. Criterion: 75% of the BFSS majors will receive a rating of satisfactory or exceptional on at least four of the six students learning outcomes. Fall 2008: Two students scored unsatisfactory on this SLO. 2009: 4 students earned satisfactory; 1 student earned exceptional on this SLO. Action: During the 2009-2010 year, the history faculty will discuss adding a 1 credit course for first and second year students that will introduce the students to the philosophy, concepts and methodology of the discipline of history. The intent is to make these attributes more explicit than implicit in the survey courses.

3) Competent

In History 466, senior BFSS majors complete a capstone project, which includes a written research paper of approximately fifteen pages in length, including both primary and secondary sources and an oral presentation of research, approximately 25 minutes in length, in which the student expresses defensible historical interpretations based on evidence. In 2007, six of the seven students (85.77%) received a rating of satisfactory or above on the written research paper, using the rubric. 85.77% received a rating of satisfactory or above on the oral presentation, using the rubric. Although the criteria were met, history faculty took several actions to strengthen student learning: 1) continue to emphasize the importance of time management and the dangers of procrastination; 2) In Fall 2007, History 465 will add a semester hour of credit to make it a three-credit course. The extra time will be used in the fall semester to allow students to do initial exploration of topics for their spring semester research paper; 3) In their proposal, students should include a historiographic review of their topic to explain how their chosen topic is linked to an important historic issue; 4) assign individual research problems to students based on their topics, asking them to find examples of different kinds of sources in response to a particular question posed; 5) post example of A,B,C, and CD/D papers in the course website in Blackboard and ask student to skim them, noting the strengths and weaknesses of each; 6) emphasize the importance of the mandatory individual conferences to discuss the progress of their work. Follow-up Results in 2008: 100% of the students met the criterion for the oral defense (average score of 92.5) and 100% of students met the criterion for the research paper (average score of 86.7). Criterion met. Action: In Fall 2009, students will 1) be assigned a short research problem closely related to a proposed topic to investigate potential sources, and 2) receive specific instructions on a literature review that incorporates basic historiography on a selected topic.

Dietetics: Communication: Students will effectively communicate both orally and in writing with a wide variety of audiences.

Course-embedded assignments (both oral and written) in Nutr 341, 373, 476, 400, 473, 470. Results: Data collected in 2007 and 2008. Where criteria not met, action taken within the course.

For example: in Nutr 400, on a written testimony assignment: 37.5 had low scores for organization of the speech and 25% forgot to include their claim in their speech. Two students (24%) showed poor writing mechanics, and three students forgot to attach their references. Criterion not met.

Action: 2/11/2008: Require students to write an outline of the paper before writing a final draft. Make time for a peer editing activity before the paper is turned in.

Longitudinal Study: In NUTR 371 and NUTR 476

2008: Jr. Mean: 3.3; Sr. mean: 4.51

2009: Jr. mean: 3.98; Sr. mean: 4.47

05/13/2009 - 2009 graduating class (n=13) mean communication skills were 3.98 in Nutr 371 and 4.47 in Nutr 476. Student writing and speaking scores increased by 0.49 points from the beginning of supervised practice to graduation.

For the 2008 graduating class, communication scores increased by 1.21 points from fall of junior year to graduation.

Psychology

Writing Conventions: Students will be able to apply appropriate writing conventions in a variety of academic and professional contexts.

Assessment of Writing Conventions occurs in several courses—from 149 to 330 to 351

There are five course-embedded direct methods (papers, research proposal, exit exam, reports, and an assignment) and an exit survey in 330.

Action includes: focused drafting, feedback, and revisions, intervention with students, adapting texts to provide more examples of APA, refining rubrics and using them with students, a four-credit course in the 07-09 catalog.

Methods (two of six):

1) In PSYC 149, students write papers on psychological topics that include correct APA references and citations for books and/or journals. Criterion: 75% of students will appropriately utilize APA citations and references for books and/or scholarly articles in their papers (a score of 3), and they will be included as entries in their e-portfolios. Results from Fall 2006: 48% of students received a score of 3. Criterion not met. Action in 2007: New sources from only APA journals will be used. Follow-up Results from Fall 2007: 56% of student received a score of 3. Criterion not met. Action in 2008: More in-depth assessment of the APA style references and citations needs to be completed. The matrix will be adjusted to reflect a 5-point scale and APA style references and citations will be a separate section. Follow-up Results from Fall 2009: 88% of students scored average or higher on their papers that required appropriate APA citations and references. Criterion met. Follow-up action in 2009: 1) continue with the draft process of writing papers; 2) Add/change any necessary elements to the rubric and implement the use of the rubric more.

