

Academic Program Assessment Report: 2015-2016

Assessment & Institutional Research Viterbo University

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Use of Assessment in the LIVE Core Curriculum	
Foundations	2
Written Communication II Assessment 2016	2
Written Communication II Assessment 2015	3
Ways of Thinking	5
Integrating Faith and Practice	5
Mission Seminars	8
Serving the Common Good	8
The Ethical Life	11
An Overview of Assessment Work by College	
College of Arts and Letters	13
School of Fine Arts	13
School of Humanities	18
College of Business and Leadership	24
Dahl School of Business	24
College of Education, Mathematics, and Science	34
School of Education	34
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics	43
College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior	49
School of Nursing	49
School of Health and Human Behavior	52

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 2015-16 reported in fall 2016.

Strengthening Learning through Assessment in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Of the 56 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- All have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- All have taken action taken to improve student learning.
- Most have followed up on targeted changes, either confirming learning or taking further action.

Systematic follow-up on targeted changes continues to be a challenge. The academic programs regularly collect assessment results and most utilize assessment for targeted changes.

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

**In 2015-2016, 56 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. Some programs with low enrollments do not update results annually.

Strengthening Learning through Assessment in the Core Curriculum

Following the assessment rotation cycle, the focus in 2015-16 was on assessing learning outcomes through the Foundations, Ways of Thinking, and Mission Seminars. Program Review recommendations, which were informed by learning outcomes assessment, are in turn informing next steps with several elements of the Core Curriculum.

- Foundations—Oral Communication: Faculty prepared for assessment in 2016-17.
- **Foundations**—Written Communication II: Faculty decided on targeted changes following two terms of assessment. Follow-up will occur following assessment of Written Communication I.
- Integrating Faith and Practice: The first round of assessment did not result in meeting the criterion. Targeted action includes a formative meeting with all IFP faculty and work on assignment guidelines. Follow-up will continue in 2016-17 until the criterion is met.
- Theological Inquiry: A faculty group met to prepare for TI assessment in 2016-17.
- Serving the Common Good: The fourth year of assessment did not result in the criteria being
 met. Follow-up assessment will be on hold until the structural changes recommended by
 program review have been implemented.
- **The Ethical Life**: Changes recommended by program review will be implemented before follow-up assessment occurs.

Assessment Practice and Progress

Faculty oversight of academic program assessment is provided through the Academic Program Assessment Committee, and in 2015-16, the committee:

- Provided in-depth formative peer review on assessment work for nine academic programs a year before their program review.
- Reviewed the status of assessment following the Sept. 2015 annual updates.
- Provided input to OAIR for a Chairs meeting on assessment in April 2016, emphasizing the significance of using assessment results for targeted actions and follow up.
- Planned for the annual assessment day on May 11, 2016. OAIR hosted a lunch for all faculty to support assessment work time by department and school.

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

Use of Assessment in the LIVE Core Curriculum

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

Foundations Written Communication II: Learning Outcomes Assessment

Written Communication II Assessment 2016

Method: Instructors of WC II courses submitted student work on an assignment designated by them as the best measurement of written communication.

Measurement: VU written communication rubric (adapted from AAC&U).

Assessment process:

- 1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 12% of the papers submitted by students enrolled at the end of each semester was drawn. Twenty-seven courses or sections in FA2015 and SP 2016 had a total final enrollment of 371 students. The instructor for two of the sections did not submit student papers. There were five online classes, and 20% of those papers were drawn.
- **2)** A group of 10 worked over three days in May 2016 to assess the papers. The group consisted of five full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, one librarian, the assessment specialist, the director of core curriculum, and the director of assessment and institutional research. It was helpful that four of the ten evaluators teach Written Communication II courses.

The group had a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group reviewed the rubric, adding specifics for each component and each level of achievement. We scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed and the group came to a common understanding of the expectations. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point on more than one component, a third reader read that paper for the outcomes that diverged. When a score diverged by more than one point on just one component, the two readers discussed the divergence and came to an agreement about the score. Six papers diverged by more than one on just one component. Four papers diverged on more than one component and required a third reader.

Results 2015-2016	Average	Low	High	# 2.5+	% 2.5+
Context and Purpose	2.4	0.5	3.75	30	60%
Content Development	2.3	0.5	4	23	46%
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	2.4	0.5	4	26	52%
Sources and Evidence	2.4	0.5	3.75	30	60%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.4	0.5	3.25	25	50%
Total Score	11.9 / 20	2.5 / 20	18.75 / 20		
Page Length	11.2	3	22		

Combined Results	Average 15-	Average	% 2.5+	% 2.5+
	16	SP15	15-16	SP15
Context and Purpose	2.4	2.5	60%	59%
Content Development	2.3	2.2	46%	41%
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	2.4	2.3	52%	46%
Sources and Evidence	2.4	2.2	60%	41%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.4	2.4	50%	65%
Total Score	11.9 / 20	11.6 / 20		
Page Length	11.2	9.25		

Conclusion: The criterion of 2.5 was not met. The group reached the decision to continue the Written Communication II working group and re-evaluate assessment results following the assessment of Written Communication I.

Written Communication II Assessment 2015

Method: Instructors of WC II courses submitted student work on an assignment designated by them as the best measurement of written communication.

Measurement: VU written communication rubric (adapted from AAC&U).

Assessment process:

- 1) Random sample of papers: A stratified random sample of 20% of the papers submitted by students enrolled at the end of the semester was drawn. Twenty courses or sections in SP2015 had a total final enrollment of 268 students. The instructor for two of the sections did not submit student papers. There were two online classes, and 20% of those papers were drawn.
- **2)** A group of 10 worked over three days in May 2015 to assess the papers. The group consisted of five full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, one librarian, the assessment specialist, the director of general education, and the director of assessment and institutional research. It was helpful that three of the ten evaluators teach Written Communication II courses.

The group had a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group reviewed the rubric, adding specifics for each component and each level of achievement. We scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed and the group came to a common understanding of the expectations. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point on more than one component, a third reader read that paper for the

outcomes that diverged. When a score diverged by more than one point on just one component, the two readers discussed the divergence and came to an agreement about the score. Four papers diverged by more than one on just one component. Six papers diverged on more than one component and required a third reader.

Assessment Results: 2014-2015						
Results	Average	Low	High	# 2.5+	% 2.5+	
Context and Purpose	2.5	1	3.75	22	59%	
Content Development	2.2	1	3.75	15	41%	
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	2.3	1	3.75	17	46%	
Sources and Evidence	2.2	1	3.5	15	41%	
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.4	.75	3.75	24	65%	
Total Score	11.6 / 20	6 / 20	18 / 20			
Page Length	9.25	4	19			

Patterns

1. The better papers were marked by the engagement of the writer in the argument.

Some of these papers were:

Drone Warfare: Evidence of how the Internet is affecting our Humanness Tristan and Isolde: A Comparative Analysis of Wagner and Lancely Green Giorgio Morandi: More than just a Still Life Painter Blindness through a Disability Studies Approach: Saramago and Milton

- 2. The description of the sophomore-level writing course includes this aim: students will "engage in writing....as a means for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communication." One of the challenges for these apprentice writers is conveying engagement in the topic or in the argument. A fairly large set of papers were formulaic and the writer seemed uninvolved.
- 3. Some of the researched argument essays did not reach higher than ENGL 103 papers. We wonder how the design of the courses and of the assignments can build upon the outcomes of first-year composition, moving these writers to a higher level of writing.
- 4. The genres included lab reports, business reports, textual analyses, researched argument essays, literary analyses, and research proposals. The rubric and the outcome was adaptable for the varied genres.
- 5. A few of the papers (four) were not seen to be arguments.
- 6. Sources and Evidence: The minimal expectation of incorporating sources was met: all the papers used at least two sources, and all of the essays included Works Cited Lists or Reference Lists. The quality of the sources varied greatly, with some papers using sources such as BrainyQuotes.com and others incorporating substantive and appropriate peer-reviewed sources. Two of the papers included inadvertent plagiarism. The biggest hurdle for these apprentice writers is to move from a source-driven argument to an effective use of sources.
- 7. Content Development: We found this component to be one of the biggest challenges for apprentice writers. For papers with a score of 2/4 or lower on this component, the average overall score was 9/20. Papers that were less than 7 pages scored considerably less on all five components of the rubric, as much as .4 less. Using compelling content and achieving a coherent whole are growth areas for writers in this sophomore-level course.

Useful resources for new WC II instructors

- A definition of argument in the guidelines would be helpful.
- Including faculty contacts in the guidelines would be a helpful resource for new instructors.

Questions and suggestions for the Written Communication II working group

- Expand the WC II guidelines to include a definition of argumentation.
- Consider revising the guidelines around the length and type of assignments.
- How can faculty teaching WC II courses more effectively build upon the work of first-year composition courses?
- How can faculty teaching writing in the majors more effectively build upon the work of WC II courses?
- Set criteria for the five components, using the Summer 2015 data as baseline data.
 These criteria will then be reviewed by the LIVE Core Curriculum Committee for approval.
- Consider inviting instructors teaching WC II courses to meet once per semester in a learning community format to share best practices and to provide support for the challenging enterprise of teaching writing.

Next steps

- Reinvigorate the Written Communication working group.
- The working group will have WC I placement analysis, WC II syllabus analysis, and WC II assessment results.
- AIR will collect the designated papers from WC II courses taught SU15, FA15, and SP16.
- Follow-up assessment of WC II will occur Summer 2016.

Review of the assessment process

- The norming session on Day 1 was productive and helpful.
- Having a day to evaluate papers provides good pacing.
- In the concluding discussion, participants noted that these assessment sessions offer fruitful discussions about teaching and learning and expressed the hope that more faculty will avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in future sessions.

Ways of Thinking Integrating Faith and Practice

Method: Instructors of IFP courses submitted student work on an assignment designated by them as the best measurement of Integrating Faith and Practice.

Measurement: Integrating Faith and Practice rubric.

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. Fourteen courses or sections in SP2016 had a total final enrollment of 251 students. There were six online classes, and 20% of those papers were drawn.
- 2) A group of 8 worked over three days in May 2016 to assess the papers. The group consisted of four full-time faculty, one adjunct faculty, the assessment specialist, the director of core curriculum, and the director of assessment and institutional research.

The group had a norming session to establish inter-rater reliability. The group reviewed the student learning outcomes, element guidelines and rubric, and revised the description, outcomes, and rubric components for clarity. The aim of Integrating Faith and Practice courses is an apprentice level, and the group set the criterion at an average of 2.5.

We scored one norming paper. After scores were compared and reviewed, a second paper was normed and the group came to a common understanding of the expectations. Each paper was read by two readers. When a score diverged by more than one point on more than one component, a third reader read that paper for the outcomes that diverged. When a score diverged by more than one point on just one component, the two readers discussed the divergence and came to an agreement about the score. Five papers diverged by more than one on just one component. Three papers diverged on more than one component and required a third reader.

Overall Results	Average	Low	High	# 2.5+	% 2.5+
Analyze theological constructs rooted in sacred and foundational texts.	1.8	0	3.75	16	36%
Critically examine how one or more specific communities engage theology in practice.	1.8	0	3.5	16	36%
Total Score	3.6 / 8	0/8	7.25 / 8		
Page Length	6.46	2.75	11.5		

The Spring 2016 papers did not meet the criterion of an average of 2.5 for each of the outcomes. Targeted changes and follow-up assessment will be necessary in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017.

Observations

- It would be helpful to be explicit about length expectations: we noticed a correlation between length and quality.
- Most papers stayed at the level of explanation and did not achieve analysis.
- The better papers were marked by the following: thesis statements that articulated a comparative analysis and papers that applied the examination and critique of theological perspectives to a new context.
- Some types of assignments are not in alignment with the expectations and rubric. For example, the book reviews and personal reflections we read were not analytical. The papers (N=10) submitted from two sections did not align with the outcomes of Integrating Faith and Practice, with 70% of the scores 0-1 out of a possible 8. These ten papers, which missed the mark in terms of assignment alignment with element outcomes, comprised 23% of the total. A subset analysis was required, in which we removed the papers from those two sections.

Subset Analysis (12 out of 14 sections)	Average	Online	Face-to-Face	Online	F2F %
		Average	Average	%2.5+	2.5+
Analyze theological constructs rooted in sacred and foundational texts.	2.2	2.4	2.1	58%	39%
Critically examine how one or more specific communities engage theology in practice.	2.2	2.5	2.1	58%	39%
Total Score	4.3	4.8	4.1		
Page Length	7.0	8.2	6.4		

Suggested Assignment Guidelines

- Instructors should select a written assignment through which students will demonstrate the achievement of the learning outcomes at an apprentice level. These signature assignments will be submitted for program assessment.
- Assignment directions should incorporate the learning outcomes and build on the outcomes of Theological Inquiry.
- The assignment should require analysis of texts and contexts.
- Length and format expectations: Times New Roman (12 point font), 200-level courses a word count of 1,800-2,400 (6-8 pages) and 300- and 400-level courses, a word count of 2,400 3,000 (8-10 pages) is a minimal expectation. Standard margins and double-spaced.
- The signature assignment should be a researched paper with scholarly sources in alignment with the outcomes.

