



Academic Program Assessment Report: 2013-2014

Assessment Report: 2013-2014 Executive Summary

This report presents the work accomplished in Viterbo University's academic programs in understanding, confirming, and improving student learning. It summarizes the assessment results of the academic year 2013-2014. The report tracks progress made in assessment processes and practices and summarizes the use of assessment for improvements in student learning in undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and general education.

Strengthening Learning through Assessment in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Of the 60 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- All (60) have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- 100% (60) have articulated action taken to improve student learning.
- 93% (56) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action.

The academic programs continue to make progress in improving student learning through assessment. The emphasis is on direct measures; indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

The Academic Program Assessment Committee set goals for continued progress in the academic programs. These goals were shared with faculty in the Annual Program Assessment Report.

	Sept. 2008	Sept. 2009	Sept. 2010	Sept. 2011	Sept. 2012	Sept. 2013	Sept. 2014 Goals	Sept. 2014 Actual	Sept. 2015 Goals
1) Establish a plan: outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
2) Collect actionable data and draw conclusions through analysis	92%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
3) Take action to improve learning	73%	83%	89%	96%	98%	96%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
4) Test the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action	18%	57%	63%	78%	86%	92%	90%	93% (56/60)	100%
5) Disseminate Results	Results are shared with key constituents: faculty in department meetings, Deans' Council, cabinet members, and advisory groups								

**In 2013-2014, sixty of the academic programs are considered established programs. There are several programs which were discontinued, and several new programs which are on the five-year assessment implementation cycle.

The report presents many examples of improved learning and student achievement through assessment. One example of effective assessment is the work done by faculty in the Accounting programs: one program is delivered in a face-to-face format to traditional students and the other program is a degree-completion program delivered in a compressed hybrid format to adult learners. Faculty have aligned the curriculum, teaching methods, methods of measurement to four common learning outcomes: Communication, Problem Solving, Ethical Decision Making, and Legal and

Regulatory Environment. Although the curricular pathways are appropriately differentiated for the two different groups of students, the same outcomes are assessed and learning is confirmed following targeted adjustments for improvements. Several direct methods of measurement are common to both programs and results have led to changes in pedagogy / andragogy and to increases in student learning. On the legal and regulatory environment outcome, results led to the instructor allocating more classroom time to student analysis and discussion of text cases, by increasing student responsibility for case preparation before class, and by increasing the number of quiz questions based on comprehensive fact situations and increasing the point value of those questions compared to more straightforward analysis questions. This action resulted in a 2% increase in student scores overall, learning was confirmed, and the loop was closed.

Assessment Practice and Progress

Faculty oversight of academic program assessment is provided through the Academic Program Assessment Committee, and in 2013-14, the committee promoted the following:

- Developed and implemented the following faculty development activities: an expanded library of resources on the assessment web pages, workshops with departments on rubric development and curriculum mapping.
- Worked with the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research to host the annual Assessment Day in May 2014—with department consultations, guided work time by departments to support the collaborative work of assessment, and hosted a lunch.
- Established robust goals for assessment progress for the Sept. 2014 updates, which were met;
- Provided in-depth formative peer review on assessment work for the 13 academic programs a year before program review;

Assessing the LIVE Outcomes-based Core Curriculum

Assessment work in 2013-2014 encompassed seven of the eight LIVE learning outcomes. The common assignments in all four mission seminars were assessed in May and June 2014, with faculty and staff teams evaluating learning outcomes in a stratified random selection of assignments.

Following four years of targeted changes based on the assessment results, the criteria for outcomes measured in Franciscan Values and Traditions were all met. The continuous improvement stemming from assessment has included: targeted changes in the assessment methods and measurements, such as finer alignment between outcomes, assignments, rubrics, and guidelines; changes in the common text based on assessment results; refinement of the structure and curricular design of the mission seminars.

2013-2014 Core Curriculum assessment measured the following LIVE outcomes:

- Social Justice
- Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development
- Intercultural Knowledge & Action
- Integrative Learning
- Critical Thinking
- Information Literacy
- Written Communication

Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director
Office of Assessment and Institutional Research

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Status of 2013-2014 Assessment in Academic Programs.....	5
Minimum Expectations for Establishing Assessment in New Program	6
An Overview of Program Assessment by College	
College of Arts and Letters.....	7
College of Business and Leadership	15
College of Education, Mathematics, and Science	24
College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior	40
LIVE Core Curriculum: Assessment Overview	49
Assessment of Mission Seminars.....	49

Status of 2013-2014 Assessment in Academic Programs

This report presents the work accomplished in Viterbo University's academic programs in understanding, confirming, and improving student learning. It summarizes the assessment results of the academic year 2013-2014. The report tracks progress made in assessment processes and practices and summarizes the use of assessment for improvements in student learning in undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and general education.

Strengthening Learning through Assessment in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Of the 60 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- All (60) have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- 100% (60) have articulated action taken to improve student learning.
- 93% (56) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action.

The academic programs continue to make progress in improving student learning through assessment.

The emphasis is on direct measures; indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

The Academic Program Assessment Committee set goals for continued progress in the academic programs. These goals were shared with faculty in the Annual Program Assessment Report.

	Sept. 2008	Sept. 2009	Sept. 2010	Sept. 2011	Sept. 2012	Sept. 2013	Sept. 2014 Goals	Sept. 2014 Actual	Sept. 2015 Goals
1) Establish a plan: outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
2) Collect actionable data and draw conclusions through analysis	92%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
3) Take action to improve learning	73%	83%	89%	96%	98%	96%	100%	100% (60/60)	100%
4) Test the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action	18%	57%	63%	78%	86%	92%	90%	93% (56/60)	100%
5) Disseminate Results	Results are shared with key constituents: faculty in department meetings, Deans' Council, cabinet members, and advisory groups								

**In 2013-2014, sixty of the academic programs are considered established programs. There are several programs which were discontinued, and several new programs which are on the five-year assessment implementation cycle.

Minimum Expectations for Establishing Assessment in New Programs:

New programs will establish learning outcomes and a curriculum map along with program design. The deans' council will determine what year is the first full year of a program, to give programs that are launched in stages a reasonable time frame. Programs with few majors (10 or fewer) may take longer to determine curricular changes.

End of Year 1: Establish a plan: outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods.

End of Year 2: Collect actionable data, test validity of assessment tools and processes, and draw conclusions through analysis.

End of Year 3: Collect actionable data, test validity of assessment tools and processes, and draw conclusions through analysis.

End of Year 4: Take action to improve student learning and/or take action to improve assessment.

End of Year 5: Test the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action. Now the program is counted as an established program.

An Overview of Assessment Work by College

College of Arts and Letters

Assessment Report for the College of Arts and Letters: Sept. 2014 Updates

School of Fine Arts			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Art	10/01/2014	10/02/2013	09/25/2009
Arts Administration	10/02/2014	10/02/2014	
Dance (minor)	10/04/2013	09/04/2011	09/04/2011
Music (2011-)	05/15/2014	12/16/2013	
Music Theatre	10/22/2013	09/02/2011	
Theatre BFA core	09/15/2014		
Theatre – Design Tech	09/28/2014	11/25/2011	
School of Humanities			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Broad Field Social Studies	07/22/2014	08/31/2011	08/31/2011
English	11/21/2013	01/01/2014	08/31/2011
History	07/15/2014	07/15/2014	09/14/2012
Latin American Studies (minor)	08/28/2014	09/17/2013	
Liberal Studies	09/25/2014	09/25/2014	
Philosophy	10/16/2013		
Religious Studies	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	
Spanish	09/04/2014	10/14/2013	
Sustainability	10/15/2014		
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2014			

2014 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sherri Lisota

Name of Program: Art

Date: September 26, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

The 2013-2014 data reflects that 80% or more of students in art programs are meeting sophomore level proficiency in six of the six outcomes. The four-level rubric for measuring outcome two was refined. Information from appropriate major courses was compared across grade levels. We wrote curriculum maps for three Art programs: the BA in Studio Art; the BFA in Art; and the BA in Art Education. We identified Art courses that meet general education outcomes in reading, writing, researching, and oral communication skills at level II.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015 we hope to focus on collecting more information and refining the rubrics for student assessment of outcome two and revise the language of outcome six having to do with professional understanding, attitudes and dispositions.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Arts Administration Advisory Board