2) In PSYC 300, student write a research proposal. Criterion: 75% of students will receive an average score or higher on their research proposals. Results from Fall 2007: Criterion not met. Action from 2007: 1) develop a rubric for the research proposal; 2) meet with any student who misses three classes or who is not passing at mid-semester; 3) a student self assessment of APA style will be given at the beginning and end of the semester. Results from Fall 2008: 15 out of 17 received an average score or higher on their research proposals. Action: Change the criterion to “100% of the students in PSYC 330 who complete the course in the semester time frame will pass with a C or above.” Results from 2009: 92.3% of student earned an average score or higher. Criterion met. Action: Update rubric to help more with drafting, feedback, and grading.

Chapter 6:

General Education Assessment and Redesign

Viterbo University's Current General Education Model

The current general education model, which has been in place since the mid-1990's, is a distributive model. Viterbo's general education program provides students a foundation of core abilities upon which programs build. The core abilities are:

1. **Thinking:** Students engage in the process of inquiry and problem solving.
2. **Ethical Decision Making:** Students respond to ethical issues, using informed value systems.
3. **Communication:** Students speak and write to suit varied purposes, audiences, disciplines, and contexts.
4. **Aesthetic Sensitivity:** Students engage in and critically reflect upon artistic experiences.
5. **Cultural Sensitivity:** Students understand their own and other cultural traditions and demonstrate a respect for the diversity of the human experience.
6. **Community Involvement:** Students demonstrate social responsibility by serving their communities.

The total general education distribution requires 45 credits, distributed in the following subject areas:

- English Composition (G1) – 6 credits*
- Religious Studies (G2) – 6 credits
- Philosophy (G3) – 3 credits
- History (G4) – 3 credits
- Fine Arts (two areas) (G5) – 4 credits
- Literature (G6) – 3 credits
- Natural Science (G7) (laboratory experience required) – 4 credits
- Social Science (G8) – 3 credits
- Liberal Studies Electives (G9) – 13 credits

In addition, students must also meet competencies in writing, math, and science. Students complete a service learning component in their major program or department. Additionally, students are required to take six credits of courses with a Diversity Overlay and one course in Environmental Awareness Overlay.

Assessment of General Education: 2006-2008

The oversight of general education at Viterbo is currently the responsibility of the General Education and Undergraduate Academic Policy committee (GEAUP). From 2006-2008, a GEAUP subcommittee conducted pilot projects for assessing the general education core abilities of communication, thinking, and ethical decision-making. With no pre-existing assessment plan in place for general education, the subcommittee asked each department to submit senior-level work that demonstrated these core abilities. The subcommittee designed, tested, and refined rubrics to assess the senior-level work; however, the results were

inconclusive because, as the committee chair noted, “few departments submitted student work” (“Viterbo University General Education 2007 Survey Results and Assessment Discussion”).

Cycle of General Education Assessment: 2006-2008

Summer 2006: General Education Assessment: Critical Thinking (pilot)

Summer 2007: General Education Assessment: Critical Thinking and Ethical Decision-Making (pilot)

Summer 2008: General Education Assessment: Ethical Decision-Making and Communication (pilot)

In Fall 2007, the GEAUAP committee conducted a survey to examine faculty perceptions of general education. The impetus for creating this campus portrait came from a desire to move forward with assessment of general education. Through a Title III grant, which paired active learning with assessment, a vibrant culture of assessment had been established in the academic programs, and the GEAUAP wanted to keep the momentum going for general education assessment. A second impetus came from the Self-Study conducted in preparation for the Higher Learning Commission’s comprehensive visit in October 2008. The survey was focused on three areas: specific components of Viterbo’s general education; how Viterbo’s general education might change; broad impressions of general education. One of the conclusions drawn by GEAUAP was that “the current assessment process for general education is flawed” (“Viterbo University General Education 2007 Survey Results and Assessment Discussion”). A second conclusion drawn from the survey results was that “the committee needs a process to review the overlays, competencies, and existing general education courses.” The committee chair also took note of a campus recognition that general education at Viterbo requires improvement and asserted that “there is on campus a great willingness to reexamine general education and make it better.” (V.U.G.E. 2007 Survey Results and Assessment Discussion”). The committee disseminated the survey results and their own conclusions on campus. The new academic vice president, Barbara Gayle, who began leadership at Viterbo in 2008, was asked to lead a process for change regarding general education.