Useful resources for Integrating Faith & Practice instructors

- Share exemplars and make available to all instructors.
- Create a Moodle site for Ways of Thinking with folders for TI and IF&P.
- Share successful rubrics and assignments.
- Share best practices.

Next steps

- Communicate the results with Religious Studies Department, the IF&P working group, and the core curriculum committee to implement appropriate targeted changes.
- Create a set of assignment guidelines including suggestions on adapting assignments to help students meet these expectations. The IF&P working group in tandem with the Religious Studies faculty, Frank Ludwig, and AIR staff will do this.
- Hold a meeting of all instructors (including adjuncts) who teach this Way of Thinking to:
 - o share assessment results,
 - o set the goal of meeting the criteria,
 - o implement revision of IF&P description, outcomes, rubric, and expanded guidelines,
 - o inform instructors of the timeline for submitting student work electronically by the end of fall and spring semesters,
 - o apply the rubric to a student paper in an abbreviated norming session,
 - o discuss potential section-specific changes to address student learning,
 - o invite participation in Summer 2017 assessment of student learning in IF&P,
 - o highlight the Moodle resource site and invite the sharing of best practices.
- The core curriculum office and the assessment and institutional research office will collect student work and prepare for a half-day assessment review.

Mission Seminars Serving the Common Good

2015-2016

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 papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming. Fifteen sections from FA2015 and SP2016 had a total final enrollment of 298 students, and 261 papers were submitted. One instructor from SP2016 did not submit papers.

2) A group of eight volunteers worked over three days in May 2016 to assess the papers. The group consisted of one full-time faculty, four adjunct faculty, the director of core curriculum, 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. Initial results revealed more divergence in scoring than teams have experienced before. The group discussed areas of divergence as a group. Then the two readers met to deliberate on divergences. Five papers required a third reader who evaluated the paper for the outcomes that diverged.

Results

SCG Assignment Rubric	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Criterion Met/Not
	Results	Follow-up	Follow-up	Follow-up	Met
		Results	Results	Results	
Social Justice	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.0	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Intercultural Knowledge & Action	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.8	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Integrative Learning		2.4	2.4	2.0	Criterion of 2 met

1) Analysis by assessment team, June 2016:

The downward trend of the results precipitated much discussion. The team also examined indirect measures of student learning in Social Justice and Intercultural Knowledge: the NSSE survey and the general education surveys show that students perceive great gains in these outcomes. 77% of seniors responded positively to the Social Justice items, compared to 53% positive responses for first-year students. 81% of seniors responded positively to the Intercultural Knowledge and Action items, compared to 64% positive responses for first-years. When we ask students to demonstrate their learning in written work, they struggle. The observations and analysis of the group resonated with the analysis from the previous year:

- Students struggle to integrate concepts with the service learning experience;
- Students struggle to demonstrate understanding of and response to cultural differences;
- Generally, students do not address their own cultural beliefs, attitudes, practices, or communication strategies.

<u>Conclusions</u>

In the fourth year of assessment, following a series of targeted changes, the criteria have not yet been met. Because of the structural changes recommended through program review, the team concluded that follow-up assessment will be on hold until those changes have been implemented. In the meantime, there are three major areas for focus to achieve the aims of the seminar:

- 1) Clarify and streamline the seminar design: clarify the essentials in the focus of the seminar. What do we want this seminar to achieve and what will it take to reach those aims? For example, the strongest papers showed deep learning about the course concepts, about a common topic, issue, or a population, and a framework for mutuality in the service, rather than a focus on one-way contributions. These larger design issues will need some collective focus and energy to turn the results around.
- 2) Secondly, focus on making the seminar design more manageable and targeted: streamline the assignment, align the rubric with that streamlined assignment, make appropriate text changes, and clarify the seminar guidelines for instructors.
- 3) Provide further support to instructors through an expanded set of resources on Moodle, by partnering with faculty development on seminar format and on Social Justice and Intercultural Knowledge and Action, and by having at least two meetings of instructors every year.

2) Team Questions and Observations:

What does the seminar do when we see it working well as expressed in student work?

- Students become less self-centered, more critically self-aware and more altruistic.
- We hear students stating a desire to continue engagement in service.
- Students are aware of becoming off-kilter or less comfortable as they encounter contradictions.
- Students gain a broader perspective by working and contributing in the world.
- Students recognize complexity.
- They realize the answers are not simplistic.
- Students develop a desire to go back out there.
- Students become more courageous.
- Students begin to think about vocation, to recognize their own gifts and the potential to contribute.
- They realize these are huge problems and some small contributions do make a difference.
- They also realize they can do damage.
- Students realize that engaging in the world will change themselves.

Cultural Diversity

Two of the seminar learning outcomes are focused on understanding of cultural differences. This focus is drawn from the LIVE outcomes of Social Justice and Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, both of which are assessed at the proficient level in this seminar. Students struggle to reach the aims related to understanding cultural differences and responding to those cultural differences.

- Students struggled with notions of culture: students did not examine or recognize the
 intersectionality of cultures. They tended to see cultures in a monochromatic scheme.
 Generally they did not address their own cultural beliefs, attitudes, practices, or communication
 strategies. The thinking about cultural difference is thin or lacking.
- 2) Student work on cultural understanding and openness was better when students were immersed with a specific population and when the course content included learning about the issues (i.e. poverty) or the particular culture(s) represented in the service-learning experience. The course content and service-learning experience does not always focus on cultural diversity.
- 3) This course builds upon the work most students have done in Living in a Diverse World: how can we build upon material from LDW, or how can students more effectively draw on the chapter in Cress about culture?

Personal Growth

Several of the learning outcomes are predicated upon personal growth through the service-learning experience: we ask students to demonstrate a "commitment to the common good," to analyze how the experience clarified "their understanding of their own cultural beliefs, attitudes, practices, and communication strategies," and to respond "to cultural differences in their communication strategies."

Yet, in the papers, many students did not intentionally focus on personal growth. Generally, students do not address their own cultural beliefs, attitudes, practices, or communication strategies.

Questions and Next Steps:

1) <u>Seminar Goals:</u> Social Justice and the concept of the Common Good are keys to this seminar. The aims of the seminar are complex, lofty, and experiential and are rooted in the university's core values. How do we support students in engaging in service through learning (about the concepts as well as the issue or population)? How do we support students in transformative learning?

2) Social Justice and Intercultural Knowledge

- Re-examine how the seminar design promotes Social Justice and Intercultural Knowledge.
- A starting point may be an examination of and revision of the SJ and IK outcomes.
- Utilize faculty expertise on these broad goals and in the seminar design.
- SCG builds upon LDW: how can we more effectively communicate the scaffolding that exists between the seminars?
- How can student learning and growth be developed in the seminar?
- Are we asking the right questions in the prompts to elicit discussion of culture?

3) Common Texts

Keep Cress as a common text and create a course packet of materials to have available for Spring 2017. Next step: collaboratively create an annotated bibliography of possible sources around the common outcomes: the common good, leadership models, service learning. A particular focus should be on replacing Rawls, which students do not find to be accessible.

4) Service Learning and Cultural Diversity

- The paradigm that most effectively promoted the learning outcomes was when the course content focused on preparing students to understand and interact with a population or focus on preparing students to understand issues facing the people with whom they interact. Some examples are: people living on the Eagle Butte reservation, women recovering from addictions, middle-school children and philosophical conversation; understanding homelessness or poverty; the Nicaragua study abroad course. This paradigm helped students move into authentic interaction.
- Another paradigm is a common focus on X and having students do their own research about a population they are working with at a variety of locations.
- What could we do to assist our community partners in fully utilizing the service learning model?
- Examine ways of most effectively promoting intercultural knowledge while maintaining flexibility in the service-learning experience.

5) Targeted changes to support learning

- Expand and update the Moodle site with great resources for teaching and learning.
- Invigorate a faculty learning community.
- Offer a faculty development workshop on the seminar format: what is a seminar and how
 can the seminar format be implemented? Krista recommends Stanford's website on
 seminar development.

Resources and Support

- Instructional Designer, Cari Mathwig Ramseier
- Assessment Specialist, Nicole Vidden
- Collaboration with Faculty Development

The Ethical Life

2015-2016 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 the submitted papers was drawn. Sixteen sections had a total final enrollment of 350 students, and 290 papers were submitted. Forty-three (15%) papers were drawn and two papers were used in norming. The average length was 10.2 pages.

2) A group of nine volunteers worked over three days in May/June 2016 to assess the papers. The group consisted of three full-time faculty, two adjunct faculty, the instructional designer, the director of core curriculum, the assessment specialist, and the director of assessment and institutional research. 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. Sixteen of the papers required a third reader.

1) Results

TEL Assignment Rubric	2013-14 Results	2014-15 Follow-up	2015-16 Follow-up	Criterion Met/Not Met
		Results	Results	
Critical Thinking	2.6	2.3	2.3	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Ethical Reasoning & Moral Development	2.6	2.2	2.2	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Written Communication	2.6	2.3	2.3	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Information Literacy	2.6	2.3	2.1	Criterion of 2.7 not met
Integrative Learning	2.3	1.9	2.1	Criterion of 2.7 not met

2) Analysis by assessment team, June 2016:

The team made the following observations:

- Overall, these student writers were engaged in their topic and made good efforts in writing an
 argument based on research. Students struggled in applying the four-way method to the ethical
 problem they identified. Some students explained the four-way method but stopped short of
 utilizing it and applying it to their focus.
- The Ethical Life sets high expectations for student learning. While the team affirms the high expectations, the following changes would help students synthesize their learning:
 - o The assignment is asking for too much in a relatively short paper. Revise the assignment to keep the essentials and shed unrealistic expectations.
 - O Devising an earlier assignment which asks students to practice applying the four-way method in a limited scope may help students reach this aim in the final paper.
- The marks of good papers were intellectual engagement in the topic, integration of sources, genuine exploration of the ethical question, and adept handling of ambiguity and complexity.

- When the seminar is working well:
 - Students express appreciate for learning to apply concepts to new material.
 - Student recognize the importance of being impartial and objective in examining one's moral commitments.
 - o Students understand that nothing is to be gained by belittling an opposing viewpoint.

The team raised the following questions:

- 1. How are students prepared for this seminar? The only prerequisite in VUSM 300, which requires a very different kind of paper, in the reflection and integration common assignment. There is little preparation for ethical reasoning before TEL. Written Communication II courses, by design, serve as preparation for the final paper in TEL (specifically in terms of incorporating research into a complex argument). How can instructors assist students in making the connections between WC II courses and TEL (if students have completed WC II)?
- 2. Given the level of expectation in this paper, the criterion of an average of 2.7 may be too high. Consider dropping it to an average of 2.5.

3) Recommendations / Suggestions for targeted action:

- 1. Revise the assignment and rubric to keep the essentials and shed the unrealistic expectations and the non-essentials (See Observations and Recommendations for details).
- 2. Expand Moodle resources to include supplemental resources for instructors and to include examples of very poor papers and fairly successful papers.
- 3. Set aside a two-hour block during in-service or out-service for TEL instructors to review assessment results, set goals for next year's assessment results, and decide on specific changes to make at the seminar and section level to boost student learning.
- 4. Partner with faculty development on a session / panel on Ethical Reasoning.
- 5. Continue an annual discussion with all seminar instructors going—to focus on the seminar format and on helping students make connections between seminars.
- **4) Feedback loop:** The assessment team analyzes results and makes recommendations for changes. 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.