Name of Program: Arts Administration

Date: October 2, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In 2013-14, the Arts Administration Advisory Board was mobilized to work on assessment; the Advisory Board met on May 15, 2014 and on Sept. 26, 2014. The board revised learning outcomes and created a curriculum map, identifying specific assignments in which students demonstrate the learning outcomes. The group decided on the criteria, gathered assignment sheets, rubrics, and results for five assignments from AADM 340 and AADM 400. Faculty analyzed the results and decided on actions, one of which is to identify an assignment in AADM 300 that measures Advocacy.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In Fall 2014: Michael Ranscht will work with adjunct faculty on revising rubrics. Michael Ranscht will communicate with adjunct faculty about collecting results for specific assignments in courses taught in FA14 and SP15; the advisory board will work to complete the outcomes statements. The advisory board will explore the concept of having a specific AADM Freshman and Sophomore Evaluation with a rubric aligned with AADM outcomes, along with the possibility of articulating entrance requirements to the program. The advisory board will identify assessment methods in AADM 200, AADM 300, and in AADM 287/487. In Spring 2015, the advisory board will meet to analyze results and draw conclusions.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Hauptert

Name of Program: Music

Date: October 2, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

The music department developed project/paper assignments for MUSC 327/328 to meet the GEN ED requirements for ORAL COMMUNICATION and WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, respectively. Rubrics were designed to meet AAC&U criteria, as well as meeting course/department outcomes for Music History. The 2013-2014 was the first series of MUSC 327/328 courses that fulfilled these requirements, providing a baseline for comparison. The Music Department will work with Nicole on refining rubrics for 2014-2015. The data for most other areas (pedagogy and performance) remain strong, with significant improvement in Piano Proficiency from Fall 2013-Spring 2014. It is uncertain whether or not the changes in piano proficiency requirements helped improve these scores.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Next time I teach this course I will be more specific on my expectation for the assignment. I expect to teach again in Spring 2016.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Vickie Holtz-Wodzak
Name of Program: Liberal Studies
Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

- 1. The capstone course (LBST 499) seems to be doing the job it was designed for. All of the students met or exceeded criteria. Informally, it's clear that they would benefit from more time to develop interdisciplinary research skills, so we are pleased that we can now offer LBST 399 the preceding semester.
- 2. LBST/English 212 serves as the beginning assessment level for 2 of the 3 criteria for the major. It is a new course. The assessment assignment used the first time the course ran encouraged students to demonstrate the ability to use 2 disciplinary lenses to discuss a problem, but it was not sufficiently focused to allow us to separate out the assessment criteria. Conclusion: the course should work, but the assignment needs redesign.
- 3. English/RLST 486 is an intentionally designed interdisciplinary course being used as a substitute for LBST 3xx, which we will likely never run due to enrollment concerns. The assessment assignment is still under consideration. There are 3 LBST students in the class.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

- 1. To refine the assessment mechanism for LBST/ENGL 212 to properly measure the assessment criteria.
- 2. To refine the assessment mechanism for the designated interdisciplinary 300 level course to properly measure the assessment criteria.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Lopez-Kaley
Name of Program: Religious Studies
Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

This past year, we focused on the continuing assessment of the RLST 160 course, which is the gateway course to all RLST courses, and required by the Gen Ed curriculum. The number of students who achieved satisfactory scores on the post-test, indicating a knowledge of four outcomes, was 94%. We will continue to proceed in this course as is. RLST 465 was newly assessed this year, and both minors and majors performed satisfactorily in a second analysis paper that tested for three outcomes. This course is offered every other year. RLST 481, capstone, testing for an overall knowledge of Religious Studies material, showed that the students applied solid research methods and was successful.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will be assessing, especially, outcomes regarding the Franciscan Tradition. In RLST 160, we will be focusing on assessing which areas of Theology students are struggling with, based on specific questions missed on the post-test. This will give direction to ways we can supplement those units during the school year. We have one major graduating in May, and so will continue to refine RLST 481. We will also be going through a curriculum review this year, so will be revising our courses and which outcomes apply to each course.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Maribel V Bird

Name of Program: Spanish

Date: September 5, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Last year we focused on two of eight outcomes. SPAN 405 was evaluated for effectiveness in oral communication. A new activity was included for this course since the current faculty member teaching the course has yet to be trained in OPI testing which was the tool of choice in the past. The new activity proved to be very effective since it utilized a variety of contexts and conditions that represented actual cultural and historical events. The students were asked to work in pairs and perform roles under the conditions described above. Besides language proficiency the students were able to demonstrate critical thinking skills and cultural specific situations. All students performed as expected.

An embedded course assignment was utilized for literary analysis. Using a rubric for literary analysis the students had to show understanding and mastery of the literary process and critical thinking skills. While some students still struggle with critical views in literary analyses, the majority is becoming bolder in their views of literature as a message envoy.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

For 2014-2015, we will be evaluating students' abilities in analyzing main issues in Spanish-speaking countries in the light of their cultures, politics, economy, and history and their skills in translating texts. Even though this is the plan as it was first established, we realize that some of our learning objectives should be streamline. While still working on our current target objectives, this year we plan to dedicate time to consult with our advisors in how to simplify our current learning objectives or perhaps narrow expectations to specific issues. For example, we could improve oral proficiency, grammar issues and other concerns such as ethics in translation by using specific tools and activities.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: S. Lucy Slinger

Name of Program: Sustainability

Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

The first student graduated with a BS degree in sustainability May 2014. Work has been done to establish key criteria for assessment of the program. This involves a pre-program assessment for students in the foundational core course SUST 210 and post- program course completion assessment

using the same instrument as a part of the capstone SUST 495 program. From the initial assessments it appears that students are meeting the middle levels or above for all criteria. Two assessment methods were reported on for each of the five outcomes. A major accomplishment has been the identification of a core group of faculty to teach the degree program courses given the School of Business decision to drop their Sustainable Business degree and hence no longer provide course coverage for 4 of the 8 core courses.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Assessment work goals for 2014-2015, we will work on the alignment of program criteria and the pre – post assessment instrument developed. This will be a transition year for the program as degree numbers have not met anticipated target levels. There will be 3 students graduating in 2014 -15 academic year to enable more detailed assessment of the program evaluation criteria. The current part-time faculty member coordinating the program will retire at the conclusion of this academic year. Pending administrative decisions to continue the program or not faculty time will be used to refine the program assessment.



College of Business and Leadership

Assessment Report for College of Business and Leadership: Sept. 2014 Updates

Dahl School of Business			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Accounting	09/15/2014	09/28/2013	09/28/2013
Accounting Degree Completion	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	05/18/2011
Business Administration	New Program		
Health Care Management	07/16/2014		
Management and Leadership	09/18/2014	09/25/2014	09/25/2014
Management Information Systems (INFO) Online	07/16/2014	09/19/2012	08/31/2011
Marketing	09/12/2014	09/13/2014	09/13/2014
Master of Business Administration	09/26/2014	09/26/2014	09/26/2014
Organizational Management	07/16/2014	09/02/2011	09/20/2012
Organizational Management Online	05/05/2014	09/19/2012	09/02/2011
Sport Management & Leadership	07/17/2014	07/16/2014	09/29/2014
Communication Studies	10/07/2014	10/06/2014	
Master of Arts in Servant Leadership	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	09/29/2014
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2014			

2014 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sara Cook

Name of Program: Accounting

Date: September 28, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In fall 2013, a new fulltime accounting faculty (Tim Szmanda) was hired, and our new group of accounting faculty met with the assessment coordinator to evaluate and draft a new assessment plan. In spring 2014, accounting faculty gathered again to discuss the current assessment plan and results to determine whether the conclusions drawn from the data matched their intuition on student performance. We again evaluated the methods to ensure they were the most authentic measures of student learning on each outcome. Subsequently, the accounting assessment plan was revised to capitalize on a new comprehensive project in the auditing course, which is required for all accounting students and taught by a fulltime faculty member. Descriptions and rubrics for the new assessment methods were added to TracDat, and data was collected on a total of four methods across three of the four student learning outcomes. The students are failing to meet the benchmarks on the outcome pertaining to ethical decision making, and the intervention proposed last year improved scores slightly, and further interventions are proposed for this year. Data collected confirmed student learning in the newly designed auditing (capstone) course.