Work Accomplished in the Redesign of Viterbo University’s General Education

In September 2008, Academic Vice President Barbara Gayle launched a general education task force of twelve members. For 2008-2009, the task force facilitated round table discussions as a means for defining the mission and goals of general education. The questions which shaped the round table discussions were: What is it we want our general education to look like? How does the liberal arts tradition play out in our own values? What does it mean to be an educated graduate of Viterbo University? (Minutes of GEAUAP, Sept. 25, 2008) By spring of 2009, the task force had a polished mission statement for general education, which was approved by the faculty by consensus. The task force is comprised of faculty from a wide range of disciplines (English, Philosophy, Music, Dietetics, Social Work, Theatre, Religious Studies, Biology, Computer Information Services, Mathematics), with representation from the Office of Global Education, the Center for Ethics in Leadership, the Registrar, and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research.

With the mission for general education in place, the focus in the 2009-2010 academic year will be on general education redesign. The process of general education design work is based on a consensus model, with small working groups of faculty creating key aspects of the new general education and bringing their work in drafts to the faculty as a whole for review, evaluation, and response. The goal is to include as many faculty members as possible in the leadership and in the creation of the new general education program, and to invite all faculty to participate in the process. A leadership team from the task force was formed in Fall 2009, and members of this team are the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences, a Nursing faculty member, and the Director of Assessment and Institutional Research. In the fall the task force was divided into three subcommittees, with the leadership team serving as chairs of the subcommittees. The three subcommittees are on assessment, structure, and engaged learning and high-impact practices. Each subcommittee will base its work on research, using the AAC&U's LEAP resources and other literature on general education, pedagogy, and assessment, as well as informal research on the practices of our benchmark and aspiration institutions.

Mission Statement: *In the tradition of our Catholic, Franciscan heritage and our firm foundation in the Liberal Arts, Viterbo University's general education program prepares students to live and work in our global society and affirm the dignity of all people, embrace a passion for justice, revere the natural world, and nurture a spirit of inquiry and a love of truth.*

Proposed Cycle of Assessment for General Education:

2008-2009: Current GE: Assess Written Communication at the summative level in the majors

2009-2010: Current GE: Assess Critical Thinking at the summative level in the majors / NSSE data for a supporting indirect measure

2010-2011: Transition Year 1: Assess Ethical Reasoning and Moral Development

Action in Seminar I and at the summative level in the majors

Appendix

Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Framework

I. Introduction

The central goal of the Viterbo University Academic Program Assessment Framework is to provide a structure for the continuous improvement of academic program quality. The framework is designed to accomplish two results for academic programs: 1) to gather information about the knowledge, abilities, and values of program graduates; 2) to use that information to improve teaching and learning in the program.

II. Framework

A. Each academic program articulates:

- a mission statement that flows from the Viterbo University mission statement
- program goals
- student learning outcomes for the program (suggested maximum:14)
- a curriculum map showing where learning outcomes tie into the courses in the curriculum and how they are developed over the entire program
- sources of assessment evidence and performance criteria for the assessments

B. As part of program assessment planning, programs should ensure that all course syllabi provide statements of student learning outcomes for the course and evidence that opportunities for learning linked to the student outcomes are incorporated in courses. Ideally, some of the student learning outcomes of any course in the program should link to program learning outcomes. Also, programs should ensure that faculty teaching courses provide students with criteria that will be used to assess their work in the course.

C. Programs are encouraged to develop a midpoint assessment. The midpoint assessment is a review at a certain point in time in the major that provides an opportunity to evaluate the student progress within the major discipline. It is an assessment designed to include components, chosen by program faculty, which allow faculty to judge progress towards program learning outcomes. Ideally, the midpoint assessment is course-embedded and receives a course grade. An individual student assessment provides the student with feedback concerning her (his) likely success as she (he) continues in the program. Collectively, midpoint assessments inform program faculty about what students are learning and not learning via the curriculum in place.

D. Programs should ensure that multiple points and types of assessment evidence are used to measure student learning outcomes:

Direct – assignments, tests, papers, projects, portfolios

Indirect – student surveys, graduate surveys, employer surveys, focus groups

E. Programs examine and use assessment findings annually to make changes for improvement. Programs have an eight year timetable for assessing all student learning outcomes for the program.