An Overview of Assessment Work by College, 2015-2016 Academic Year

College of Arts and Letters

Assessment Report for the College of Arts and Letters: Sept. 2016 Updates

Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up				
Associate of Arts/Science	Revised Program						
School of Fine Arts							
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up				
Art	05/03/2016	10/02/2013	09/25/2009				
Arts Administration	09/22/2015	10/02/2014					
Dance (minor)	09/21/2016	09/21/2016	09/04/2011				
Music	05/11/2016	05/11/2016	09/28/2015				
Music Theatre	09/23/2016	09/02/2011					
Theatre BFA core	09/21/2016	09/28/2015					
Scl	nool of Humanities						
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up				
Broad Field Social Studies	05/13/2016	08/31/2011	08/31/2011				
English	12/04/2015	12/04/2015	08/31/2011				
History	05/13/2016	07/15/2014	09/14/2012				
Latin American Studies & Latino Studies (minors)	08/25/2016	10/14/2015	08/25/2016				
Liberal Studies	09/24/2015	09/25/2014					
Philosophy	09/22/2016	09/22/2016					
Religious Studies	08/29/2016	08/17/2016					
Spanish	06/01/2016	10/14/2013					
Women's Studies (minor)	09/19/2016	06/06/2012	06/06/2012				
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2016							

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries School of Fine Arts

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sherri Lisota

Name of Program: Art Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The 2015-2016 data reflects that 80% or more of students in art programs are meeting sophomore level proficiency in five program outcomes. In 2015-2016, we focused on reviewing Art Department program outcomes to more succinctly address skills, qualities, and knowledge that we want and are able to assess. As a result, Art Program Outcome #7 was removed from assessment at the sophomore review level pending revision or elimination.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Our primary focus for assessment work for 2016-2017 will be to complete the revisions to the language of outcomes six and seven, and to revise the sophomore review rubric to align it with these revisions. We would also like to make an artifact that reflects student usage of academic databases and resources and see the correlation between it and student achievements in outcome three.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Susan Cosby Ronnenberg

Name of Program: Arts Administration

Date: September 29, 201

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-2016, none of the classes with designated assessment assignments ran, so we had no data to analyze. Instead, we significantly revised and reduced the number of Student Learning Outcomes for the program and working with faculty who will be preparing the AADM courses for 2016-2017 to insure consistency and accuracy in including the revised SLOs on syllabi and assignments. We also developed a curriculum map for assessment purposes with the new SLOs. The board had a new chair (Diana Cataldi-Music) and a new member (Susan Cosby Ronnenberg—Asst. Dean of COAL) this year, making it a transitional year in leadership for the program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, two of the AADM courses with designated assessment assignments are running: AADM 300 (Performing Arts Management) and AADM 400 (Arts Administration Seminar). We'll be collecting data from those courses, with the new SLOs, to start analyzing how the students are progressing toward appropriate skill levels for SLOs 1 & 2.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Shane Rhoades

Name of Program: Dance Minor Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year, (2015-16), was the first year that I had any input into TracDat. My main focus for assessment for the Dance Minor was the Program Review. I spent a great deal of time on that report. As a result of that, I was able to assess the Dance Minor and make changes to the course catalog and the requirements for the minor.

Regarding TracDat, I have looked at the program objectives and they are being met. The goal of "80% of students will score 80% or higher on the final exam performance" was met for DANC 250 Jazz 1. This goal was also met in DANC 270 Jazz II.

DANC 490, Dance Rep, also had a successful Spring semester culminating in a dance concert in the black box theatre.

There was also great success in the productions regarding dance. I choreographed both Oklahoma and Shout and they were very well received by the community. Students took the knowledge they gained in classroom work and put that into practice in the productions.

Qualtrics was utilized for the Musical Theatre and Theatre students Freshman and Sophomore Evals. This is a great assessment tool to gauge the students understanding and growth.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-17 the primary assessment work will be continued investment in classroom to production integration. DANC 360, Dance Composition, is in rotation in the Spring semester. This course will investigate the creation of dance and choreography. Students learning will be evaluated on examining and understanding choreography based on counts, shape, line, space, formations, tempo and rhythm. Students will also choreograph a dance solo to demonstrate their understanding of dance composition.

DANC 110, Fundamentals of Dance, is a key component for our Freshman Musical Theatre and Theatre students. I am teaching this course and give them the fundamentals of ballet, tap, and jazz in order to prepare them for their specialized courses that will follow during their pursuit of their BFA. Rubrics for all disciplines have been developed, as well as written exams to test for understanding of key dance terminology.

Modern Dance is also in rotation in the Spring semester. An adjunct will be hired who has already taught the course. This will make for seamless integration of that course into the dance minor objectives as a whole.

Qualtrics will once again be used for Freshman and Sophomore evaluations.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Haupert

Name of Program: Music Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The music department increased action items last year from 4 to 27, but still had a high level of results without actions. In order to more effectively manage our assessment methods for department outcomes (performance, theory, history, and teaching), we trimmed our assessment methods to those that best measure development and mastery levels, as they pertain to specific degree programs. We hope that these revisions will help us to focus assessment methods on the refinement of our program outcomes.

Specifically, in performance, the applied jury rubrics will provide data for ongoing development of student performance (in both voice and piano). The senior recital (MUVO/MUPI 490) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Performance and the half recital (MUVO/MUPI 390) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Education and the B. A. in Music. Theory development will be assessed in the Sight Singing Exam (MUSC 117); mastery will be assessed in the Theory IV (MUSC 252) Composition Project (for the B. A. in Music) and Form and Analysis (MUSC 353) Final Project (for the B. M. in Performance or Music Education). The assessment methods for history have been trimmed to the Music History II (MUSC 328) Research Paper (for the B. A. in Music and B. M. in Music Education) and

Survey of Song Literature (MUSC 332) Final Project (for the B. M. in Vocal Performance). In the area of teaching, evaluations for student teaching (MUSC 425 and 429) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Education; assessment for the Pedagogy Practicum (MUSC 481) will measure mastery for teaching in the B. M. in Performance – Pedagogy Emphasis programs (piano and voice).

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The music department discussed assessment methods for our department outcomes (performance, theory, history, and teaching) and trimmed our assessment methods to those that best measure development and mastery levels, as they pertain to specific degree programs. We hope that these revisions will help us to focus assessment methods on the refinement of our program outcomes.

Specifically, in performance, the applied jury rubrics will provide data for ongoing development of student performance (in both voice and piano). The senior recital (MUVO/MUPI 490) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Performance and the half recital (MUVO/MUPI 390) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Education and the B. A. in Music. Theory development will be assessed in the Sight Singing Exam (MUSC 117); mastery will be assessed in the Theory IV (MUSC 252) Composition Project (for the B. A. in Music) and Form and Analysis (MUSC 353) Final Project (for the B. M. in Performance or Music Education). The assessment methods for history have been trimmed to the Music History II (MUSC 328) Research Paper (for the B. A. in Music and B. M. in Music Education) and Survey of Song Literature (MUSC 332) Final Project (for the B. M. in Vocal Performance). In the area of teaching, evaluations for student teaching (MUSC 425 and 429) will measure mastery for the B. M. in Music Education; assessment for the Pedagogy Practicum (MUSC 481) will measure mastery for teaching in the B. M. in Performance – Pedagogy Emphasis programs (piano and voice).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Karla Hughes

Name of Program: Music Theatre

Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

During the 2015-2016 school year our focus was on maintaining our strong results for 3 out of 4 outcomes where we met our criterion and improving upon the 4th outcome where we had not met our criterion. For all of our results, this year we actually improved upon our scores from last year and met all criterion for the first time. This came through establishing and clarifying individual outcomes with each student. At the start of each semester the student and teacher sat down and listed a series of individualized goals for that student. The student was the one to establish goals with the guidance of the instructor. This action empowered the student to take an active role in achieving his/her goals and allowed student and teacher to focus on the individual student's needs. The instructor and student then discussed these goals on a regular basis during the semester, modified goals as growth was made, and at the end of the semester, did a personal assessment of their goals with the teacher.

We are so happy we will be closing the loop and moving forward with a new area of assessment which is more inclusive for the 2016-2017 school year.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In Music Theatre we will be moving from assessing the Voice Lesson component to assessing the Senior Capstone Project. Where the assessment of Voice Lessons has helped improve the voice area, this is truly a single component of the student's overall education. The Senior Capstone Project encompasses every aspect of the student's education and involves not only voice, but also the other major areas dance and acting. We feel the Voice Lesson component has moved in to a very strong position and we can move forward with assessment in a more integrated fashion which will involve faculty cooperation across disciplines (voice, acting, and dance) within our department.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeff Stolz

Name of Program: Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theatre-core

Date: September 21, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year, (2015-16) we continued to streamline our freshman and sophomore evaluations so as to better reflect each faculty member's interaction with the students. Nicole Vidden was great help in sorting and recording the data from our evaluations and creating a Qualtrics survey that we will use this spring

Our current evaluation only has five questions which relate to the BFA core and production work as a whole.

21.8% of students were scored as doing superior work 65% of students were scored as high achieving or doing superior work

This only reflects the freshman and sophomores, but still gives us a good look at how our program is functioning, as well as showing us that students are being successful which will hopefully lead to greater retention

Whereas before our streamlined evaluation we had anecdotal evidence to show that the students were progressing, we didn't have the hard data. We had to assume our previous results of- 70% for each outcome, which fell short of our goal of 80%. Now we have the data in a manageable format and can see that we are closer to meeting our goals.

Our follow up and action will to implement our valuation in the new Qualtrics format and compare the results with this year.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-17 the primary assessment work for the core in the Theatre BFA will include streamlining and creating a Qualtrics version of the student evaluation so that we are able to compare faculty scores with student scores. This will give us an indication where we need to close the gap between what we think they are learning and what they actually think about our Theatre core in the BFA. A secondary goal is to be able to successfully administer our Qualtrics survey, review the results and share the findings with our students in one of our departmental forums. I would be interested to hear their feedback about the effectiveness of the freshman and sophomore evaluation as an assessment tool. We need to work to

dedicate at least one department meeting after the evaluations to review the results as a group and see what improvements can be made.

School of Humanities

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Smuksta / Andrew Hamilton

Name of Program: Broad Field Social Studies

Date: May 25, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

All of our six outcomes were assessed last year at the novice and apprentice/proficient level. Last year was also transition year at both the novice and the apprentice/proficient level with the elimination and replacement of the capstone sequence courses, History 465 and 466, with the common humanities capstone course, Humanities 481. Material from History 465 was a three credits course distributed as two credits on historical methodology and history as a discipline and one credit on students preparing a preliminary research proposal. The assignment in History 100 that worked best was the 3-page paper as a result of reading the book The Return of Martin Guerre, an American Historical Review Forum, and the transcript of the trial. This assignment served as a good introduction to historical methodology. Although one BFSS students did not meet outcome number 1 in the history survey classes, the student who earned less than a C in History 111 subsequently changed his major to Management. Humanities 481 worked well as history department members read the research proposals, the annotated bibliographies, and numerous drafts of theses, offering advice and suggestions over the course of two semesters. Department members also attended the oral presentations and poster sessions and evaluated the performances of the students at or above the criterion of a BC.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

First, the department needs to discuss revision of History 100, the Historian's Craft. Although it is recommended to continue the Return of Martin Guerre assignment, a decision needs to be made whether to keep an additional book, Landscape of History. Although not formally assessed, the sense of the instructor was that the above average BFSS majors in their first and second years were able to comprehend that argument of the book (history should align with the soft sciences, not the social sciences), the average students, defined as C range students, had some difficulty with the text. Second, although no BFSS students are expected to register for Humanities 465, the department needs to review the rubric for Historical Analysis and be consistent in its use, especially with disaggregating the data related to specific program outcomes. Third, students will be sent the material related to the mid-way interviews over the summer, and the department will review the responses and schedule a follow-up meeting as needed. Fourth, the BFSS curriculum map needs revision and supporting documents deleted or updated. Finally, the faculty member previously responsible for TracDat assessment has retired, so another member of the department will need to administer assessment.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Smuksta / Andrew Hamilton

Name of Program: History

Date: May 25, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

All of our six outcomes were assessed last year at the novice and apprentice/proficient level. Last year was also transition year at both the novice and the apprentice/proficient level with the elimination and replacement of the capstone sequence courses, History 465 and 466, with the common humanities capstone course, Humanities 481. Material from History 465 was a three credits course distributed as two credits on historical methodology and history as a discipline and one credit on students preparing a preliminary research proposal. The assignment in History 100 that worked best was the 3-page paper as a result of reading the book The Return of Martin Guerre, an American Historical Review Forum, and the transcript of the trial. This assignment served as a good introduction to historical methodology. One history major did not meet outcome number 1 in the history survey classes due to family issues and despite an outreach by the instructor and advisers from the Center for Student Success. Humanities 481 worked well as history department members read the research proposals, the annotated bibliographies, and numerous drafts of theses, offering advice and suggestions over the course of two semesters. Department members also attended the oral presentations and poster sessions and evaluated the performances of the students at or above the criterion of a BC.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

First, the department needs to discuss revision of History 100, the Historian's Craft. Although it is recommended to continue the Return of Martin Guerre assignment, a decision needs to be made whether to keep an additional book, Landscape of History. Although not formally assessed, the sense of the instructor was that the above average history majors in their first and second years were able to comprehend that argument of the book (history should align with the soft sciences, not the social sciences), the average students, defined as C range students, had some difficulty with the text. Second, although no history majors are expected to register for Humanities 465, the department needs to review the rubric for Historical Analysis and be consistent in its use, especially with disaggregating the data related to specific program outcomes. Third, students will be sent material related to the mid-way interviews over the summer, and the department will review the responses and schedule a follow-up meeting as needed. Fourth, the history curriculum map needs revision and supporting documents deleted or updated. Finally, the faculty member previously responsible for TracDat assessment has retired, so another member of the department will need to administer assessment.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jesús E Jambrina

Name of Program: Latin American Studies & Latino Studies (minor)

Date: August 26, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

During Spring and Fall 2014 students declaring the LASP minor were advised to take HIST 153 at the beginning of the process so they can apply that foundational knowledge to other LASP courses. Some of these students took HIST 153 in the fall 2015. Although final grades for the assignments did not meet the criteria, these students however got a higher grade overall in the course regarding assessed goals.