In 2013-2014, MBA faculty gathered to discuss the current assessment plan and results to determine whether the conclusions drawn from the data matched their intuition on student performance. We also discussed whether the methods were the most authentic measures of student learning on each outcome, especially given that the student learning outcomes were revised last year, so this was the first full cycle of assessment on the new learning outcomes with a new MBA core curriculum. The MBA assessment plan was revised to incorporate methods from a wider range of core courses. Data was collected on three of the four student learning outcomes. Interventions continue to be made on the leadership outcome in the leadership course, especially regarding the ability of ESL students to analyze a case study through a theoretical lens. A loop was closed in this area, but other interventions are now suggested through that method as well as the case study analysis in the change management course for the sustainable business strategy outcome.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect data on all four student learning outcomes. We have two new MBA faculty and a line open for a third hire, so the assessment plan and curriculum will continue to be refined by our new team. A specific focus of assessment in 2014-2015 will be results drawn from the capstone projects; this year an action was taken on the capstone method for the communication outcome, and major changes have been made on the capstone process and presentation format for 2014-2015. A Dahl School of Business goal for 2014-2015 is to re-imagine and implement the assessment process in the school to increase efficiency while also maintaining authenticity and effectiveness.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sara Cook

Name of Program: Organizational Management

Date: September 28, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Data was collected on three student learning outcomes for the organizational management program in 2013-2014: human resource management, group behavior and teamwork, and management skills. Direct measures for the human resource management SLO and the management skills SLO were in their third year of data collection so were also analyzed. Students met the criteria on all collection points for the human resource management outcome over the three year cycle, and the criteria were met on two of the three collection points for the management skills outcome. Subsequently, analysis of the combined data on the two outcomes confirmed student learning.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, per the OMGT assessment rotation, we will again collect data on three of the six student learning outcomes (human resource management, group behavior and teamwork, communication). Curricular changes (removing OMGT 304 as a requirement and moving content into OMGT 306) necessitates a revision of one assessment method. A Dahl School of Business goal for 2014-2015 is to re-imagine and implement the assessment process in the school to increase efficiency while also maintaining authenticity and effectiveness. The recent addition of a CAL program coordinator necessitates a discussion regarding best practice for collecting, entering, and analyzing the assessment data for CAL programs.



2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015 we will focus again on formation of servant leaders. Specifically, we are implementing in Fall 2014 an “exit” paper on vocation / formation as part of the colloquium paper and presentation. This will give students an opportunity to articulate their development as servant leaders in relation to their research and coursework. It will also offer a way for the program to understand the impact of the program on student formation. For example, we will be able to compare personal statements submitted as part of the application to the “exit” reflections. (See new assessment method under Outcome I: Servant Leadership Theory and Practice.)



College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

Assessment Report for the College of Education, Science, and Mathematics: Sept. 2014 Updates

School of Education			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
IA GRAD: Early Childhood Education Endorsement	09/20/2014	09/20/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Middle School Endorsement	09/20/2014	09/20/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Principal/Supervisor of Special Education	09/22/2014	09/22/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Reading Specialist Endorsement	09/20/2014	09/20/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Reading Teacher 5-12 Endorsement	09/22/2014	09/22/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Reading Teacher K-8 Endorsement	09/22/2014	09/22/2014	09/22/2014
IA GRAD: Talented and Gifted Endorsement	09/20/2014	09/20/2014	09/22/2014
Master of Arts in Education	09/25/2014	09/25/2014	
Undergraduate Program	09/25/2014	02/03/2012	
WI GRAD: Cross-categorical Special Education License	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	
WI GRAD: Director of Instruction License	08/18/2014	09/12/2012	
WI GRAD: Dir. of Special Ed. & Pupil Services License	08/18/2014	06/28/2012	
WI GRAD: Early Childhood Education License	09/11/2014	09/18/2014	
WI GRAD: Post Baccalaureate Teacher License	09/25/2014	02/03/2012	
WI GRAD: Principal License	08/07/2014	08/31/2012	
WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	
WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License	09/29/2014	09/29/2014	09/15/2010
WI GRAD: School Business Administrator License	10/22/2012		
WI GRAD: Superintendent License	08/18/2014		
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Biochemistry	09/29/2014	08/31/2011	09/24/2012
Biology	10/02/2014	10/06/2013	
Biopsychology	10/02/2014	10/06/2014	
Chemistry	09/29/2014	08/23/2011	
Environmental Biology	New Program		
Environmental Studies (minor)	10/06/2014	08/30/2011	
Mathematics	10/04/2014	10/04/2014	
Mathematical Physics	09/06/2013		
Sport Science & Leadership	10/03/2014	10/06/2013	09/01/2011
Dates are based on information in TracDat as of Fall 2014			

2014 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Norene Bunt

Name of Program: IA Early Childhood Education Endorsement (106)

Date: September 22, 2014

Adjunct committee and recommendations will be made for continuous improvement in this area, as well as in all of the NMSA Standards.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Norene Bunt
Name of Program: IA PK-12 Principal/ Supervisor of Special Education Licensure (189)
Date: September 22, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

The Iowa Center is consistently administering end of program completer surveys, completer employer surveys, 1 and 3 year follow up surveys, and systematically requiring capstone portfolios from Educational Leadership program completers. These assessment tools are analyzed using the prescribed rubrics.

In reviewing the 2013-2014 End of Program completer surveys, surveys completed by program completers’ employers, and the 1 and 3 year Follow-Up Surveys of program completers’, the data were determined to be well-aligned. The areas of strength, as well as the areas in need of continuous improvement, were clear and consistent. This data is a good example of support through triangulation. The Educational Leadership program needs to focus more on Standard 3 “Management” and Standard 5 “Family and Community”, particularly the areas of budgeting, scheduling, providing PD in research-based strategies, and family, school, and community connections and services.

2. Plan for 2013-2014

The areas listed above will be addressed more in depth during Educational Leadership coursework and internships. Budget and scheduling will be foci during “Leadership for Learning: Management” and through Seminars offered for the students on these specific topics. Providing PD will be a more intentional focus in the course, “Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment”. Family, school, and community services will be emphasized in “Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners” and “School, Family, and Community Relations”. In addition, Seminars will be offered for students on these specified topics. In addition, new “must dos” have been developed for internships that will provide students with more active involvement “out in the field” in these areas.

End of program surveys, surveys of employers, and 1 and 3 year follow up surveys of program completers are being, and will continue to be, administered on a regular basis and data will be analyzed to monitor progress in these identified areas. Data will be shared with the EL adjunct committee and the Iowa Center Advisory Committee and recommendations will be made for continuous improvement in these areas, as well as in the other ISSL.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Norene Bunt
Name of Program: IA Reading Teacher K-8 (#148), Reading Teacher 5-12 (#149), and Reading Specialist (176) Endorsements
Date: September 22, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

End of program surveys and capstone portfolios will continue to be administered on a regular basis and data will be analyzed to monitor progress in this identified area. Data will be shared with the Iowa Adjunct committee and recommendations will be made for continuous improvement in this area, as well as in all of the GTE Standards.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Susan Hughes
Name of Program: Master of Arts in Education
Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In previous years, we have used data from the end of program and the Proseminar course evaluations for data reporting. During the 2013-14 academic year, a new, comprehensive data plan was developed using course-related outcomes tied to specific course assignments and activities. These outcomes will be rolled into the assessment plan over the next several academic years, and will be assessed on a cyclical basis, reporting two outcomes each year. For the year reported herein, Outcome One: *Synthesize information and experiences to grow professionally and actively participate in the educational community* was assessed utilizing one criteria, the book reflection rubric from EDUC 604. Although the results that were reported this year met the criterion (mean of 94.5 for the 162 students who were assessed), we will add two additional measures in future years once the assessment plan is totally in place. We feel that this will provide a more broad and meaningful assessment of our students’ ability to demonstrate written synthesis at the graduate level.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect results for the next two learning outcomes in our cycle of assessment and will also follow up on the results for synthesis by reporting the two additional criteria, and breaking down the content of the synthesis paper by individual outcomes. The primary goal, and the thrust of the activity this year will be to hold professional development sessions with the faculty members who teach all of the core courses to support them in their integration of the specific course rubrics that will be utilized for each of the outcomes. The plan includes utilizing the rubric function on Moodle so that the instructors can make this a part of their grading practice and the results can be converted to an Excel spreadsheet for ease of reporting. The assessment coordinator for the program will hold several ‘boot camp’ types of in-service sessions in order to facilitate this process.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage
Name of Program: Undergraduate Education
Date: September 25, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

When completing our program assessment in fall 2013, we determined that our previous measures of student learning—portfolio submission and Praxis II scores, did not provide an accurate picture of student performance for multiple reasons, as evidenced by the fact that the criterion for every learning

outcome has been consistently met for the past six years. We therefore put an action plan into place for the 2013-14 school year that included an extensive review of our curriculum, and curriculum revisions to prepare our students for the Foundations of Reading test and for edTPA. While significant progress has been made, including focused work to map and fill gaps in the curriculum across the education program, the magnitude of this effort, as well as transition in faculty and department leadership, prevented us from formally tracking these changes for the 2013-14 school year.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will continue our work to define authentic assessments of student learning and growth. We will develop embedded assessments for both oral and written communication, which will be administered in education courses at the freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior levels. We will also revise our student teacher observation/evaluation form to align with the edTPA assessment, as well as to provide more objective and useful information regarding student performance. We may identify additional objectives for student growth based on these revisions.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeanette Armstrong
Name of Program: WI Cross-Categorical Special Education License (801)
Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Last summer was the first time that students began to complete the Cross-Categorical Special Education program. In the time that the students were enrolled in the program, significant changes were made to the program format and required credits. For example, the entire program moved from a face-to-face format to an entirely online format; required program credits were reduced from 26 credits to 19 credits; and the state of Wisconsin mandated that educators earn passing scores on the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (WFRT). Due to the incredible change that took place within the program, many areas of the program assessments reflect “criteria not met.” However, this is not a concern; it is reflective of a program in the midst of change. Over the upcoming year, the program requirements will stabilize and faculty will continue to define assessment (e-portfolios, signature assessments, and rubrics). I was pleased with the overall scores for the WFRT- 90% of students passed the test on the first attempt (N=10).