F. Programs must involve stakeholders and communicate with them regarding assessment initiatives. Stakeholders are students in the program, faculty, administrators, and advisory boards.

III. Annual Assessment Report (using TracDat system)

Each program is responsible for continual updates of the assessment plan and results on TracDat. An annual "Assessment Plan" and "Results by Assessment Method" report will be due the third Friday in September. The report will be collected electronically via the TracDat system. The timing of the report allows for budget plans to be prepared based on program assessment action plans, following in a chronological sequence. The report will be made available to: the chair of the department in which the program is housed; the dean of the school in which the program is housed; the academic vice-president; and the office of institutional research and assessment.

(See the Viterbo University Annual Report it will include each outcome in the Appendix.)

- Assessment methods, criteria, timeline, and how data will be used
- Results
- Action Plan
- Follow-up: What were the results of changes?

IV. Features of the Viterbo University Assessment Framework

A. It provides a learning-focused curriculum

The framework encourages assessment that is course-embedded and thus integral to teaching and learning. The framework asks that at least some assessments take place in the form of authentic tasks (e.g. papers, reports, projects, hand-created products, performances, reflection papers, presentations, etc.) This type of assessment enhances student learning and focuses on what students know and can do. Programs and individual faculty are asked to supply students with criteria that will be used to assess their work. With performance criteria, students obtain meaningful feedback from instructors regarding the assessment results. If performance criteria are linked to a course grade, student motivation for the tasks is increased. Outcomes and performance criteria should be provided to students before learning occurs so that students know and understand faculty expectations.

The course-embedded strategy asks faculty to define explicit student learning outcomes, and from these to develop criteria for judging student performance. It asks faculty to think about student learning in three ways: What are realistic and optimal learning outcomes? What learning strategies and experiences are best employed to obtain optimal learning outcomes? What is the best method for assessing a given outcome?

B. It provides the information necessary to improve program design

Faculty in programs articulate exit competencies for graduates. For students to achieve exit competencies, systematic and deliberate choice and sequencing of curricula in a program is necessary so that students progress developmentally toward the goals. Ideally, program faculty will cooperate in designing their courses such that each fits within the overall integrated and cumulative plan for learning. The framework asks for assessments to take place in courses and/or assessments applied to the entire curriculum of a program. Both sources of data may be used in program assessment, and ultimately, drive course revision and program change.

Academic Program Assessment Plan**A. Programs define and update continually:**

- 1. Program Mission Statement:** Identify the mission statement
- 2. Program Goals:** List statements that describe what the program intends to accomplish.
- 3. Outcomes:** List student learning outcomes (what students will know, be able to do, and value) for a student graduating from the program
- 4. Curriculum map:** Identify which courses and program components will contain teaching and learning directed towards achieving specific student learning outcomes.

B. Programs define for each outcome:

- 1. Assessment methods:** Indicate assessment methods that will be used to measure the outcome *at the program level*. Examples include student-level data such as portfolios, self-assessments, focus groups; aggregated course data; capstone data; standardized exams or exam questions; and qualitative data such as alumni or employer surveys.
- 2. Criterion for Evaluation:** For each assessment method, state the criteria for success or performance indicators that will be used to determine successful achievement of each outcome. Attach rubrics if applicable.
- 3. Timeline:** Describe the timeline for data collection for each assessment method. All outcomes should be evaluated over an 8-year period.
- 4. How will Data/Results be Used:** Describe a "who/when/how" for data analysis, action planning, and follow-up. Who will be responsible for each step? When will data be collected and analyzed? How will results be acted upon?

C. Results reported for each outcome, updated at least annually:**Assessment Impact**

- 1. Result:** Describe what the data analysis revealed. Include pertinent documents, tables, and spreadsheets. What program weaknesses (or strengths) were identified?
- 2. Action Plan (use of result):** What adjustments to the program were discussed and/or recommended? What are the specific changes that the program will implement based on the result? When will the results of changes be assessed?
- 3. Follow-up:** What did the follow-up reveal? Were the changes effective in resolving the weakness?

Examples of Improvements in Student Learning

- ***Music Sight Singing Rubric***

Assessment Form for Sight Singing

Intended Outcome: The ability to read and sign/play at sight fluently.