Some of these students have taken other LASP elective courses and faculty has mentioned that they are better prepared for them.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Continue collecting results for HIST 153 this fall on the three program outcomes using a new text book, and renovating teaching methods toward a seminar formant. Also this year LASP is going through its second program review and we look forward to the committee recommendations.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Vickie Holtz-Wodzak

Name of Program: Liberal Studies

Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year, we evaluated 5 senior projects from Liberal Studies. Of those projects, three met all outcomes, one partially met the outcomes, and one did not meet outcomes at all. From this evidence, we conclude that the program is meeting the expected assessment standards.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The challenge of the liberal studies program is always that we help students craft a degree program that is composed primarily of courses over which we have little control. Additionally, students come to us from a variety of former degree programs and "need to graduate" as soon as possible. We have few points to affect assessment outcomes. We recently changed the format for LBST 399 and 499, the exit-point class sequence. We used to meet as a class, but the students' interests and needs were too varied for any type of successful class cohesion; instead, we meet individually with students on a weekly basis to guide them through their final project. This year's numbers (3/5 successful) suggest the process works. We will be watching this upcoming year to see if we can continue or improve the success rate.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jason Howard

Name of Program: Philosophy Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

We still have limited data to draw any significant conclusions from given the small number of majors that we have. However, looking over the results of the exit exam, there is a trend established over the last few years that suggests our students are not grasping the history of philosophy with as much depth as we'd like and that thematic differences between different branches/themes of philosophy could be articulated with more clarity. Following up on our assessment from last year, we have now included certain mandatory questions on our exit exam to refine the accuracy of what students know and how these align with different learning outcomes of the program. We continue to contemplate having all of our majors give a research presentation before they graduate. In the past this type of capstone project was met through an independent study that encouraged a public presentation at Scholars day or our annual Philosophy conference, but not every student does the presentation (although the vast majority do).

2. Plan for 2016-2017

We will continue discussing the integration/organization of a formal oral defense as a regular part of the capstone experience for our majors. Also, we are in conversations with History and English to add our students to the joint humanities cap-stone thesis class currently being supervised by Rolf Samuels (and offered once every academic year). We continue to face considerable challenges scaffolding our courses for our major and will try to meet these challenges as best we can.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Lopez-Kaley

Name of Program: Religious Studies

Date: September 21, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-16, the assessment of the Way of Thinking: Theological Inquiry, and the Way of Thinking: Faith and Practice, was turned over to a committee consisting of Religious Studies faculty and others. That information can be gleaned in other sources.

Three Religious Studies courses were assessed for the major. In RLST 465: Christian Morality, two majors submitted the 8-10m page paper required for the course. One of the students achieved the goal of 80% or higher, one did not. The student who did not failed to put adequate time into the project because of family obligations. In RLST 354: Liturgy and Worship, the assessment tool of a 6-8 page paper was submitted by all majors, with a score of 80% or higher as the benchmark. Of the four majors in the course, two achieved the outcome, two did not achieve the outcome. In RLST 311: Gospels, a 6-8 page paper was submitted by the majors. A score of 80% or higher was the benchmark. Of the two students in the class, one achieved the outcome, one did not achieve the outcome. In both 354 and 311, follow up will include norming the papers and refining the assignment.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, the department will be addressing the following concerns: 1) defining a natural progression to upper level courses; 2) scaffolding work within the major; 3) standardizing a framework for research papers;

4) standardizing the rubric for research papers and norming it; 5) identifying two or three courses that use biblical commentary; 6) developing a running list of what students need to be successful beyond the university. Courses to be assessed this year are RLST 425: Christology (the third time, every other year), and RLST 331: Church History (the first time, every other year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Maribel V Bird

Name of Program: Spanish

Date: May 24, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

We have changed the focus of assessment, the methodology, and the tools to assess SLO. We no longer rely exclusively on courses to measure all five learning objectives. Instead we require a research project and a poster presentation to measure the first four SLO. Seven students graduating in 2016 presented

during the Humanities Symposium and were evaluated. Complete results are compiled on table #2, included.

Conclusion: Individual focus on Spanish majors give us a more accurate picture of the quality of graduates and the strength and weaknesses of the program. Utilizing courses did not demonstrate individual achievement because the courses included students pursuing minors.

The program for this academic year focused in communication, culture, connections, and comparisons. Students were asked to prepare a poster presentation where they presented research on a cultural aspect of a Spanish speaking country and where the following SLO were demonstrated.

Communication

1. Demonstrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in a variety of topics and contexts.

Culture

2. Demonstrate understanding of culture manifestations connecting and distinguishing Spain, Latin America, and the USA.

Connections

3. Explain and show the interdisciplinary nature of language studies.

Comparisons

4. Compare and contrast language and cultures differences.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

- 1. After this end of year evaluation, it is obvious that a midterm assessment might be necessary in order to develop timely interventions or strategies to bring the student to the targeted performance before graduation.
- 2. The SLO related to community will have to be assess in collaboration with VUSM faculty and/or within departmental requirements.
- 3. More than half of the students did not reach the target for communication. We have to develop some strategies to improve communication skills.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Apryl Denny Name of Program: Women's Studies Minor

Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Student performance at the introductory level in all three areas of assessment met our program goals. 100% of students (16 out of 16) in Introduction to Women's Studies in the fall of 2015 (results recorded 9/19/2016) scored 80% or better on the Gender and on the Diversity assignment and on the Service Assignment; also, 94% of students (15/16) scored 80% or better on the Interdisciplinary Study assignment. So all three student outcomes were met at the introductory level and all loops were closed. The problem, however, is that none of the assessed students are current women's studies minors—or at least not currently declared minors. The fact that non-minors are meeting our assessment expectations suggests that our curriculum is successful, but our recruitment strategies leave much to be desired.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Last year Marlene Fisher devised a plan to make the minor more accessible to students. We reduced the credit requirements by 3, from 21 to 15, and created a new capstone course that will be part of another class that Marlene teaches. This comes in response to changes in Viterbo policy concerning minimum course enrollment. Also, now that we have a minor who is nearing the advanced level, TracDat assessment at the advanced level will need some revision, but this probably won't come until 2017-18. Currently, we are in the process of updating our WMST recruitment brochures to include a course rotation so that long-range student-planning for the minor is possible. With an interdisciplinary minor, student advising is done in departments that don't necessarily know the course rotations for WMST courses (because these courses are listed in many different departments); also advisors don't necessarily understand which courses can be substituted for core credit. (This is especially true of VUSM courses that can be taken for WMST, VUSM, and/or major credit). Even though every course in the minor can be double counted for WMST and core curriculum credit, many advisors are likely to discourage a minor that can't easily be planned ahead in their curriculum. Similarly, many students are unlikely to see how easily a minor can be added to their graduation plan without having access to an available course rotation and a thorough explanation of how the program works. The following list indicates some of the problems that have arisen recently within the WMST program. Beneath the list we offer a plan for beginning to solve the problems in the coming year.

- 1) students who indicated verbal interest in the minor (but didn't officially sign up) have not yet been recontacted
- 2) the absence of an easily available course rotation makes advising more complicated
- 3) the absence of cross-listed WMST courses in the fall and spring course schedule made advising more difficult
- 4) negative press related to feminist issues is a continuing problem that discourages young women to declare their interest in WMST

Solutions: Currently, I am making sure that problems 1 and 2 are being taken care of by updating our course rotation and by adding it to the brochure (Marlene Fisher and Deb Daehn Zelmer have already updated the course information and contact information so this is in progress already!) and by making sure that the registrar understands our need for cross listing. Once the new brochure is complete, I will respond to problems 2 and 3 by contacting the 2015 and 2016 WMST 100/VUSM 290 classes and faculty advisors with an email explaining the program and attaching a brochure. I will also attend the minors' fair on Oct. 26th with brochures and a display, and I will make sure that our program's brochures are displayed outside the admissions office (which they are not currently). As part of a 5-hour WMST activism project in my WMST class in response to #5, I will encourage minors (I have one now and hope to accrue more) to visit freshman and sophomore classes to dispel myths about women's studies and to invite students to join the minor (especially classes in the humanities and social sciences). To further promote understanding on campus, Marlene Fisher and I will continue to work on planning WMST campus events. She will be showing Iron Jawed Angels on Sept. 29th to encourage women to vote. And she and I will organize the Women's Studies Film Festival to be shown in the spring. I will be on sabbatical during that time, so the brunt of that process will fall on Marlene's shoulders.

College of Business and Leadership

Assessment Report for College of Business and Leadership: Sept. 2016 Updates

Dahl School of Business						
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up			
Accounting	09/29/2016	09/29/2016	09/28/2013			
Accounting Degree Completion	09/30/2016	09/30/2015	05/18/2011			
Business Administration	09/30/2016	09/30/2016	09/30/2016			
Finance	New Program					
Health Care Management	09/30/2016	09/30/2016				
Management and Leadership	09/30/2016	09/30/2016	09/25/2014			
Management Information Systems (INFO) Online	10/03/2016	09/30/2015	08/31/2011			
Marketing	09/23/2016	09/23/2016	09/23/2016			
Master of Business Administration	09/27/2016	09/08/2016	09/01/2016			
Organizational Management	10/02/2016	09/30/2015	09/01/2016			
Organizational Management Online	10/03/2016	09/30/2015	09/02/2011			
Professional Studies	10/03/2016	New Program				
Sport Management & Leadership	05/17/2016	08/28/2015	05/19/2016			
Creative Media Design	09/29/2016	09/29/2016				
Master of Arts in Servant Leadership	09/28/2016	09/28/2016	09/28/2016			
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 201	6	1	ı			

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries Dahl School of Business

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Accounting Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Most assessment criteria were met during the 2015/2016 academic year (7 out of 9 data points collected represented meeting the assessment criteria). Both of the measures that were not met were related to the ethical decision-making program outcome. In ACCT 311, students struggled with the ethics discussions, and in ACCT 425, students struggled with the exercise that required them to give examples of how the auditors could have been more skeptical.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

More work will need to be done with the ethical decision-making outcome and measurement criteria. In particular, it will be important to find a way to help our international students evaluate ethics in an Accounting context. The audit course (ACCT 425) has a new textbook with online software, and it is hoped that if students have the opportunity to do more hands-on work, it will solidify the principles with practical applications. Beginning in 16/17, we will add to the scope of courses that contribute to our

assessment measurements by including some measures from ACCT 416 (Fed Tax II) and reducing the number of measurements coming from the auditing course (ACCT 425).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Accounting Degree Completion

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Only half of the assessment criteria were met (2 out of 4 of the data points collected). One measurement was taken for each of the 4 program outcomes, however there are two direct measures for each outcome (a total of 8 measures). The other measures should have been collected, but the course (ACCT 425) was taught by a new adjunct who did not submit the data. This program utilizes ACCT 425 heavily in its assessment plan. In future years (beginning in 16/17) we will add to the scope of courses contributing to our assessment measurements by adding some criteria in ACCT 416 (Fed Tax II).