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect portfolio assessment results for each course in the program. Signature assessments will be embedded into each course, and common rubrics for each signature assessment will be collected and analyzed. The results of both will be used to make necessary curricular changes. We will begin determining methods and strategies for embedding literacy and literacy assessment into each course in the program; this will provide students with needed support to acquire the skills that are assessed on the WFRT.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jim Bagniewski & Scott Mihalovic
Name of Program: WI Director of Instruction (10)
Date: August 29, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

We only have one measurement to report on this year and that is on whether or not 90% of the students in the program reached the bench mark of having a 3.6 average on the Essential Questions. The only standard that missed this benchmark was Standard 4 on which 88% of the students obtain a 3.6 average. Since this was not missed last year we will keep an eye on it, but do not think it is anything to worry about.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Just like with the Principal licensure program we need to find a different benchmark that can track the progress of this program because the use of the capstone is mandated as part of the practicum course and therefore not as good of performance measure. We also have to make sure that the Exit Survey (End of Program Survey) is given out. We may have to revert back to the pencil and paper method, since it was 100% reliable. As with the principal licensure program, it would be advised that students are evaluated on their ability to summarize a paper for each standard on the “Look Fors”.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Ruth E. Badciong
Name of Program: WI Early Childhood Licensure (70-777)
Date: September 2, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

There were no unclosed loops nor follow-up actions required for the 2013-14 assessment results. Students who began the program in fall 2012 and completed it on or before summer 2014 were the first cohorts to experience the once-a-year vs. once-every-two-years schedule for the launching of a new course cycle. Thus they had the opportunity to catch up with any missed courses without having to wait two years for the course to come around again.

Average response ratings increased for each question on the Program Evaluation survey from the 2012-13 assessment cycle to the 2013-14 cycle. The completers’ overall average rating of the program increased as well.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

As was noted last year, the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test became consequential for program completers who were endorsed for licensure after January, 2014. To date four students have attempted the test and all have passed.

The test results are reported for four subareas: *Foundations of Reading Development, Development of Reading Comprehension, Reading Assessment and Instruction, and Integration of Knowledge and Understanding*. The first three categories are related to the multiple choice section of the test and the final category to the open-response section of the test. For each subarea the student is given one of four ratings. This data will be used in part to assess the effectiveness of the instruction in the Emergent

Literacy (Pre-K-3) course in preparing our candidates for teaching early literacy. If there are patterns showing weakness in a given subarea, we will focus on improvement in that area. The Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test data will be reported under Outcome 5: *Using Content Knowledge to Build Meaningful Curriculum* and Outcome 4: *Using Developmentally Effective Approaches to Connect with Children and Families*.

Please note that Outcome 5 is one of the three outcomes where the assessment goal was *not met for the 2013-2014 school year*. Because the results were insignificant, no significant changes are planned for 2014-2015. The data will be monitored for one year and revisited in fall 2015.

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage
Name of Program: WI Post Baccalaureate Teacher License
Date: September 25, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

When completing our program assessment in fall, 2013, we determined that our indicators of student learning—portfolio submission and Praxis II scores, did not provide an accurate picture of student performance for multiple reasons, as evidenced by the fact that the criterion for every learning outcome has been consistently met for the past six years. We therefore began work during the 2013-14 school year to review the post-bac curriculum, to map and embed assessments, and to prepare our students for edTPA, a national assessment that will become a consequential benchmark next year for all students pursuing a license. As with the undergraduate program, progress has been slower than we would like, but we have identified the gaps in our curriculum in the areas of assessment, differentiation and inclusion, and emergent literacy, and will continue our work to fill these gaps and to identify authentic assessments throughout the course of the program.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will continue our work to define authentic assessments of student learning and growth. We will develop embedded assessments for the areas we have identified as having gaps, as well as in the areas of oral and written communication. We will also revise our student teacher observation/evaluation form to align with the edTPA assessment, as well as to provide more objective and useful information regarding student performance. We may identify additional objectives for student growth based on these revisions.

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jim Bagniewski & Scott Mihalovic
Name of Program: WI Principal License (51)
Date: August 28, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

There were three standards in which the benchmarks were not obtained:

Standard 4 – Only 83% of the students in the 2012-2014 cohort indicated a positive understanding of the concepts in this standard (a positive understanding is an “agree or positively agree” response and our benchmark is 90%). The other benchmark for this standard was attained.

Standard 5 – 89% of the students in the 2012-2014 cohort indicated a positive understanding of the concepts in this standard (benchmark is 90%). The other benchmark for this standard was attained.

Standard 7 – 82% of the students in the 2012-2014 cohort indicated a positive understanding of the concepts in this standard (benchmark is 90%). The other benchmark for this standard was attained. The only deficit standard from last year is standard 5 and it missed the benchmark by only one percentage point and therefore we do not believe it is something to be concerned with.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Last year the primary focus of this licensure program was finding a replacement measurement for the capstone portfolio and it appears it will be our main goal again. The thinking was that the Common Formative Assessment may have worked as a replacement accountability measurement but after assessing the 1st writing of the students’ papers in WI. If nothing else it needs some revisions. The recommended revisions would include a written set of directions that would be given to all the instructors giving the assessment for consistency, along with an enhanced rubric.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong

Name of Program: WI Reading Specialist (17)

Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In January of last year, the state of Wisconsin mandated that Reading Specialist 17 candidates earn a passing score on the new Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (WFRT). Between January and September, 100% of our Reading Specialist 17 candidates passes the WFRT on their first attempt (N= 5).

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect portfolio assessment results for each course in the program. The rigor of the portfolio assessments will be evaluated. We will begin determining methods and strategies for embedding WFRT sub-set specific literacy and literacy assessment into each course in the program; this will provide students with needed support to acquire the skills that are assessed on the WFRT.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong

Name of Program: WI Reading Teacher (316)

Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Last year the Reading 316 program focused on developing an e-Portfolio to replace the previously existing paper portfolio. This change brought about much scrutiny of the desired outcomes and criterion of the overall portfolio assessment process. It was noted that the paper portfolio was a one-time only snapshot of the student’s acquisition of knowledge and skills. In an effort to move from a one-

time only snapshot to a “growth over time model”, the rigor of the portfolio expectations increased. As a result, numerous portfolio resubmissions became necessary. Although we did not meet the criteria in many portfolio areas, I do not see this as an area for concern; it is reflective of a program that is experiencing rapid change. In January, the state of Wisconsin mandated that Reading Teacher 316 candidates earn a passing score on the new Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (WFRT). Between January and September, 100% of our Reading Teacher 316 candidates passes the WFRT on their first attempt (N=36).