Performance Criterion: Students will sing ascending and descending major, natural minor, harmonic and melodic minor scales. Students will sing 3 excerpts including one in a major key, a minor key, and one with a modulation. Students may choose to sing with solfege, a neutral syllable, numbers or pitch names.

Ratings	3	2	1	
	Accurate pitches and rhythms, maintains pulse, secure tonal center	Makes errors in pitch or rhythm (4-8), pulse has slight irregularity	Makes 9 or more errors in pitch or rhythm, unable to maintain pulse	
Content Areas				Scores
Musical Excerpts				
Major				
Minor				
Modulation				
	3	2	1	
Ratings	Accurate	Makes an error but maintains tonality	More than 1 error, occasions of lost tonality	
Scales				Scores
Major				
Minor				
Harmonic Minor				
Melodic Minor				

Scores:

Pass = 21-16

Fail = 15 and below

Name of Student: _____ Date: _____ Faculty _____

- ***Biology Writing Rubric and Biology Report***

Plant Competition Formal Lab Report: Due at beginning of lab on Tuesday/Thursday March 17/19

60 points total

****Fill out a completed rubric (see next page) – attach to the top of your lab report.**

*****Include copies of all previous drafts (hypotheses, introduction and methods) at the end**

Include:

- 1. Title**
- 2. Introduction** (include feedback from earlier draft)
- 3. Methods** (include feedback from earlier draft)
- 4. Results**
 - a. Start with a brief overview of findings, but do not interpret
 - b. Do not include SPSS output, write all your results as we did in class
 - c. Include appropriate graphs and place them throughout results section (introduce when you refer to them in the text)
- 5. Discussion**
 - a. Start with a general statement paragraph of your overall findings, then discuss major results in detail. Explain whether your hypotheses were correct or not.
 - b. Do not include statistics (p-values, etc) – this should all be in the results section instead.
 - c. Put your findings into the larger context of other studies. Include at least 2 references (can be ones used in introduction) and compare to your findings to these (consistent or not consistent with your results?) Re-visit topics you presented in introduction.
 - d. Should be at least 2 pages long.
 - e. Address experimental error (but should not be the focus of your discussion)
 - f. End with a summary/wrap-up paragraph re-stating major findings and relevance of your study.

BIOL 251: Ecology and Evolution Formal lab report grading rubric

	Poor	Below average	Average	Above average	Excellent
Introduction and Title (20%)					
• title describes lab content concisely, adequately, appropriately					
• successfully establishes the scientific concept of the lab					
• background information clearly presented with sufficient detail of scientific concepts and principles					
• effectively presents the objectives and purpose of the report					
• states hypothesis and provides logical reasoning for it					
• includes appropriate peer-reviewed references (relevant to focus of experiment subject) – at least 3 references					
• incorporates feedback from previous drafts					
Methods (20%)					
• gives enough details to allow for replication of procedure (sample sizes, dates, locations, etc)					
• statistical analyses described					
• incorporates feedback from previous drafts					
Results (20%)					
• presents visuals clearly and accurately, properly labeled figures and tables					
• correctly interprets and reports results of statistical analyses and relevance to results					
• successfully integrates verbal and visual representations (appropriate reference to figures/tables – summarizes pertinent information in tables/figures)					
Discussion (25%)					
• clear explanation of how data support/refute hypotheses					
• backs up statement with reference to appropriate findings from experiment					
• provides sufficient and logical explanation for overall findings					
• clear discussion of how results are related to general scientific concepts addressed by the experiment (revisits topics from introduction)					
• sufficiently addresses other issues pertinent to lab (error, potential problems, etc)					
• addresses how findings compare to previously published findings (peer-reviewed papers) – at least 2 references					
• addresses any findings that are unexpected or unpredicted					
• convincingly summarizes with overall findings and concepts of experiment					
Presentation (15%)					
• citations and references adhere to proper format					
• format of tables and figures is correct					
• report is written in scientific style: clear and to the point					
• grammar and spelling are correct					
Overall Aims of the Report: <i>The student...</i>					
• has successfully learned what the lab is designed to teach					
• demonstrates clear and thoughtful scientific inquiry					
• accurately measures and analyzes data for lab findings					

Summary of Assessment Data on lab report writing

July 2007

Final lab report in Bio 251 results:

	Intro (out of 12)	Methods (out of 12)	Results (out of 12)	Discussion (out of 15)	Presentation (out of 9)	Total (out of 60)
average	11.04	11.29	10.17	13.77	8.02	54.33
Std dev	0.99	0.86	1.77	1.31	0.83	4.40