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The audit course (ACCT 425) has a new textbook with online software, and it is hoped that if students have the opportunity to do more hands-on work, it will solidify the principles with practical applications. Beginning in 16/17, we will add to the scope of courses that contribute to our assessment measurements by including some measures from ACCT 416 (Fed Tax II) and reducing the number of measurements coming from the auditing course (ACCT 425). In addition, more effort will be made to work with adjuncts to make sure they are aware of the data needed for assessment purposes, and that they properly submit the data on a timely basis.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Business Administration

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

9 out of 12 data points collected in 15/16 represented measures that met our assessment criteria for this program. Students continue to score low on the formal business report assignment in MGMT 300. It has been confirmed that ENGL 103 and 104 instructors do not help students with grammar, so this is a challenge when they get to the 300-level business writing course. We've considered eliminating the Aplia work, but feel strongly that students need the additional writing support it provides. Low scores on the MGMT 474 panel discussion teamwork component in the first semester was partly the result of that assessment not truly being built to be an assessment measure. With some additional work on the assessment of teamwork, these scores greatly improved in the Spring 2016 section of MGMT 474. We consistently met the requirement for the scaled scores on the MFT – to be within 2 standard deviations of our peer schools. However, perhaps this outcome should be within 1 standard deviation of our peer schools.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

We've improved some of the measurement criteria for the 16/17 academic year, specifically in the MGMT 449 course, where we will utilize a new version of the simulation project to measure the learning outcome related to using various business disciplines to solve complex problems. In terms of the historically low written communications project scores, the faculty discussed accepting a little lower threshold for students scoring 80% or higher on the business report. Perhaps given all that they are practicing, it's more appropriate to have a goal that 75% of our students will receive a score of 80% or higher on this assessment. This is still a stretch goal, but reflects a result we would find acceptable. Lastly, we will look for additional ways to utilize the MFT data to support our assessment efforts.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Health Care Management

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The assessment plan has been re-structured to more closely match the assessment maps and the processes used to assess our daytime programs. A new assessment map has been established for the 2015-16 academic year. There are still 2 outcomes that each need an additional direct measure. Data were gathered for all other measures in the 15-16 academic year. All measures are meeting the criteria, (10 out of 10 data points reflect the criteria have been met for the year). However, it is noted that in many places, there is very little distinction in the grading. In particular, the research papers in HMGT 330 (Legal and Ethical Issues in Health Care), the health care finance case studies in HMGT 340, and the journal article summaries in HMGT 320 all show very little distinction in grades from one student to the next. This is a concern that will need to be addressed in the HMGT program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Two additional direct measures will be developed and implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year — one for the Management and Leadership outcome, and one for the Health Care Informatics outcome. In addition, rubrics should be evaluated and modified in order to allow for greater distinction between "A" level work and "B" level work, etc. Where we are consistently meeting the criteria, faculty should assess whether or not we could re-set the criteria a bit higher.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Management & Leadership

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

8 out of 14 data points collected in 15/16 represented measures that met our assessment criteria for this program. Students continue to score low on the formal business report assignment in MGMT 300. It has been confirmed that ENGL 103 and 104 instructors do not help students with grammar, so this is a challenge when they get to the 300-level business writing course. We've considered eliminating the Aplia work, but feel strongly that students need the additional writing support it provides. Low scores on the MGMT 474 panel discussion teamwork component in the first semester was partly the result of

that assessment not truly being built to be an assessment measure. With some additional work on the assessment of teamwork, these scores greatly improved in the Spring 2016 section of MGMT 474. Low scores on the future leader paper in MGMT 375 may have been the result of introducing the rubric too late in the semester, in addition to weak writing skills. In 16-17, this course will be taught by a new faculty member, so some further development of the project expectations and rubric may be needed. Faculty work on the case study in MGMT 341 shows improved student learning related to the students' understanding of the planning, organizing, leading, and controlling processes of organizations. This criteria was not met in the 14/15 academic year, but is now showing 88% of students have met the expectations.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

We've improved some of the measurement criteria for the 16/17 academic year, specifically in the MGMT 449 course, where we will utilize a new version of the simulation project to measure the learning outcome related to using various business disciplines to solve complex problems. In terms of the historically low written communications project scores, the faculty discussed accepting a little lower threshold for students scoring 80% or higher on the business report. Perhaps given all that they are practicing, it's more appropriate to have a goal that 75% of our students will receive a score of 80% or higher on this assessment. This is still a stretch goal, but reflects a result we would find acceptable.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Management Information Systems (INFO) Online

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The assessment plan has been re-structured to more closely match the assessment maps and the processes used to assess our daytime programs. A new assessment map has been established for the 2015-16 academic year, however, much additional work is needed to fully develop the measurement criteria for each learning outcome. Many of these criteria are out-dated. It is noted that in many places, there is very little distinction in the grading (students all receive a similar grade), or there is wide variation in grading between sections with different instructors. This is a concern that will need to be addressed in the MIS program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Several new direct measures need to be developed and implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year. The MIS program will undergo some extensive curriculum revisions for the next catalog, and as a result, it is at the top of our priority list for re-designing course content. As part of the course updates, new assessment criteria, project descriptions, assignment instructions, and grading rubrics will be created. This will help us to prepare varying instructors to more consistently deliver the content, and allow for greater grading distinction between "A" level work and "B" level work, etc. Where we are consistently meeting the criteria, faculty should assess whether or not we could re-set the criteria a bit higher. Finally, the instructors will need to be better prepared upon being hired to teach these courses, so they are consistently delivering the content, applying the assessment methods, and gathering the necessary data.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Marketing Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Most assessment criteria were met during the 2015/2016 academic year (9 out of 11 data points collected show students are meeting the assessment criteria). In the two cases where the criteria were not met, both were very close – as 78% and 79% of the student in these courses met the assignment criteria, while 80% was the goal. Most often, students not meeting the criteria had more to do with not meeting an assignment deadline, while the content of their work would have met the established criteria. Much work has been done in all courses in MKTG to provide exemplars, clear assignment instructions, and rubrics, so the expectations are clearly laid out. This has resulted in students consistently meeting our assessment criteria in this program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In MKTG 353, students will be asked to turn in the infographics for their marketing research final project in Week 14 rather than waiting until Week 15. This should help students plan to complete their work more timely and avoid what tends to be a very busy final week of classes. In most courses, MKTG faculty will continue to provide the clear expectations that have led to students' success in meeting the measurement criteria. Additionally, marketing faculty will reassess all rubrics to ensure there is a direct match between what is being asked of the student in the assessment and that of which it is being graded on. This will include both the rubric and narrative directions in the cases, which is the primary assessment tool for program outcomes other than exams and quizzes. Also, the marketing faculty will look at all cases that now have been used for several years to measure specific program/school outcomes and look to change at least one case.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sara Cook & Dale Krageschmidt

Name of Program: Master of Business Administration

Date: September 29, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-16, data were collected on all four student learning outcomes. Assessment of students' application of business strategies showed improvement resulting from delivery changes implemented last year; the benchmark was exceeded for the year, and the loop was closed. Performance on our ethical leadership outcome showed mixed results with the assessment in MGMT 525 exceeding the benchmark and the assessment in MGMT 512 missing the benchmark with a 50%. Follow-up identified a communication and cultural gap that decreased course understanding in a segment of the population of students. The integrative/critical thinking outcome also had mixed results with scores of 100%, 78% and 64%. The lower scores are from the capstone courses where new project models and expectations may have led to some confusion. Changes implemented to the accounting course demonstrated targeted improvement and resulted in 100% attainment. Similar to an observation made last year, the communication courses had different results for face-to-face (50%) vs. blended (83%). There may be several reasons for this including an increased number of international students and younger students in

the face-to-face class compared to the blended. This was the only assessment showing a significant difference between performance of students in face to face and blended formats.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-17, we will again collect data on all four learning outcomes. Although we showed improvement, we will investigate the differences and similarities of the blended and face to face formats. There will be a continued focus on critical thinking and communication outcomes measured through the capstone. The capstone directions will be more explicit and communications between the students and the capstone advisors will be more frequent and formal than in the past. The focus of our capstone to applied, action oriented projects (including quality improvement projects) has been successful and will continue to be implemented in 2016-17. The implementation of capstone projects where students directly impact their organizations has more deeply engaged the students in creatively solving real organizational problems, and improved their critical thinking skills. Interactive capstone projects will remain a focus in 2016-17. Assessment results this year pointed to room for improvement in clarifying expectations for a particular demographic segment of our students. We will make this a major focal point for this academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Organizational Management

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The assessment plan has been re-structured to more closely match the assessment maps and the processes used to assess our daytime programs. A new assessment map has been established for the 2015-16 academic year, however, additional work is needed to fully develop the measurement criteria for each learning outcome. Many of these criteria are out-dated. Two of the measurements are consistently below expectations – the final writing assignment in OMGT 302 (the Business Report), and the CSR/Sustainability paper in OMGT 402. We will need to find ways to help students be successful in these projects. It is noted that in many places, there is very little distinction in the grading (students all receive a similar grade), or there is wide variation in grading between sections with different instructors. This is a concern that will need to be addressed in the OMGT program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Several new direct measures need to be developed and implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year. The OMGT program is at the top of our priority list for re-designing course content, since these courses were in existence before we rolled out new online content across several programs, and as a result, many of these courses haven't had the content updated in over 2 years. As part of the course updates, new assessment criteria, project descriptions, assignment instructions, and grading rubrics will be created. This will help us to prepare varying instructors to more consistently deliver the content, and allow for greater grading distinction between "A" level work and "B" level work, etc. Where we are consistently meeting the criteria, faculty should assess whether or not we could re-set the criteria a bit higher. Finally, the instructors will need to be better prepared upon being hired to teach these courses, so they are consistently delivering the content, applying the assessment methods, and gathering the necessary data.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Organizational Management Online

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The assessment plan has been re-structured to more closely match the assessment maps and the processes used to assess our daytime programs. A new assessment map has been established for the 2015-16 academic year, however, additional work is needed to fully develop the measurement criteria for each learning outcome. Many of these criteria are out-dated. Two of the measurements are consistently below expectations – the final writing assignment in OMGT 302 (the Business Report), and the CSR/Sustainability paper in OMGT 402. We will need to find ways to help students be successful in these projects. It is noted that in many places, there is very little distinction in the grading (students all receive a similar grade), or there is wide variation in grading between sections with different instructors. This is a concern that will need to be addressed in the OMGT program. Where we may have had concerns in the past about getting comparable results in the online versions of the OMGT courses, those concerns are not supported by the data, which often shows that our online students are scoring as good as or better than the classroom-based students.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Several new direct measures need to be developed and implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year. The OMGT program is at the top of our priority list for re-designing course content, since these courses were in existence before we rolled out new online content across several programs, and as a result, many of these courses haven't had the content updated in over 2 years. As part of the course updates, new assessment criteria, project descriptions, assignment instructions, and grading rubrics will be created. This will help us to prepare varying instructors to more consistently deliver the content, and allow for greater grading distinction between "A" level work and "B" level work, etc. Where we are consistently meeting the criteria, faculty should assess whether or not we could re-set the criteria a bit higher. Finally, the instructors will need to be better prepared upon being hired to teach these courses, so they are consistently delivering the content, applying the assessment methods, and gathering the necessary data.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Professional Studies

Date: September 30, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

2015-2016 was the first academic year that the College of Business and Leadership provided oversight for the PRFS program, which has had curricular revisions and program title changes for two years in a row. This program allows for students to come in with various backgrounds, and transfer credits from a variety of disciplines. They can select two focus areas, and complete their degree. Only a couple of common courses bring this population together, which has presented challenges in assessment. To date, only one common learning outcome and course (the capstone project in ORST 495) has been identified. Additional work on the assessment of this program is needed moving forward.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Several new learning outcomes and direct measures need to be developed and implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year. As part of this work, the assessment criteria, project descriptions, assignment instructions, and grading rubrics need to be updated or created. This will help us to prepare varying instructors to consistently deliver the content. Finally, the instructors in the few common courses in the PRFS program will need to be better prepared upon being hired to teach these courses, so they are consistently delivering the content, applying the assessment methods, and gathering the necessary data.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: David Waters Name of Program: Sport Management & Leadership

Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Data were reported for direct measures for all 6 of the SPML learning outcomes. Data were delivered by the Program Director/main instructor Dr. David Waters as well as from our current adjunct, Mr. Brian Meeter. Most of the assessment criteria were met, according to the data. It was noted that the "Comprehensive Assessment of Agency assignment in SPML 490 was being used as a summative assessment tool for nearly all of the learning outcomes of the program, so we discussed utilizing a couple of other courses and assignments as direct measures (in SPML 350 and 340). It was also determined that the ethics and social responsibility element could be given greater importance in the project requirements and corresponding rubric of the "Comprehensive Assignment of Agency" assignment in SPML 490.