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect portfolio assessment results for each course in the program. Signature assessments will be embedded into each course, and common rubrics for each signature assessment will be collected and analyzed. The results of both will be used to make necessary curricular changes. We will begin determining methods and strategies for embedding WFRT sub-set specific literacy and literacy assessment into each course in the program; this will provide students with needed support to acquire the skills that are assessed on the WFRT.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jim Bagniewski & Scott Mihalovic
Name of Program: Director of Special Education & Pupil Services License (80)
Date: August 29, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

For this Licensure program similar to the Director of Instruction licensure program we only have one benchmark to report on. As in the other licensure program we are no longer using the Capstone portfolio as a measurement instrument. The Exit was not given for the 2nd year and a row so that leaves us with only a report on whether or not 90% of the students received a 3.6 average or higher on their Essential Questions. Unlike the other licensure program the Director of Special Education and Pupil Services students do not go through the program as a cohort. What that means is that when the Access Data Base program is run there may be a number of students with “0’s” because he/she may not have taken the course yet. With this in mind our 90% benchmark was only attained under standard 1. Standard 2 – 83%, Standard 3 – 60%, Standard 4- 67%, Standard 5- 83%, Standard 6- 58% and Standard 7 – 67% --- the % is the % of students who obtained a 3.6 or higher. We need to align this measurement with the students who completed the Practicum course and not in a cohort per se.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

As in the other programs I will need to come up with an assessment plan to replace our analysis of the capstone portfolio since that is now going to be part of the practicum course grade. With this program it imperative to have the Exit Survey given and check the percent of students with a 3.6 average or higher and have completed the Practicum course. As was suggested with the Principal and Director of Instruction Licensure program, we believe it would make sense to assess the students on their progress toward understanding the standards by addressing the “Look Fors” with this license.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jim Bagniewski & Scott Mihalovic

Name of Program: WI Superintendent License

Date: August 29, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In six of the seven standards, one of two benchmarks were met and frequently, the one which was not met was within percentage points of meeting the benchmark. In standard 4, both benchmarks were met. Therefore, we will monitor but at present we do not believe it is something to be concerned with. In standard 7 we had only 73% so we will monitor that standard more closely. Only 7 Superintendents completed the exit survey.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

We will also have to find an alternative assessment to the use of capstone portfolios since the practicum will incorporate the capstone into its course grade. We are currently looking at the feasibility of measuring progress toward understanding the standards by addressing the "look fors" with each license. We will meet with the adjuncts to be sure ALL superintendents complete the exit survey in their final course. This gets complicated because with the superintendents the practicum is not always the final course.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Kyle Backstrand

Name of Program: Biochemistry & Chemistry

Date: September 29, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

We are analyzing results this year for Outcome B – Communications and Outcome E – Ethics.

Outcome B: Communications – Chemistry & Biochemistry

Our first assessment method is a research proposal oral presentation in CHEM 397 – Introduction to Research. Our criterion is that 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score 80% or higher on the presentation rubric. Our results are as follows: 83% (5/6) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Our second assessment method is a research proposal written paper in CHEM 397 – Introduction to Research. Our criterion is that 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score 80% or higher on the paper. Our results are as follows: 83% (5/6) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Our third assessment method is a research oral presentation in CHEM 499 – Senior Seminar. Our criterion is that 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score 80% or higher on the presentation rubric. Our results are as follows: 100% (4/4) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Our fourth assessment method is a research written paper in CHEM 499 – Senior Seminar. Our criterion is that 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score 80% or higher on the paper. Our results are as follows: 100% (4/4) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Outcome E: Ethics – Chemistry & Biochemistry

Our first assessment method is an ethics assignment in CHEM 120 – General Chemistry I. Our criterion is 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score above 80%. Last year we had the students answer questions based on reading the Chemists' Code of Conduct. We did not grade the assignment but 100% of students did complete the assignment. We will start a discussion at the department level about either changing the criterion for this assessment method or replacing the method.

Our second assessment method is an ethics assignment in CHEM 397 – Introduction to Research. Our criterion is 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score above 80%. Our results are as follows: 83% (5/6) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Our third assessment method is an ethics essay from the final exam in CHEM 397 – Introduction to Research. Our criterion is 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will score above 80%. Our results are as follows: 100% (6/6) of chemistry/biochemistry majors scored 80% or higher. We met our criterion.

Our fourth assessment method is a Data Analysis question on an exit survey in CHEM 499 – Senior Seminar. The question states "My knowledge/skill/application of evaluating the ethical issues surrounding research is at what level compared to all college graduates in the sciences (at Viterbo and other institutions)?" Our criterion is 80% of chemistry/biochemistry majors will choose "superior" or "above average". We did not reach our goal with only 69%. This is the second year that we have asked that exact question on the senior survey. Therefore our action plan is to take a wait-and-see approach and try to observe a trend in this student confidence issue. It may be that the criterion should be lowered.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Eventually, we hope to have three years' worth of data to analyze each year for two different outcomes (we started this new plan last year). Also, the Chemistry department is currently undergoing a major shift in the way we teach our general chemistry sequence. We are 'flipping' our classes in CHEM 120 and CHEM 121 and this may have an impact on our assessment in the coming years.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Biology

Date: October 6, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

The biology program focused on:

OUTCOME: 1. "Understand importance of interrelationships and unifying themes of major biological concepts" subsections A. Evolution explains the unity and diversity of life, B. Cells, the basic unit of life, C Importance of genetic variability and mechanisms that lead to variability in BIOL 340, BIOL 250.

We found subsection A met criteria in the mastery level based on two questions. These questions were follow-up assessment from previous year's data in which criteria were not met at the upper-level and for the same cohort as assessed this year, were not met at the intermediate level. We are pleased to see this positive outcome in reporting the data. We have closed this loop. Subsections B and C showed mixed results at the intermediate level. That is, some criteria were met and others were not as demonstrated by the differences in correct answers depending on the questions. We will review the difficulty of these questions and reassess.

We concluded that assessing only a few subsections for this outcome may not provide the data needed to most accurately assess the outcome. Therefore, we plan on assessing all subsections for this outcome next year with a focus on the mastery level assessment (i.e., upper-level courses). We hope

to further develop the program with improvements to current biopsychology courses and with the addition of current biology and psychology courses where possible. We also found that student writing and collateral skills were underperforming. These data were seen this year as a follow-up from last year's data as well. Therefore, we will consider the overall program to include courses that support these important outcomes and include additional assignments in current courses where possible.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri & Jennifer Sadowski

Name of Program: Environmental Biology

Date: October 6, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

This is the first year of this new major for the biology department. On TracDat we have added a mission, outcomes, established a working plan with outcomes aligned with teaching strategies and methods and identified specific courses to assess outcomes. The working document is attached to the TracDat page as are BIOL major courses that are representative of classes from which we will collect data. Additionally, a 2014 curriculum map has been added to the documents for environmental biology in TracDat.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

We will add proposed assessment methods to TracDat after feedback from the assessment committee. We will begin to collect data in the proposed classes.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Environmental Studies (minor)

Date: October 6, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

We assessed the mastery of a formal written lab report. This assignment is in the online ENVS course over the summer and fall semester. The criteria was met. We were not able to identify current environmental studies minors in the course. There is no single course to determine if a student has declared the minor or not. Additionally, I believe that this was the first year that the environmental studies minor was to be offered.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

The minor has a single required course with various other options. That course is ENVS 325 (was ENVS 400) and has not been offered for several semesters as there has been no minors needing the course. We plan on offering it through CAL to increase enrollment and hope to get the course offered for other programs as well. We will explore the need for assessment of this minor given the new environmental biology major and the new environmental science minor and the sustainability minor. Environmental science is not listed as a minor in the 2014-2015 course catalog.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

OUTCOME 5 promote health and well-being in SPSL 110 criteria not met (thought by science adjunct) and SPSL 331 criteria met (taught by adjunct). Overall we were pleased to see outcomes being met. We agree that we should continue moving towards more diverse measures (beyond multiple choice questions in the SPSL science courses for assessment). We are somewhat concerned by the amount of adjuncts teaching these courses. We don't have full-time faculty with the background to teach the SPSL courses so assessment is done with the help of adjunct faculty (often not the same ones from year to year). We are thankful for the talented and dedicated adjuncts we have been able to hire. For example, from the previous year's assessment, we determined that a standard assignment should be developed for the outcome "Promote Health and Well-being" Sport Science student will develop an exercise plan to promote health / fitness based on accumulated knowledge in SPSL 331 Exercise Physiology. A standard assignment was written and scored (attached doc in TracDat) from Brad Northrup – biology adjunct.

We have also noticed a shortcoming in the first year course (SPSL 110) student performance in meeting outcomes. We have tried to reword questions and assignment types however we are still finding this class to be a challenge to many first year SPSL students. Of those not meeting the criteria, many are unable to continue in the SPSL program due to overall low grades. For those students continuing in the program, several questions were used and we find those students are meeting the criteria. However, through advising we have noticed that many of these same students struggle in the BIOL, CHEM, PHYS and other science courses.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

We will continue to track SPSL students in their sciences courses outside of SPSL (e.g., BIOL, CHEM, and PHYS) partly through advising given the diversity of these courses to determine if the methods of assessment for SPSL are appropriate. From previous assessment and follow-up work noting student success in their major and mapping this to career goals and science coursework required outside of the SPSL courses, we are finding talented students are often better served to major in BIOL and minor in SPSL as a means of meeting certain career goals (e.g., physical therapy). The SPSL minor is a new minor and is in part the result of assessment work done for the major in realizing the program requirements and career plans of many students. We are working to advise students with specific career goals to consider alternate course selections based on performance in introductory level coursework (as seen from assessment in SPSL 110) and major level courses (i.e., BIOL 160, 161, CHEM 120, 121, MATH 113). We will also continue to develop assessment measures in addition to multiple choice questions. We will need to continue to work with adjunct faculty and continue to request faculty support to aid in the major.