By major (out of 60)

average biology	54.27	(11 students)
average biochem	56.1	(5 students)
average biopsych	52.1	(5 students)
average chemistry	52.5	(1 student)
average Nat Sci	56.75	(2 students)

The faculty identified two issues:

1. When writing concepts are introduced in the core. It was decided that:
 - a. Bio 159: Individual tables and figures, a group lab report
 - b. Bio 161: One complete individual lab report, with an emphasis on the introduction
 - c. Bio 250: Minimum one complete individual lab report, with an emphasis on materials and methods
 - d. Bio 251: Minimum one complete individual lab report, with an emphasis on results and discussion.
2. Even with the high averages on the lab report in Bio 251, the faculty report poor writing skills in upper level classes. It was suggested that we need to have common guidelines in biology classes, and use common rubrics whenever possible, to build the skills introduced in the core.
 Action suggested: Jen, Michael and Ward would be a sub-committee on lab report writing during the 2007-2008 school year, and bring suggestions to the entire faculty. Also, we need to clearly identify what upper-division courses will require a full, individual lab report.

• **Social Work Critical Thinking Policy Analysis Rubric**

SOWK 441 Social Welfare Policy II-Grading Rubric for Policy Analysis Paper

	Exemplary (A/AB)	Good (B/BC)	Acceptable (C/CD)	Unacceptable (D/F)
Historical(10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precipitating factors • How previously handled • Change in policy overtime • Why analyze now 	9-10 points Thorough, comprehensive and insightful discussion. Rationale for current analysis addressed	7.5-8 points Adequate discussion.	6.5-7 points Some discussion but not very comprehensive or insightful.	5-6 points Not addressed or marginal in coverage. OR Information is inaccurate.
Problem Description(10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem identified • Extent of problem • Causes of problem • How policy addresses problem 	9-10 points Accurate, extensive and insightful discussion of problem and policy including extent and causes. Backed by statistics.	7.5-8 points Accurate and insightful discussion of problem and policy including extent and causes. Backed by statistics.	6.5-7 points Discussion of problem and policy including extent and causes. Some statistical background.	5-6 points Discussion of problem absent or minimal OR inaccurate Little or no statistical support.
Policy Description(20 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals/outcomes of policy • Population serve, eligibility, benefits • Administration of policy 	17-20 points Goal, population, eligibility, benefits thoroughly & accurately described. Agency responsible for administration identified	15-16 points Goal, population, eligibility, benefits described.	13-14 points Marginal description of goal, population, eligibility, benefits	10-12 points Missing required content OR inaccurately.
Policy Analysis(20 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale for policy • Values of policy • Consequences of policy • Feasibility of policy 	17-20 points All 4 criteria discussed. Analysis is coherent, reasonable and supported.	15-16 points 3 of 4 criteria discussed. Analysis is reasonable and supported.	13-14 points 3 of 4 criteria discussed. Analysis is not well supported or argument lacks coherence	10-12 points Marginal discussion of criteria. Analysis missing or very weak.
Policy Conclusion(20 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of policy • Recommendations 	17-20 points Exceptional demonstration of critical thinking & reasoning	15-16 points Strong demonstration of critical thinking & reasoning	13-14 points Some demonstration of critical thinking & reasoning	10-12 points Little or no demonstration of critical thinking & reasoning
Writing(20 points) Content/Reasoning Clarity & support of ideas/argument, ability to engage reader with content. Internal structure & development of ideas. Use of outline to organize the paper.	17-20 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of writing outstanding • Argument is well developed, logical & supported in depth • High level of critical thinking & sophistication of ideas evident • Writing is engaging • Organization around outline carries the paper 	15-16 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing clear • Argument develops logically and is supported • Content demonstrates critical thinking • Writing is interesting & informative • Outline and organization adequate 	13-14 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing unclear at times • Argument at times is illogical, unsupported or weak • Content is very basic, unreflective or lacks critical thinking • Writing is uninteresting, writer does not connect with reader • Some organization problems 	10-12 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is confusing • Argument unsupported or incorrect • Content is simplistic or superficial • Tone is inappropriate • Paper lacks organization. Info not appropriately placed in outline
Mechanics/Conventions Correctness of spelling, grammar, word usage, APA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent grasp of academic writing & format • Grammar & word usage are commendable • No punctuation/spelling errors • No citation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer demonstrates proper academic writing style & format usage • Minor problems in grammar word usage • Minor punctuation/spelling errors • Minor citation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of writing is inconsistent and distracting • Some problems with grammar and word usage • Recurring punctuation/spelling errors • Some citation errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing errors significant & detract from content • Grammar or word usage errors are noticeable & affect meaning • Many punctuation/spelling errors • Citations wrong or missing
Research Depth & quality of research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research is exceptionally relevant and current • Depth & breathe of research is substantial • Research is scholarly & authoritative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research relevant and current • Research adequate in breathe & depth • Research is authoritative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research has limited relevance or some outdated • Quantity of research is limited • Scholarly content & authority of research is questionable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research not relevant or outdated OR PLAGIARISM • Over reliance on a few articles limiting perspective • Materials used are not scholarly &/or appropriate