The SPML program continued to be a vibrant program with an enrollment number at 35-40 students. This is the first complete year following favorable feedback by Viterbo's internal program review committee. The program continued to utilize practical, applied assignments with pertinence at solving real world problems in the sport industry. These included: a sponsorship pitch in sport marketing graded by faculty/students; shadow and interview of an active sport leader; semester-long sport finance business project. The program organized two Sport Leadership Bus Tours, one each semester; each trip had approximately two dozen participants and provided excellent on-site learning, observing, questioning. The capstone course, SPML 490, continues to need a directed major assignment; in the past, an agency assessment has drawn mixed feedback. A class project in the community did not occur, although several sessions were created for assisting in the ALM Charities' Golf Event (to be held September 2016). Thus, fall and spring semesters had tremendous interaction with this charity.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The SPML program will continue traditional undergraduate delivery, with 2 blended (online) courses; adjunct Brian Meeter has expressed interest in teaching two online courses for spring 2017. It is a transition year with its lead faculty member receiving a sabbatical for 2016-2017. A goal is to continue to communicate positive results to our majors, employers, and our alumni; with Viterbo's revamped website, perhaps SPML could highlight accomplishments in strategic places in the media and website. To its benefit, the SPML program, having completed its seventh year, continues its continuity, with two faculty (e.g., main instructor and adjunct faculty member). It is noted that courses include several populations of students (e.g., SPML, Sport Science and Leadership, Business Administration, Marketing)

which is both helpful (diversity) but also a hindrance in some low grade achievements. It is hoped more engagement with local, community sport leaders occurs with class projects, interviews, and class visits to critique student work. If possible, the SPML 490 course could have a more-distinct capstone project. An initiative – "Trusted Coaches" – is to be initiated in SPML 320 or 340. It is foreseen that the SPML program continues its current assessment and may introduce some changes with expected curriculum mapping. Finally, COBL could explore national accreditation for SPML by the Commission for Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA). This may be difficult during the 2016-17 academic year, with Dr. Waters on sabbatical, but it should remain a consideration for the future.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Creative Media Design

Date: September 29, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Assessment results were quite incomplete for this period. Many of the classes that contained the relevant assessment measures were canceled due to low enrollments. Lack of any longitudinal data due to continual curricular revisions has proved to be problematic. A course rotation has been developed and adopted to ensure that the courses containing the relevant direct measures will have enough students with which to draw relevant assessment results during each assessment period. In consultation with the assistant dean of COBAL, we have identified new or revised measures for the new courses in the program. Program outcomes have been reduced from eight to five, focusing on the most relevant outcomes for the reorientation to more business related focus for the program.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Primary focus for this assessment period will revolve around collecting enough of the relevant data from courses with which to do accurate assessment. Most consist of embedded course assessments that ensure the data will exist. During the transitional period, some of the previously used measures were not utilized nor relevant to new program outcomes. CRMD faculty now feel our assessment plan is well-positioned to provide good measures of the program outcomes, and the course rotation has been adjusted with the goal of having more students in each class, and having assessment measures for each outcome each year. Finally, CRMD faculty will work with MKTG faculty to get into a couple of classes to talk about the CRMD minor, and they will also visit classes at Western to talk about the articulation agreement and hopefully draw new interest in the major from transfer students.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Matthew Bersagel Braley Name of Program: Master of Arts in Servant Leadership

Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-2016 we implemented a two-course, two-semester case study capstone sequence. Though specific criterion were met or nearly met, feedback from students and discussion among program faculty indicated that this model is not sustainable. One factor is the loss of one of our primary research faculty due to other university obligations. The other factor is the lack of scaffolding throughout the rest

of the curriculum for original case study research. Finally, from our analysis of themes in student vocation papers, the original research project is not central to our program in terms of student recruitment or student satisfaction. A decision has been made to shift to a one-semester, extended literature review on a servant leadership topic relevant to the student's work or community experience. We believe this will focus our efforts on mastery of the literature in servant leadership and align better with how the rest of the curriculum prepares students for colloquium.

We graduated our largest group of students since at least 2009. Several of these graduates were the reason for our relatively high % of students from beyond a 150-mile radius. This past year no new "distance students" enrolled in the program. As a result of both the overall drop in numbers of students and the concentration of students locally, we will be engaging in a strategic plan process to revise our recruitment approach. This may include packaging courses within the current curriculum so as to reach younger students interested in community transformation as well as nonprofit leaders.

In general, the capstone oral presentations continue to be a highlight of the program. Oral presentations have been strengthened by additional emphasis and practice in the capstone course. Less clear from what we are currently measuring is the quality of written work.

The vocation paper analysis conducted in SP/SU2016 by two faculty members was particularly insightful as to why students choose this program and what they get out of it. This analysis will serve as the jumping off point for strategic planning in 2016-2017.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The main focus for 2016-2017 will be on cleaning up the current assessment plan to align with revised outcomes. The intent is to develop a new assessment map in which our three required courses - 501, 502, and 504- each have two direct measures at the introductory/developing level and one indirect measure. Our capstone course will continue to serve as summative assessment with three direct measures, though these measures will be revised to reflect the change to the colloquium project format.

A second focus of assessment this year will be the impact of our revised recruiting strategies. Alumni working in nonprofits will be surveyed as part of an MBA student's capstone project. This data will help us to develop new recruiting materials. We will revisit the vocation paper and personal statements (submitted as part of applications) to understand better the type of students who are drawn to the program and how we can continue to expand our reach both in terms of geography and type of student. This year will provide a new baseline, though we don't expect significant data for reporting in 2017.

College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

Assessment Report for the College of Education, Science, and Mathematics: Sept. 2016 Updates

School of Education						
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up			
IA GRAD: Early Childhood Education Endorsement	09/28/2016	09/17/2015	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Middle School Endorsement	09/28/2016	09/17/2015	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Educational Leadership (PK-12 Principal)	09/29/2016	09/29/2016	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Reading Specialist Endorsement	09/28/2016	09/29/2016	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Reading Teacher 5-12 Endorsement	09/28/2016	09/16/2015	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Reading Teacher K-8 Endorsement	09/28/2016	09/29/2016	09/22/2014			
IA GRAD: Talented and Gifted Endorsement	09/28/2016	009/29/2016	09/22/2014			
Master of Arts in Education	09/26/2016	09/26/2016				
Undergraduate Education Program	09/21/2016	09/20/2016				
WI GRAD: Cross-categorical Special Education License	09/25/2015	09/30/2015				
WI GRAD: Director of Instruction License	09/22/2015	02/16/2016				
WI GRAD: Dir. of Special Ed. & Pupil Services License	09/23/2015	02/16/2016				
WI GRAD: Early Childhood Education License	09/27/2016	09/01/2016	03/01/2016			
WI GRAD: Post Baccalaureate Teacher License	09/21/2016	02/03/2012				
WI GRAD: Principal License	09/22/2015	02/16/2016				
WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License	09/29/2015	09/25/2015				
WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License	09/29/2015	09/29/2015	09/15/2010			
WI GRAD: Superintendent License	09/23/2015	02/16/2016				
School of Natural	Sciences and Mat	hematics				
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up			
Biochemistry	09/29/2016	09/29/2016	09/24/2012			
Biology	10/01/2016	10/01/2016				
Biopsychology	10/01/2016	10/01/2016				
Chemistry	09/29/2016	09/29/2016	10/09/2015			
Environmental Biology	10/01/2016	10/01/2016				
Mathematical Physics	05/11/2016	05/11/2016				
Mathematics	11/02/2016	10/04/2014				
Sport Science & Leadership	10/01/2016	10/01/2016	09/01/2011			
Dates are based on information in TracDat as of Fall 2016	•	•	•			

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries School of Education

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Norene Bunt Name of Program: IA Middle School Endorsement (182)

Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The Iowa Center is consistently administering end of program completer surveys and systematically requiring capstone portfolios from endorsement completers. Both of these assessment tools are analyzed using the prescribed rubrics.

In reviewing the 2015-2016 middle school completers' portfolios and the middle school end of program completers' surveys, there is strong evidence that the middle school program prepares our students well in the NMSA standards overall. End of program survey responses were "Extremely High" or "High" on all survey items, except content knowledge and achievement goals, which received an "undecided". Students' portfolios are well-developed and clearly provide evidence of proficiency in the standards. Of the two program completers in 2015-2016, all earned a "meets" or "exceeds" expectations in each of the NMSA standards.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

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 through December of 2016, after which time the lowa Center will not be continuing the MS endorsement program.

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 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The lowa Center is now consistently administering end of program completer surveys and systematically requiring capstone portfolios from endorsement completers (who applied after July 1, 2014). Both of these assessment tools are/will be analyzed using the prescribed rubrics.

During 2015-2016, 8 students completed the Reading endorsement #148 program and all of these students were required to present a capstone portfolio. All 8 students received "Meets" or "Exemplary" on all of the standards.

No end of program surveys for Reading endorsements #148 and #149 were submitted, despite reminders to the students.

In reviewing the 2015-2016 Reading Specialist #176 completers' portfolios and end of program completers' surveys, there is strong evidence that the Reading Specialist program prepares our students well in the Reading standards. Two students presented capstone portfolios and both received "exemplary" on all of the standards.

On the end of program surveys for the Reading Specialist #176, all areas received responses of "Agree" and "Highly agree". The mean responses ranged from 4.2 to 4.6 out of a possible 5.0. The lowest areas were "Foundations of Reading", which students take prior to starting their Specialist program and "Oral Communication".

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Based on the 2014-2015 results, "Genres and text structures" and "instructional strategies" will be emphasized more in EDUC 650 Content Reading and EDUC 640 Balanced Literacy. Intentional emphasis will continue to be placed throughout Reading Specialist program, particularly in EDUC 639 Directing and Supervision of Reading Programs, on management aspects including evaluation and feedback of teaching quality and managing special programs, such as Title I.

Due to the transition of losing the Iowa Center Reading Advisor, student end of program surveys were not consistently distributed. Students who complete the program will be consistently provided with the surveys and the submission rates will be monitored for improvement.

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

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Norene Bunt

Name of Program: IA Talented and Gifted Endorsement (107)

Date: September 28, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

The lowa Center is consistently administering end of program completer surveys and systematically requiring capstone portfolios from endorsement completers. Both of these assessment tools are analyzed using the prescribed rubrics.

In reviewing the 2015-2016 TAG completers' portfolios and the TAG end of program completers' surveys, there is strong evidence that the Talented and Gifted endorsement program prepares our students well in the GTE standards overall. End of Program survey responses indicated "Extremely High" or "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" on most survey items. The mean response on survey items ranged from 4.2 to 4.8 out of a possible 5.0. The lower responses were in the area of "individual learning differences".

Students' portfolios are well-developed and clearly provide evidence of proficiency in the standards. All students received a score of 5.0 on their capstone portfolios.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

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. Particular topics of discussion and recommendations for continuous improvement will be addressing the unique learning differences of students within Talented and Gifted programs.

The Talented and Gifted program has now moved to a completely online format. We will need to continue to be aware of maintaining the quality and rigor of this program in this new online format. Courses will be evaluated per the COOL process and the Program Specialist will evaluate at least one course per year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Susan Hughes Name of Program: Master of Arts in Education

Date: September 26, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

For the current year, we focused for the first time on all six outcomes as a result of the use of the Final Growth Portfolio for the first time. This represents a shift in our assessment data from the former use of the Comprehensive Exam Data to what we consider to be a more authentic approach to assessment based on students' scores on individual outcomes of the Master of Arts in Education program. The criteria that were set included that students would collectively score at the 80% point or better for each of the six outcomes as measured by their rubric scores in the respective areas. For the first year, students' scores met the 80% criterion in only one of the six outcomes, Ethics. Other assessment data were reported from three assessments that take place in the final course for the program, Proseminar. Students fell short of the 90% criterion for the Book Synthesis Paper with an aggregate score of 23/28 or 82%; students also failed to meet the 90% criterion for the Research Presentation, with an aggregate score of 26/32 or 82%.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In the coming year, we will again collect scores from all six of the program outcomes via the Final Growth Portfolio, as more students will complete the portfolio this year. Students who were admitted to the program before June 1, 2014 have the option to complete the portfolio or take the Comprehensive Exams. We look forward to the cycle when all students will be completing the growth portfolio as the demonstration of their growth in the program outcomes. During this year, we will schedule two sessions with our faculty members to engage in activities to promote a common view of students' work in the hope of finding that our faculty members more effectively assess students' growth based on the criteria set out in various common rubrics.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage Name of Program: Undergraduate Education

Date: September 21, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

2015-16 was the year of assessment for the undergraduate education program, as we worked to collect, organize, and assess data in preparation for potential CAEP certification. In response to our 14-15 goal, as well as a continued need to support student writing abilities, we identified two courses in which to embed writing assessments, EDUC 330 and EDUC 390, and are currently creating a common rubric by which these will be measured. A writing assessment was also administered in EDUC 255, with a cut score of 80%, which 21/24 students passed. We developed a student teacher evaluation that more specifically outlines student teaching expectations, which is administered through Qualtrix, and are in the final phases of creating a rubric by which to assess student portfolios, for the purpose of providing more objective and useful information regarding student performance. Lower portfolio scores (1.38 average on sub 1 and 1.64 average on sub 2) reflect efforts to more authentically assess student work, including

an emphasis on writing quality, and are now evaluated by faculty. We revised a required Attitude and Disposition form in order to collect more relevant and useful information regarding student performance, and created an initial draft of a program assessment handbook, for implementation this year.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we will continue efforts to embed and standardize assessments of student learning and mastery across the curriculum. Our faculty have created a common lesson plan template to align with the edTPA assessment, which has been implemented in four education courses this fall. We are also in the process of creating a common rubric to assess student writing, and will continue efforts to embed an assessment of oral communication skills. Now that the State of Wisconsin has determined a cut score for the edTPA assessment (38), we will incorporate this data into our assessment plan. We are in the final stages of creating more authentic and useful evaluations for student field experiences, furthermore, and will administer the first of those this year, and will continue work on our assessment handbook.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic Name of Program: WI Director of Instruction (10)

Date: September 14, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

As a result of previous data from 2015, we focused on creating a third indicator of success that could be measured and added to the Exit Survey of Standards and the Essential Questions by course for each student. New for fall 2016 will be a final written paper called the "Final Reflection Paper" which is a reflective overview of the four course program and how each of the classes has prepared them for the Directors of Special Ed and Student Services license.

Another accomplishment which also enhanced consistencies for all of our adjuncts was that we completed the task of rebuilding the 6 Essential Questions for EDUL 704 Collaborative Leadership for Learning course. The Essential Questions in some cases were redesigned to be reflective of changes in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSfEL), the curriculum, the readings, book selection, and primary focus.