College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

Assessment Report for the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior: Sept. 2014 Updates

School of Nursing			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)	05/15/2014	08/29/2013	04/22/2010
BSN Completion	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	
Graduate Nursing	09/30/2014	09/30/2014	09/17/2012
School of Health and Human Behavior			
Program Name	2014 Date of Last Result	2014 Last Action	2014 Last Follow-up
Criminal Justice	10/03/2014	09/18/2009	09/30/2010
Dietetics	05/19/2014	05/16/2014	08/13/2012
Dietetics Internship	09/29/2014	09/10/2013	
Gerontology (minor)	07/10/2014	10/17/2013	
Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling	08/28/2014	05/12/2014	
Psychology	09/05/2014	09/05/2014	09/16/2012
Social Work	08/27/2014	08/27/2014	06/17/2011
Sociology	10/06/2014	10/07/2013	09/16/2012
Substance Abuse Counseling	09/26/2014	09/26/2014	
Women's Studies (minor)	10/15/2013	06/06/2012	06/06/2012
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2014			

2014 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Deane Hatteberg

Name of Program: BSN Nursing

Date: September 27, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Last year we focused on two of our nine outcomes. Three of the four methods met the criteria for ethical issues. One method that had a diversity component may have had confusing wording. The focus question was reworded and will be evaluated fall 2014. For critical thinking the criterion for all measure were met. There was a recommendation to improve the weak area of measurable outcome identification. This enhancement will begin fall semester. Last year was also a follow up year for communication. The criteria was met.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect results for the next learning outcomes in our cycle of assessment and will also follow up on results for critical thinking and for ethical reasoning. Our program has new outcomes based on new standards for the nursing profession. This will be the last assessment for professional nursing roles and aesthetics. The professional values is a new program that will be measured at the developmental level. The curriculum is in the process of some revision for the future.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Hedrick-Erickson

Name of Program: BSN Completion

Date: September 29, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

All six program outcomes (previously described as graduate outcomes) were fully implemented and two of the six were evaluated to measure achievement. The two program outcomes include:

- Incorporate effective interpersonal and inter-professional communication and collaboration skills
- Articulate the direct and indirect relationship of healthcare policy, finance, and regulations.

Two new courses were created related to university changes, and new Course Overview and Assessment (COA) tools were created. One course was changed from a 400 level to a 300 level to better reflect the level and rigor of the course requirements. Nursing 481 – Clinical Synthesis Portfolio was changed from a four to a three credit course, reflecting the change in the number of program outcomes required for mastery.

All courses were assessed using a Course Assessment and Analysis (CAA) tool, from the School of Nursing. New assignment specific rubrics from the first nursing course were created and piloted for effectiveness to better measure achievement of course outcomes. It was determined this is an effective approach for all assignments and additional rubrics will be created for each assignment in the next academic year.

Last, based on the assessment of each course using the university online evaluation tool, all course specific data were synthesized. Results from the following questions “Course teaching-learning methods supported course objectives,” “Technology was used effectively in this course,” and “Textbooks and/or learning materials were used appropriately in this course” revealed means greater than 4.0 on a 5.0 Likert scale for all nursing courses.

Faculty made revisions to the nursing leadership issue paper and the leader/manager paper, providing clarity and added rigor. None of the previous assignments stood out as course concerns in 2013-2014 according to means data from the online university evaluations, and from student narrative feedback on the university evaluations.

We continue to conduct focus groups as a means of assessment, on a rotating basis at each site. Data was shared with all persons directly involved with our program to determine how we can best meet our student and program needs. Students voiced concerns over amount of assignments/reading required in a number of core curriculum courses. It continues to be a concern that many of the faculty do not seem to teach using adult learning principles, allowing depth and analysis versus amount. This was shared with the Director of Adult Learning. As well, some students voiced concerns over lack of response from faculty in several online courses. This was shared with the Director of Adult Learning as well as the Program Chair directly involved. Students continue to voice concern about the amount of work required during the summer courses, which include Mission 470, Nursing 450 and Nursing 451. Because of this continued concern, the program course plan will be changed in fall 2014 to better distribute courses offered each semester. We will continue to monitor these courses and make program changes as necessary.

End of program (EOP) narrative results will be disseminated to faculty and Director of Adult Learning once available (Fall 2014). Alumni surveys are sent out via e-mail and results will be shared once obtained.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we will collect results related to two School of Nursing program outcomes. We will be assessing the outcomes:

- Assimilate professional values of altruism, autonomy, human dignity, integrity, and social justice.
- Integrate health promotion, disease prevention, and safety principles for individuals and populations.

We will follow new course outcomes and assignments closely to assure we are meeting the established course/program outcomes. Faculty will meet monthly or every other month to review assignments using new rubrics. We will continue to finalize assignment specific rubrics in N472 and N408; those are the only remaining syllabi to complete.

We will continue open discussion with those involved teaching core curriculum courses as they relate to teaching adult students and share concerns with department chairs, and the Director for Center for Adult Learning.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Bonnie Nesbitt

Name of Program: Graduate Nursing

Date: September 30, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In 2013-14 we collected assessment data on two outcomes according to our scheduled cycle: Practice in an expanded, specialized, and/or advanced practice role and Facilitate the translation of research and evidence into practice. We piloted the rubrics to be used for assessment for each of these outcomes and critiqued their ease of use and congruency with the selected course embedded assignments; this action will need to be continued. We streamlined our processes for outcome assessment by the course faculty at the time the assignment is turned in for course grading purposes. To this end we created a shared file where faculty can put the mean scores in of their class based on a 1-3 scale with 3 being the highest rating after reviewing the course embedded assignments.

We have continued with using the TYPHON portfolio for the repository of the student's course embedded documents. Two classes out of three used TYPHON with the third year class using flash drives. The flash drive approach has not been effective (students lose; don't turn in; faculty forget to ask for flash drive to check uploads, etc.), so Typhon will be the approach of monitoring development of the outcome over time per student for all classes in future including the post MSN DNP Students; check point times for the portfolios need to be established.

Course embedded grids for the portfolio template were developed for the post MSN DNP students (who are already NPs or enrolled in the Ethical Leadership DNP), as well as the post MSN DNP students seeking initial NP certification.

will be re-assessed in Spring 2014. This competency was not met – 88% of students met the competency but 12% (n=1 student) missed the minimum score by 3%. As this course is being deleted, with much of the course content being rolled into NUTR 477, we are currently in discussions as to how, and during what course, this competency will be assessed.

The action plan for competency 4.12 states that the instructor will re-arrange the sequence of presentation, case study, and quiz to enhance understanding and to focus on the content the students will be quizzed over and was to be reassessed in Fall 2013. This competency has now been changed to 4.11 and 100% of students achieved the minimum score of 80%, therefore this competency is now MET.

All of the Professional Practice Expectations competencies (2.1-2.13) assessed this past year, were met at the benchmark level. One competency, 2.13, received many “N/A” scores – we will evaluate the specific course this will be assessed in for future years, rather than evaluate in all courses.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

Our primary focus for assessment work in 2014/2015 will be to continue to implement the comprehensive assessment that the department developed in fall 2011. The competencies scheduled for assessment this year include those listed under subset 3 (CRD 3.1-3.6) “Clinical and Customer Services: development and delivery of information, products and services to individuals, groups and populations”.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Connie M. Fossen

Name of Program: Gerontology Minor

Date: September 3, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

Last year we reduced the minor outcomes from five to two outcomes. It was determined that two outcomes more accurately reflected the knowledge and skill necessary for a minor in Gerontology. The Career Preparation outcome was assessed this year. An Internship Integration Paper assessed the outcome. The average score of 4.57 on a scale of 1-5 was the result of seven internship papers scored by a rubric. The criterion score of 3 was far surpassed with the average score of 4.57. This was the first year of using the Integration Paper rubric to assess this practice outcome. This assessment method will be used again in 2015-2016 with hopefully a larger student population.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, results for Knowledge learning outcome will be collected in this cycle of assessment. Assessment results for 2013-2014 will be posted on the Gerontology Minor Moodle site for student review.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Debra A. Murray

Name of Program: Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling

Date: September 30, 2014

benchmark for these same practice behaviors The National Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) is in the process of developing a new set of Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) that will be available in 2015. The new EPAS standards will require that we revisit our entire assessment plan and curriculum. As a result there will be potentially significant changes in our program and how we assess outcomes. Much of our process for assessing outcomes (competencies and practice behaviors) is determined by mandates from CSWE. Consequently our plan is to refine our current course embedded measures this year and consider more comprehensive revisions of our assessment program when the new accreditation standards are in place.