Name _____ See comments on paper. Thanks for your hard work this semester! Total points out of 100

- ***Women's Studies Gender Diversity and Interdisciplinary Study Rubric***

Rubric For Measuring Both the Gender Diversity and the Interdisciplinary Study Outcomes at the ADVANCED Level in WMST 400

The final paper in WMST 400:

effectively examines how privilege and oppression affect women's lives within one area related to the student's major field of study.

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

offers a convincing reason or reasons for the inequality or privilege it examines in the student's major field of study.

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

considers ways in which gender difference can be construed as a detriment and/or a strength in the student's major field of study.

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

effectively considers differences among the women examined in the student's major field of study (for example, differences of class, race, sexual orientation, religion, sexual orientation, ability, etc.).

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

thoroughly understands how gender diversity issues are applicable to the student's major field of study.

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

reveals sufficient research on gender diversity issues in the student's major field of study.

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

successfully places research on gender diversity in the larger context of research in the student's major field of study

Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

TOTAL SCORE: Satisfactory_____ Unsatisfactory_____

COMMENTS:

- **Nursing BSN Therapeutic Communication Rubric**

Viterbo University School of Nursing

Program Outcome Rubric for Therapeutic Communication

		Met	Not Met	Rater's Comments
Responsiveness to the context of the interaction	Communication is: *relevant to the situation.			
	Appropriate to the patient age and developmental level			
	Informed by evidence, education & experience			
	Goal oriented, focused on the need of client			
Demonstrated Skills	∞Active Listening Behaviors			
	∞Effective Communication Strategies			

Examples include but are not limited to:

*Communication is relevant to the situation:

- Behaviors fit the circumstance, i.e. student choice of therapeutic communication skills with a new mother of a healthy newborn would be different than if she just learned her child has significant disorders.

∞Active listening behaviors include:

- Attentive, non judgmental listening
- Appropriate use of touch
- Being present such as giving time and demonstrating noticing
- Using appropriate body language and interpreting body language of others

∞Effective communication strategies include using:

- Appropriate use of silence, empathy, summarizing, validating, clarifying
 - Non judgmental language
 - Advocating, mediating negotiating for the patient
- Assisting patients to access health information and interpret its

- *Dietetics Longitudinal Report*

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting Form

Course: Longitudinal data on communication Date: May 13, 2009

Outcome category

X Communication

Knowledge/Skill/Competency Statement :

Students will show proficiency in using communication skills in medical nutrition therapy and community nutrition

Evaluation Method:

Evaluation of professionalism evaluations were collected from the current senior class for the following courses: Junior year course Nutrition 371 and final semester senior level course Nutrition 476. Evaluations were completed by program faculty for Nutrition 371. Two evaluations were completed by clinical preceptors for Nutrition 476, one in medical nutrition therapy rotation, and one in community nutrition. All evaluations utilized the same grading rubric with scores for communication in clinical situations rated on a scale of 1 for “Beginner” to 5 for “Competent”

Benchmark Level

The mean values for communication scores in supervised practice settings will increase from junior year to final semester senior year.

Results

The following mean scores and range for critical thinking were computed:

Course	N	Range	Mean
Nutr 371	13	2.75-4.5	3.98
Nutr 476	13	3.5-5	4.47

The mean communication score increased by .49 points from the beginning of the junior year to the end of the senior year for students in the dietetics curriculum.

Corrective Action

No corrective action needed. The mean scores increased.

Signed _____ Karen Gibson MS RD CD CSSD _____

Discussed at Dietetics Department meeting on _____
(date)