In reviewing the data, the 2015 students scored above 90% on 6 of the 7 Standards for each of the 6 Essential Questions. Only Standard 1, the Teacher Standard was below the 90% goal at 81%. In addition, the Exit Survey or Program Summary these students met the 97% goal on standards 3,6,7 and 100% on Standards 1,2,4, and 5 from the 12 respondents.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016, we will collect results from our third indicator which is a combination of rubric scoring for the Final Reflection paper, an overview of four courses in the Dir of Instruction program as it relates to a students' preparedness to be a Director of Instruction administrator.

We will be surveying 3 cohort groups in 2016 as we have expanded to Green Bay and Middleton for the Director of Instruction. Therefore, the focus for 2016-17 will be bring the instructors together from

across the state to review curriculum, resources, books, and data. Since we have just recently expanded, the teachers were hired late in the process and any sharing of syllabi and course materials was done electronically. Funding has been set aside to allow for face to face formal review by the 5 instructors.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

Name of Program: WI Director of Special Education & Pupil Services (80)

Date: September 14, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

As a result of previous data from 2014 and 2015, last year, 2015-16, we focused on creating a third indicator of success that could be measured and added to the Exit Survey of Standards and the Essential Questions by course for each student. New for summer 2017 will be a final written paper called the "Final Reflection Paper" which is a reflective overview of the four course program and how each of the classes has prepared them for the Directors of Special Ed and Student Services license.

Another accomplishment which also enhanced consistencies for all of our adjuncts was that we completed the task of rebuilding the 6 Essential Questions for 3 of the 4 courses. The Essential Questions in some cases were redesigned to be reflective of changes in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSfEL), the curriculum, the readings, book selection, and primary focus.

The Exit Survey was not given in a timely fashion for 2015 completers and thus there is not a definitive score was not available. AREA for Improvement.

In reviewing the data based on standards, the 2013 and 2014 starters performed below goal of 90% in Standards 3,4,5,6,and 7. With a total population of about 18 students possibly skewing the average, the variance in scores related to students understanding of the Standard 1 through 7 is concerning. Only Standards 1-2 were above the 90% goal.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we will collect results from our third indicator, the Final Reflection paper, an overview of four courses in the Dir of Special Ed and Student Services program as it relates to a students' preparedness to be a Special Ed and Student Services administrator.

We have used our data to determine there was a need for changing the instructor for the Dir of Special Ed and Student Services Practicum course, EDUL 768 that is ongoing throughout the program and meets two dates in the last summer. We have recently added a third person in the program to assume that role. AS we continue to review the curriculum for each of the courses, we will be assessing our improvement on areas of weakness as defined above with improvements needed in Standards 3-7.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Ruth E. Badciong Name of Program: WI Early Childhood Licensure (70-777)

Date: September 27, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Because the Wisconsin Graduate Early Childhood Education Program did not accept any new students as of September 1, 2015 and will conclude as the final cohort finishes all program and licensure requirements by December 2016, no assessment goals were established for the 2015-2016 school year. However, data was collected for this final cohort. All assessment criteria were met or exceeded and all loops were closed.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

This program will conclude in December 2016. The final program goal is that each of the final 20 students enrolled in the program will successfully complete all program requirements – including student teaching, program portfolio, and Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT) – no later than December 15, 2016.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage

Name of Program: WI Post Baccalaureate Teacher License

Date: September 21, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Many of the efforts implemented in the post-bac program in 2015-16 reflected the work taking place at the undergraduate level. In addition to revising the Attitude and Disposition surveys to more accurately reflect the skills and behaviors we would like to see students demonstrate in the k-12 classroom, we are continuing to work on field experience rubrics, and to align our assessment of student work with edTPA data. The evaluation of student teaching form has been revised to include more specificity, and is now administered to cooperating teachers via Qualtrics. Portfolio scores met established criteria across the board, but future portfolios will be evaluated against a rubric revised for the purpose of providing students with feedback that is objective and useful to them, as well as to gather relevant data regarding student performance.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Like the undergraduate program, faculty in the post-bac program have noticed that many students are deficient in writing skills. Therefore, during the 16-17 school year, a benchmark assessment, the Philosophy of Education paper, which is required in each session of Introduction to Education, will be assessed against a common rubric. Rubrics used for assessment of portfolios will also be revised and normed to align with undergraduate requirements, and will include assessments specific to writing proficiency. edTPA portfolio scores, finally, will be assessed against the State of Wisconsin cut score of 38, and this data will be incorporated into our assessment plan.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic Name of Program: WI Principal License (51)

Date: September 14, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year, 2015-16, we focused on creating a third indicator of success that could be measured across all 6 of our Principal cohorts throughout the state. The Practicum Instructors for spring 2016 piloted a new final written paper called the "Final Reflection Paper" which is a reflective overview of the two year program and how each of the classes has prepared them for the principal license. A grading rubric was developed to incorporate Part I, the Electronic Portfolio of artifacts of learning complied over two years and Part 2 is the final reflection paper. In combination, the two part rubric will be used as our third indicator of success beginning with the 2016-18 cohort.

Having the new 3rd Indicator be a combination of the Electronic Portfolio and the Final Reflection paper gives us a stronger view of our Principal programs, and allows us to establish better consistency among instructors more easily.

Another accomplishment which also enhanced consistencies for all of our adjuncts was that we completed the task of rebuilding the 6 Essential Questions for each of the 7 Core Principal courses. The Essential Questions in some cases were redesigned to be reflective of changes in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSfEL), the curriculum, the readings, book selection, and primary focus.

Closed the loop with 2015 action to change curriculum in EDUL 634 and EDUL 640 to reflect more on Standard I Teacher Standards.

Data from 2014-16 Principal Cohorts in La Crosse, Middleton, Eau Claire, Green Bay, and Tomahawk we met the benchmark of 90% on each of the Wisconsin Administrator Standards 2,3,4,and 6. We scored slightly below the benchmark in Standards 1 (Teaching),5 (Broader Community),and 7 (Politics). 42 Scored Essential Questions related to the Wisc. Content Guidelines were scored for 78 students in the Principal program. With respect to the Exit Survey or Program Summary, the average rating for ALL of the cohorts together was above the 3.6 out of 4.0 meeting the 90% or above benchmark in all areas for Standards 1 through 7.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we will collect results from our third indicator which is a combination of rubric scoring for the Electronic Portfolio (a collection of artifacts of learning for every WCG within each of Standards 2-7) and the Final Reflection paper (a synopsis of two years of learning in the Principal program as I relates to a students' preparedness to be a school administrator).

Adjunct training in June 2017 will be designed to bring instructors from La Crosse, Eau Claire, Green Bay, Tomahawk, West Allis and Middleton together for a more formal assessment of the program, to inform our learning, and to allow extensive times for teachers of like courses to have quality time evaluating the Essential Questions for each course, the books and references, the project based activities, and the rubric scoring practice for better consistency.

Based on the 2014-16 data, a Curriculum Review will focus on Standards 5 (Relationships with Broader Community, and Standard 7 (Political, Social, Economic, Legal aspects) Additionally, we will seek to find

another place to add Budgeting to the Curriculums as this has been one area of weakness noted by our students over time.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic Name of Program: WI Superintendent License

Date: September 14, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year, 2015-16, we focused on creating a third indicator of success that could be measured in all of our licensure programs. After two years of the Capstone paper on Standards 1 through 7 for the Superintendent program it was determined that the paper was serving the purpose of program evaluation for those in their final course. The written overview based on the standards has been productive as noted by the new Practicum Instructor for the past two years, 2013-15 and 2014-16.

Because the data is segregated by "start date" for Superintendent, it becomes harder to have a clear view of progress on standards because in this licensure program the students are completing the 24 credit program at all different times from 2 years to 5 years. Thus, in evaluation of the 2013 and 2012 starters, Standards 1,2, and 4 all meet benchmark of 90% or better. Standard 3 was 82%, Standard5 is 76%, Standards 6 is 82%, and Standard 7 was 75%. When you add the 2014 class, for Standards 5 and 7, then those Standards rise to about the 90% benchmark. Thus, the program review needs to include a focus on Standards 5 (Relationship with Broader Community) and 7 (Political, Social, Economic, and Legal) over time.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Adjunct training in June 2017 will be designed to bring Superintendent instructors from La Crosse and Tomahawk together for a more formal assessment of the program, to inform our learning, and to allow extensive times for teachers of like courses to have quality time evaluating the Essential Questions for each course, the books and references, the project based activities, and the rubric scoring practice for better consistency.

We have hired a former instructor to complete an overview of Superintendent Curriculum as it relates to the Essential Questions we are measuring/assessing in each of our eight courses. Recent annual portfolio assessments/summaries will contribute to possible changes in aligning new Essential Questions to the standards, particularly Standards 1,5, and 7 as noted by the data over time.

The Exit Survey has not been completed by Superintendents the past two years and a Qualtrix survey sent out in spring of 2016 yielded only 3 respondents. Therefore, the Practicum Instructor will give the Exit Survey during the final class AND the program director will survey all other completers whose last course was not the Practicum.

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Tammy Clark

Name of Program: Biochemistry Date: September 29, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

As per our assessment plan, we have: provided data for all assessment methods from the 2015-2016 academic year; analyzed the assessment data for Outcomes A and D (chemistry assessment data was incorporated into this assessment as per our assessment plan); and provided follow ups for the evaluations that were completed last year on Outcomes C and F.

Additionally, a new outcome was added last year which has been folded into the analysis schedule: G. Literature: Students will be able to understand and appreciate the primary literature in biochemistry and be able to extract the salient features and advances from journal articles.

Evaluation of Outcome A: Problem Solving

Overall, we see very strong results in this category. The few exceptions in lower than goal results of the ACS exam scores may be related to using a new version of the exam. This occurs since each exam emphases different aspects of the curriculum. We will evaluate scores from the next year's biochemistry ACS exam to determine if action needs to be taken.

Evaluation of Outcome D: Data Analysis

This is a very strong outcome for our students. We attribute their success in part to our open-ended lab experiences that require an in-depth understanding of the experiment and an increased level of engagement in discovery. For instance, we are in the process of refining a newly developed multi-disciplinary medicinal chemistry lab in which students design and synthesize a small molecule inhibitor of LDH in Organic Chemistry II Lab, and then test it efficacy in Biochemistry Lab the following semester. As we are implementing the lab, we are learning each year, how to better prepare our students for this intense, research experience. As a result, have seen some of these assessment method scores drop, but continually work to provide the scaffolding that our students need to succeed. Additionally, we are seeing that the level of engagement in this lab has been truly remarkable, and the students seem all too happy to be Beta testers.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

- 1. As a result of changing the version of the ACS exam in biochemistry, we don't feel that this is an adequate assessment method. We will determine how better to assess this outcome for that class.
- 2. As we participate in CURE activities (actual research experiences in the classroom that may contribute to our scholarship), we will be learning how to assess these new experiences so we can measure their abilities to engage students. With good assessment methods, we hope to turn these into chemical education publications.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Biology, Biopsychology, Environmental Biology, Sport Science and Leadership

Date: October 3, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Our 2015-2016 assessment was focused on the research/internship series as we have implemented several recent changes and saw the greatest need to review these aspects of all majors in the biology department.

For each major in the program these included are data have been entered in TracDat for:

Outcomes by program related to our overall 2015-2016 review

Biology: Scientific Method: 2. Understand the elements of the scientific method, design and implement experiments independently, and analyze and present data to the faculty and peers in a competent and professional manner A. Understand and use steps of the scientific method B. Conduct literature review to develop a relevant hypothesis and appropriate experimental design C. Collect the data and statistically analyze the results D. Present data in a written form based on departmental guidelines E. Present data in a oral form based on departmental guidelines

Biopsychology: Critical Thinking in Writing: 2. Demonstrate critical thinking skills in writing in core classes Biopsychology: Critical Thinking in Verbal Communication: 3. Demonstrate critical thinking skills in verbal communication in core classes.

Biopsychology: Collateral Skills : 5. Develop skills in collateral areas such as statistical analysis and experimental design

Environmental Biology: In mid- and advanced-level courses, students should be able to apply their knowledge to practical, "hands on" field or laboratory situations, and the scientific method.

Environmental Biology Demonstrate a working knowledge and application of issues related to environmental biology including experimental design and data analysis and/or active internship related to the discipline. Sports Science and Leadership: Apply managerial and leadership theories and techniques as they relate to the sport industry.