This year we will refine assignments being used to measure the practice behaviors that fell below benchmark for course embedded measures in the following manner:

EP 2.1.2d. Apply Ethical Reasoning: This practice behavior is measured in SOWK 482 with the Ethics Paper assignment. The instructor will place more emphasis on this assignment as a mechanism to assess ethical reasoning. Hopefully students will respond by having a more intentional emphasis on the paper. Faculty feel that the 75% of students reaching 80% (benchmark is 80% of students will earn 80% or higher) or higher on this assignment may reflect the attitude of this particular class towards the assignment rather than a true indication of their ability. The faculty believe that the students did not take this assignment seriously in spring 14 resulting in outcome for this measure falling below benchmark.

EP 2.1.4a Cultural Oppression and EP 2.1.4c Difference Shapes Life: Both of these practice behaviors are measured with the same assignment in SOWK 431 and both practice behaviors fell below benchmark. Feedback from students has indicated that the assignment is too complex and they are unable to focus and do their best work due to this complexity. The instructor will divide the assignment into three parts so the students can focus on each section.

2.1.6 Engage in research informed practice and practice informed research: The assignment has changed this year to include a class-wide project where students can help each other with the assignment. The instructor will also work on trying to identify expectations appropriate for bachelor's level students.

2.1.9a Discover, appraise, and respond to contexts that shape practice. The faculty discussed that this is a very difficult practice behavior to measure with an assignment. The instructor in SOWK 421 will revisit the rubric and determine if there is a more effective way to measure this practice behavior from the assignment or if a different course embedded measure would be more effective (e.g. a five minute reflection paper or an exam question).



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Liza Ware
Name of Program: Substance Abuse Counseling
Date: September 26, 2014

1. Assessment Results from 2013-2014

In 2013-2014, we revised our program learning outcomes and developed a curriculum map. We will be refining the assessment methods as we assess each outcome on this rotation. (E.g., developing assessment rubrics that specifically capture the outcomes.)

We also continued our data collection for outcomes 3 (Ethical Principles and Standards) and 4 (Communication Skills). For outcome 3, the criterion was met and the loop was closed on the current method being used. However, we have also concluded that a more accurate method than student's self-assessment of their learning could be used. The same assignment will be used, but a rubric scored by the instructor will determine whether students meet the outcome. The rubric has been uploaded to the Documents section of TracDat.

For outcome 4, the criterion was not met completely using our current methods. However, we believe that the criterion of an average score of 90% is unrealistic. We will be identifying and developing appropriate methods for this outcome in the coming year.

2. Plan for 2014-2015

In 2014-2015, we have 3 goals for our assessment work in this program.

(a) Continue to assess outcome 3 in ADCT/PSYC 423 using the new rubric (see above).

(b) Continue to assess the written communication component of outcome 4 in ADCT/PSYC 427 with new criteria and rubric. Assess the oral communication component in ADCT/PSYC 423 using the assignment and rubric uploaded to the Documents section on TracDat. Develop a rubric to assess the interpersonal communication component in ADCT/PSYC 423 or 427.

(b) Assess outcome 2 in ADCT 330 and ADCT/PSYC 423. Develop rubric for 330 paper to capture this outcome.



LIVE Core Curriculum: Assessment Overview

LIVE Core Curriculum Structure



LIVE includes three main components:

- **Foundations** courses, which give students underlying skills in information fluency, quantitative literacy, and written and oral communication
- **Ways of Thinking** courses, in which students learn the assumptions, methods, and questions of different disciplines
- Four sequenced **Mission Seminars**, in which students examine issues from a disciplinary lens
 1. Franciscan Values and Traditions
 2. Living in a Diverse World
 3. Serving the Common Good
 4. The Ethical Life

Assessment work in 2013-2014 encompassed seven of the eight LIVE learning outcomes. The common assignments in all four mission seminars were assessed in May and June 2014, with faculty and staff teams evaluating learning outcomes in a stratified random selection of assignments.

Following four years of targeted changes based on the assessment results, the criteria for outcomes measured in Franciscan Values and Traditions were all met. The continuous improvement stemming from assessment has included: targeted changes in the assessment methods and measurements, such as finer alignment between outcomes, assignments, rubrics, and guidelines; changes in the common text based on assessment results; refinement of the structure and curricular design of the mission seminars.

Assessment of Mission Seminars

Franciscan Values and Traditions: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

LIVE Outcomes	FVT Outcomes	Assessment method	Evaluation tool
Ethical Reasoning and Moral Development: Ethical Self-Awareness	1. Students will compare, contrast, and analyze Franciscan values, Viterbo core values, and disciplinary values.	Common assignment	Common rubric
Integrative Learning: Connections across Perspectives	2. Students will compare and contrast their personal values to Franciscan, Viterbo, and disciplinary values.		
Social Justice: Diversity of Communities	3. Students will compare and contrast their personal values to the values of other people.		
Written Communication: Sources & Evidence			

2013-2014 Follow-up Results

Method: common assignment in all VUSM 1XX sections

Measurement: common rubric created collaboratively and modified through the 10-13 assessment process.

Assessment process:

1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 15% of the papers submitted by students enrolled at the end of the semester was drawn. Ten sections in FA2013 and six sections in SP2014, with a total final enrollment of 303 students. 15% of 303 is 51. Fifty-one papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming. The submitted papers in one section were the wrong assignment (an early response paper, rather than the common assignment). The lowest enrollment was 11 and 2 papers were drawn. The largest enrollment was a team-taught course, with 5 papers drawn. There were no online courses (online courses are over-sampled to allow for assessment of modes of delivery).

2) A group of 8 volunteers worked over three days in May 2014 to assess the papers. The group consisted of four full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, the assessment specialist, the director of general education, and the director of assessment and institutional research. It was helpful that two of the eight evaluators teach the FVT seminar.

The group had a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group reviewed the assignment and the rubric and scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point, a third reader read that paper for the outcome that diverged. Twenty-three out of the 47 papers required a third reader; however, only eight papers diverged by more than one component on the rubric.

FVT Assignment Rubric	2010-11 Results	2011-12 Follow-up Results	2012-13 Follow-up Results	2013-14 Follow-up Results	Criterion Met/Not Met	Action
Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development	1.5	2.1	2.4	2.2	Criterion of 2 met	We corrected the rubric to align with the slightly revised assignment.
Social Justice	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.2	Criterion of 2 met	Loop closed
Integrative Learning	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.3	Criterion of 2 met	Loop closed
Written Communication	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.5	Criterion of 2 met	Loop closed
The assessment team analyzes results and makes recommendations for changes. The team makes some changes to the rubric, as warranted. The CC director works with the FVT lead faculty on changes in the assignment, course guidelines, or teaching and learning strategies. The results and action plan are shared the Franciscan Values and Traditions instructors in the learning community for implementation and with the Core Curriculum Committee for accountability.						

Living in a Diverse World: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

LIVE Outcomes	LDW Outcomes	Assessment method	Evaluation tool
<p>Ethical Reasoning and Moral Development: Ethical Self-Awareness</p> <p>Integrative Learning: Reflection and Self-Assessment</p>	<p>1. Students will analyze the background, structures and effects of oppression, privilege, prejudice, or discrimination.</p> <p>2. Students will demonstrate their awareness of cultural or social diversity and its value.</p>	Common assignment	Common rubric
<p>Intercultural Knowledge & Action: Cultural Self-Awareness / Knowledge of Cultural Frameworks</p>	<p>1. Students will analyze the background, structures and effects of oppression, privilege, prejudice, or discrimination.</p>		
<p>Social Justice: Diversity of Communities and Cultures, Action and Reflection</p>	<p>1. Students will analyze the background, structures and effects of oppression, privilege, prejudice, or discrimination.</p> <p>2. Students will demonstrate their awareness of cultural or social diversity and its value.</p> <p>3. Students will analyze a cross-cultural experience using servant-leader characteristics.</p>		

2013-2014 Results

Method: common assignment in all VUSM 2XX sections

Measurement: common rubric created collaboratively and modified through 11-12, 12-13, and 13-14 assessment process.

Assessment process:

1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 15% of final enrollment numbers was drawn. There were eight sections in FA2013 and ten sections in SP2014, with a total final enrollment of 322 students. 15% of 322 is 48. Forty-eight papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming. Sections with a final enrollment of 10-16 had two papers drawn, sections with final enrollment of 17-22 had three papers drawn, and one section with an enrollment of 23 had four papers drawn. There were no online courses (online courses are over-sampled to allow for assessment of modes of delivery).

2) A group of eight volunteers worked over three days in May 2014 to assess the papers. The group consisted of three full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, the coordinator for community engagement, the assessment specialist, the director of general education, and the director of assessment and institutional research. The group had a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group reviewed the assignment and the rubric and scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point, a third reader read that paper for the outcome that diverged. Two of the papers were excluded because they were in response to a different assignment, not the common assignment. Nineteen papers required a third reader (39%), a rather high divergence of scores; however, only four diverged on more than one component of the rubric.

LDW Assignment Rubric	2011-12 Results	2012-13 Follow-up Results	2013-14 Follow-up Results	Criterion Met/Not Met	Action
Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development	2.6	2.7	2.6	Criterion of 2 met	Loop closed. We will continue to measure this in 2014-2015.
Intercultural Knowledge & Action	2.3	2.7	2.7	Criterion of 2 met	Loop closed. We will continue to measure this in 2014-2015.
Social Justice	2.3	1.8	1.8	Criterion of 2 not met	1. Revised the common assignment to more effectively draw out students' demonstration of their learning regarding Social Justice. 2. Revised the components of the rubric related to Social Justice.
Integrative Learning	2.4	2.6	2.6	Criterion of 2 met	Added Notes to Instructors to highlight the significance of section-specific course content and to suggest scaffolding assignments to build toward the final product.
The assessment team analyzes results and makes recommendations for changes. The team makes some changes to the rubric, as warranted. The CC director works with the LDW lead faculty on changes in the assignment, course guidelines, or teaching and learning strategies. The results and action plan are shared the Living in a Diverse World instructors in the learning community for implementation and with the Core Curriculum Committee for accountability.					

Serving the Common Good: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

LIVE Outcomes	SCG Outcomes	Assessment method	Evaluation tool
Social Justice: Contexts & Structures, Diversity of Communities and Cultures, Identity and Commitment, Communication in the Context of Social Justice	1. Students will connect service learning to commitment to common good. 4. Students will demonstrate understanding of and openness to cultural differences, including communication.	Common assignment	Common rubric
Intercultural Knowledge & Action: Cultural Self-Awareness, Empathy, Attitudes Curiosity, Attitudes Openness, Skills Verbal and Nonverbal Communication	3. Students will reflect on how service-learning affected their understanding of a specific culture. 4. Students will demonstrate understanding of and openness to cultural differences, including communication.		
Integrative Learning: Connections to Experience, Connections to discipline, Transfer, Reflection and Self-Assessment	2. Students will interpret service-learning experience using principles and content. 4. Students will demonstrate understanding of and openness to cultural differences, including communication.		

2013-2014 Results

Method: Integration Paper (common assignment) in all VUSM 3XX sections

Measurement: common rubric created and modified collaboratively

Assessment process:

1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 15% of final enrollment numbers was drawn. Forty-five (15%) papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming. Sections with a final enrollment of 9-16 had two papers drawn, sections with final enrollment of 17-22 had three papers drawn, and the two sections with an enrollment of 23 and 24 had four papers drawn. Online courses are over-sampled (30% of final enrollment) to allow for assessment of modes of delivery.

2) A group of eight volunteers worked over three days in June 2014 to assess the papers. The group consisted of two full-time faculty, two adjunct faculty, one staff member, the director of general education, and the director of assessment and institutional research, and the assessment specialist. The group began with a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point on more than one component of the rubric, a third reader read that paper for the outcome that diverged. When a score diverged on only one component, the two evaluators met together to come to a mutual agreement on the score. If the agreement was not possible, a third reader scored the paper.

SCG Assignment Rubric	2012-13 Results	2013-14 Follow-up Results	Criterion Met/Not Met	Action
Social Justice	2.4	2.3	Criterion of 2.7 not met	Revised outcomes, assignment, and rubric.
Intercultural Knowledge & Action	2.3	2.3	Criterion of 2.7 not met	Loop closed
Integrative Learning		2.4	Criterion of 2 met	Revised outcomes, assignment, and parameters for instructors.
The assessment team analyzes results and makes recommendations for changes. The team makes some changes to the rubric, as warranted. The CC director works with the SCG lead faculty on changes in the assignment, course guidelines, or teaching and learning strategies. The results and action plan are shared the Serving the Common Good instructors in the learning community for implementation and with the Core Curriculum Committee for accountability.				

The Ethical Life: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

LIVE Outcomes	TEL Outcomes	Assessment method	Evaluation tool
Critical Thinking: Explanation of issues, Influence of context and assumptions, Student's position, Conclusions and related outcomes	2. Students will integrate ethical perspectives with case studies and propose a defensible solution. 3. Students will reason logically on complex issues and have awareness of the general relations of premises to conclusion.	Common assignment	Common rubric
Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development: Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives, Application of Ethical Perspectives, Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives	1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of major ethical perspectives. 2. Students will integrate ethical perspectives with case studies and propose a defensible solution.		
Written Communication: Content Development, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, Sources and Evidence, Context and Purpose for Writing, Control of Syntax and Mechanics	1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of major ethical perspectives. 2. Students will integrate ethical perspectives with case studies and propose a defensible solution. 3. Students will reason logically on complex issues and have awareness of the general relations of premises to conclusion. 4. Students will identify, locate, evaluate, and responsibly use information to communicate effectively. 5. Students will demonstrate the ability to write and in-depth analysis of a moral problem		
Information Literacy: Determine Extent of Information Needed, Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically, Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose, Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	4. Students will identify, locate, evaluate, and responsibly use information to communicate effectively.		
Integrative Learning: Connections to discipline, Transfer	2. Students will integrate ethical perspectives with case studies and propose a defensible solution.		

2013-2014 Results

Method: Integration Paper (common assignment) in all VUSM 4XX sections

Measurement: common rubric created and modified collaboratively

Assessment process:

1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 15% of final enrollment numbers was drawn. Thirteen sections had a total final enrollment of 269 students, and 257 papers were submitted. Forty-two (15%) papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming.

2) A group of eight volunteers worked over three days in June 2014 to assess the papers. The group consisted of three full-time faculty, two adjunct faculty, the director of general education, the assessment specialist, and the director of assessment and institutional research. The director of general education and the director of assessment and institutional research aligned the assignment rubric with seminar outcomes and with LIVE outcomes before the assessment team convened. The group began with a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed. Each paper was read by two readers. When scores diverged by more than one point on just one of the nine rubric components, the two readers discussed their differences and came to a conclusion about the score. When a score diverged by more than one point on several components, a third reader read that paper for the outcomes that diverged. Thirteen of the 42 papers required a third reader.

TEL Assignment Rubric	2013-14 Results	Criterion Met/Not Met	Action
Critical Thinking	2.6	Baseline data, Criterion of 2.7 not met	1. Revised the common assignment for clarity.
Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development	2.6	Baseline data, Criterion of 2.7 not met	
Written Communication	2.6	Baseline data, Criterion of 2.7 not met	2. Revised the rubric to simplify it.
Information Literacy	2.6	Baseline data, Criterion of 2.7 not met	
Integrative Learning	2.3	Baseline data, Criterion of 2.7 not met	
The assessment team analyzes results and makes recommendations for changes. The team makes some changes to the rubric, as warranted. The CC director works with the TEL lead faculty on changes in the assignment, course guidelines, or teaching and learning strategies. The results and action plan are shared The Ethical Life instructors in the learning community for implementation and with the Core Curriculum Committee for accountability.			

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results that relate to LIVE Learning Outcomes

Liberal Arts Integrated Values-Based Education		LIVE Core Curriculum Outcomes & Comparison Groups																	
		Ethical Reasoning and Moral Development (3 items)		Social Justice (2 items)		Intercultural Knowledge and Action (6 items)		Integrative Learning (9 items)		Oral Communication (1 item)		Written Communication (1 item)		Critical Thinking (5 items)		Critical Thinking subset: Quantitative Literacy (4 items)		Information Literacy (14 items)	
		First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors	First-Year	Seniors
Positive responses		66%	82%	53%	77%	64%	81%	60%	77%	57%	78%	72%	88%	72%	84%	46%	47%	73%	77%
Viterbo means that met or exceeded comparison group	Catholic C&U	75%	100%	0%	100%	50%	100%	67%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	40%	100%	75%	50%		
	Carnegie Class	100%	100%	0%	100%	75%	100%	89%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	50%		
	NSSE	100%	100%	0%	100%	75%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	50%		
Viterbo means that met or exceeded means for schools that participated in the Information Literacy Topical Module																	100%	100%	