For 2015-2016 our assessment focuses on the research/internship series in all majors in the biology department. As we continue to adapt to student needs in the STEM fields, we have made major changes to our research series to include internship opportunities in the biology major. These opportunities have been in place in the Environmental Biology and Biopsychology major for several years. From internship experiences that we have reviewed the past several years, we have decided to review the work being done in the sophomore biology course focusing on scientific writing and applying statistics, adding a mandatory "data driven" component to internship experiences, re-envision current courses in the research series and capstone experience, as well as design new courses to allow for a comparable experience to the existing research option for majors in the biology department. To this end a major hurdle is the internship experience taken by SPSL majors that is conducted and oversee through the SPML program. For students interested in a more management focus, these courses work well. However, as we have stated in the past, for science outcomes the current SPSL major capstone experience options (SPML 481 Sports Leadership Practicum or BIOL 487 Internship) needs to be further developed and examined. We have found that the pre-requisites for many health and STEM field career requirements need to be electives in the SPSL major.

At the first year general biology experience we recognized the need to continue our work conducting open-ended, inquiry based laboratory experiences. To this end, several faculty members in the department have written new laboratory experiences for General Biology II (BIOL 161) and we are now publishing an in-house laboratory manual. Lead instructors of General Biology I (BIOL 160) will work to complete the manual to include materials covered in BIOL 160 for 2016-2017 academic year. We will track this new lab manual and how student writing of lab reports and specifically how writing introduction section and using statistics (both found to be needing improvements from the 2015-2016 assessment) leads to improvement.

Our ongoing work with improving statistical knowledge and application in ongoing. We have added stats to our BIOL 251 course required for BIOL, and EBIO, and as of 2015 for BIOP majors although many students choose to take this course as an elective and to meet core curriculum writing requirement II. Two stats options are available to students in the biology program. MATH 130 (3 credits) and MATH 230 (4 credits) are acceptable for their major

and either is a pre- or co-requisite to BIOL 251. We see that students taking MATH 230 are better prepared for stats in BIOL 251 and in their future research and upper-level courses using statistics in biology. Considering career options, some students can be very successful with Math 130 instead of Math 230 although we feel this is not optimal. Because of scheduling difficulties and the number of credits for each course, and course availability students may choose or are forced to take MATH 130. With a new math faculty member re-envisioning the stats course in 2014 we have included R language (which was much more challenging to students) as well as to try and add the 4th credit of Math 230 on-line as well as work with the Math department to bring the Math 230 course to 3 credits. As this faculty member left Viterbo in 2016, we are seeking new options and reviewing what we can continue with new staffing.

To help students with their oral communication in the sciences, we have started work on adding the oral communication core requirement to BIOL 250. This course is required of all BIOL and BIOP majors. Most EBIO and SPSL majors will elect to take this course on academic advisor's recommendations. The BIOP major has had the oral communication required in BIOP 261 with great success. Now that we are exploring improving oral communication related to science data and collection, we will assess the requirement in BIOP 261 as well as where EBIO and SPSL majors elect to meet this requirement if not in BIOL 250.

New to TracDat by major:

Assessment criteria in the capstone research/internship series have been standardized for majors in the biology department. Now that we are moving towards all majors in the biology department (with work to still be done with SPSL as assessment continues) are moving to either a research opportunity or the newly implemented data-driven internship, we have decided to make the criteria the same. Although the outcomes are met with different disciplinary data projects, we are working on mechanisms for the written and oral measure of success for any major.

BIOP new assessment method in Collateral skills - outcome added is final stats quiz in BIOL 251 as BIOL 251 has recently been required of the major.

BIOP new 80% of the biopsychology majors will score at least an 84% on the oral presentation of their BIOL 397 Research proposal project.

BIOP new 80% of the biopsychology majors will score at least an 84% on the written proposal from their BIOL 397 Research Proposal project.

BIOL added assessment methods to the capstone research/internship experience. Added assessment methods to the required BIOL 251 course related to scientific method.

EBIO all assessment methods are new to the environmental biology major as this is a relatively new major and assessment is being developed.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Review of overall assessment is something we plan on developing in 2016-2017 academic year after program reviews have been completed. Our goal is to further review the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) extensive study on biology education and highlighted in the "Vision and Change In Undergraduate Biology Education: A Call to Action" document with developing materials at http://visionandchange.org. Our department plan is to review all aspects of assessment to make the data more useful as we align to AAAS standards. We have already begun to model all majors in the biology department after Vision and Change including high impact practices (e.g., research and internships), active learning, and inquiry-based laboratories. We have also modeled several of our assessment outcomes, core concepts, and competencies after work published by the AAAS. As reported in previous assessment reports, the biology department regularly meets and discuses aspects related to courses taught, student successes and challenges related to our program outcomes. Items under regular discussion include having students being able to meet the needs of internship opportunities and STEM employers through discussion with internship and career science partners, career ready skills, content knowledge in the sciences, and scores on post-secondary entrance exams.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Tammy Clark

Name of Program: Chemistry Date: September 29, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

As per our assessment plan, we have: provided data for all assessment methods from the 2015-2016 academic year; analyzed the assessment data for Outcomes A and D (summarized below); and provided follow ups for the evaluations that were completed last year on Outcomes C and F.

Evaluation of Outcome A: Problem Solving

Overall, we see very strong results in this category. The few exceptions in lower than goal results of the ACS exam scores may be related to using a new version of the exam. This occurs since each exam emphases different aspects of the curriculum. We do not feel that we need to take any curriculum action to improve this outcome, but will continue to consider implementation of new pedagogies in an effort to achieve the best possible results.

Evaluation of Outcome D: Data Analysis

This is a very strong outcome for our students. We attribute their success in part to our open-ended lab experiences that require an in-depth understanding of the experiment and an increased level of engagement in discovery. For instance, we are in the process of refining a newly developed multi-disciplinary medicinal chemistry lab in which students design and synthesize a small molecule inhibitor of LDH in Organic Chemistry II Lab, and then test it efficacy in Biochemistry Lab the following semester. As we are implementing the lab, we are learning each year, how to better prepare our students for this intense, research experience. As a result, have seen some of these assessment method scores drop, but continually work to provide the scaffolding that our students need to succeed. Additionally, we are seeing that the level of engagement in this lab has been truly remarkable, and the students seem all too happy to be Beta testers.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

- 1. We will work to keep up with our normal assessment schedule.
- 2. As we participate in CURE activities (actual research experiences in the classroom that may contribute to our scholarship), we will be learning how to assess these new experiences so we can measure their abilities to engage students. With good assessment methods, we hope to turn these into chemical education publications.
- 3. We found through assessment that we need to work on improving our general chemistry series. Since this is a critical sequence for all majors in the sciences, we are working to develop a robust and well thought out action plan.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Anthony Gerig

Name of Program: Mathematical Physics

Date: May 12, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Because of the low numbers of students enrolled in the program, results are cumulative and updated whenever new data is generated. New data were available this year for the following assessment methods: ETS percentile (under Physical Principles), CHEM 397 proposal score (under Scientific Method), CHEM 499 paper score (under Scientific Method and Scientific Communication), average lab score for PHYS 321 (under Lab Methods), PHYS 498 grade (under Lab Methods) and CHEM 499 presentation score (under Scientific Communication). With the inclusion of the new data, all assessment measures currently meet or exceed their stated goals with the exception of ETS percentile (addressed below in the assessment plan).

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Although the total number of results for the ETS percentile measure remains small, students have been producing unexpectedly low scores. I suspect two possible explanations, both of which pertain to the assessment method itself rather than program deficiencies. First, the ETS exam tests some subjects that are not required for the mathematical physics major, and second, the exam is not given as part of the students' coursework so there is little incentive to prepare or perform well. I therefore plan to replace the ETS exam as a measure for the Physical Principles outcome with scores on questions similar to those found on the ETS exam, but given on exams in the upper-level physics courses required for the major. This alternative should correct both problems with the ETS exam, although it unfortunately leaves us without a standardized, external measure of the quality of the program. Changes will be implemented the next time upper-level physics courses are offered, which should be the fall of 2017 (there are no upper-classmen in the program for the 2016-17 academic year).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sheldon Lee

Name of Program: Mathematics

Date: November 2, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year we assessed three of our six outcomes. We looked at deductive reasoning at the upper division level, since there were no majors in any appropriate lower division courses. We looked at both MATH 420 (Real Analysis) and MATH 344 (Abstract Algebra) and measured deductive reasoning through exam questions. Many students did not meet the proficiency and apprentice level work we expect for these courses. The ability to reason deductively is very much determined by the incoming mathematical ability of the student, as well as their level of motivation and willingness to work hard. Nevertheless, we discussed making some changes to our Intro to Abstract Math course (MATH 260) to make sure that students are getting more familiar with this kind of reasoning. We assessed oral communication by using oral presentations in MATH 499, math seminar. We assessed written communication in MATH 344, using problems from homework and the final exam. This outcome continues to be problematic because the lack of ability to communicate in written form may be confounded with their lack of understanding of the material. Since written communication is difficult to assess, we are considering combining this

with the deductive reasoning outcome. These two outcomes are difficult to separate in an assessment setting.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Assess deductive reasoning at the lower-division level in MATH 221 and 260 Assess problem solving in MATH 221, 320, and 330.

Assess technology use in 230 and 330 with the modified rubrics to include procedural programming. Assess independent research at the lower and upper-division levels in MATH 260 and 365.

Continue to ensure that students in MATH 260 are capable of succeeding in upper division courses such as MATH 420. This requires deductive reasoning skills, written communication skills, as well as having a strong mathematical ability.

Consider combining the written communication and deductive reasoning outcomes.

Implement exit interviews to graduating majors and incorporate into our assessment plan.

Modify our rubrics for independent research. We want to target students individually.

College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

Assessment Report for the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior: Sept. 2016 Updates

School of Nursing			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)	05/24/2016	05/24/2016	04/22/2010
BSN Completion	09/23/2016	09/30/2014	
Graduate Nursing	10/26/2016	10/26/2016	10/26/2016
School of Health and Human Behavior			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Criminal Justice	10/17/2016	09/18/2009	09/30/2010
Dietetics	09/29/2016	09/12/2016	08/13/2012
Dietetics Internship	09/29/2016	09/07/2016	
Diversity Studies (minor)	New Program		
Family Studies (minor)	09/30/2016		
Gerontology (minor)	08/31/2016	10/17/2013	
Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling	09/23/2016	12/18/2014	10/23/2014
Psychology	09/23/2016	09/23/2016	09/16/2012
Social Work	09/01/2016	09/01/2016	06/17/2011
Substance Abuse Counseling	08/10/2016	08/10/2016	
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2	016		•

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries School of Nursing

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Toni Wissestad

Name of Program: Nursing BSN Date: September 29, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year we focused on two of our seven outcomes. Two of the three methods met the criteria for professional values of altruism, human dignity, integrity and social justice. One course did not submit proof of meeting this outcome and the assigned faculty was alerted of the importance of submission. The criterion related to incorporating evidence based practice to clinical decision making was met for all measures. There was a recommendation to improve the data collection tool for a simulated evidence based assignment in NURS 422, and faculty has made those revisions.

The new learning outcomes were identified and incorporated into the mastery plan for future measurement.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we will collect results for the next learning outcomes in our cycle of assessment and will also follow up on results for evidence based practice. The new learning outcomes, based on the new standards for the nursing profession will be measured in our cycle assessment. There will be a need for

faculty education and input to refine and identify assignments designated to measure in the future. The assessment cycle will be updated to reflect the plan for future assessment activities.

A new Assessment Coordinator will be on-boarded beginning September 2016.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Hedrick-Erickson

Name of Program: BSN Completion Program

Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Last year we focused on two of our six outcomes: 2) Evidence Based Practice and 2) Critical Thinking. All methods measured met the criteria (see attached documents).

Overall program feedback has been consistently meeting benchmarks, with our end of program report means result on a 7.0 Likert scale of "overall satisfaction" at 6.24 and "overall learning" at 6.43/7.0. Although students seem very satisfied, some overall themes can be identified where we meet challenges, based on data gathered from a variety of tools used to collect narrative responses. Many students continue to describe the workload in some of the core courses to be quite heavy. As well, some redundancy in core/mission courses. Other themes include the necessity to create an applied statistics course, which was created for Fall 2016; this is now a support course requirement (or Math 130). And a final theme described that there are too many papers as a means of evaluation. And last, many have described the need to have timely and quality feedback from instructors. Some discussion arose regarding the need to offer more classes face to face; however, the audience who provided feedback had more delivery options than we currently offer.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

We will assess our current curriculum map and seek more meaningful results to better determine student's ability to achieve outcomes. Adult students tend to be high achievers and most, if not all, achieve 80% or better on the selected assignments.

We will continue to closely monitor the effectiveness of online courses. Will focus on retention efforts, in particular for online students.

We will conduct mid-program focus groups. The survey will now be completely online in order to gather open and honest feedback, with anonymity. The survey includes gathering feedback about what has gone well, what could be improved, and the effectiveness of various campus resources, including: academic advising, library, academic resource center, and technology support.

We will monitor upcoming changes to the university core curriculum and assure we adapt courses to meet requirements. This may mean a complete revision of courses and/or our program, whereby this provides opportunity to assure we are meeting our population wants/needs. However, prioritizing work to assure quality.

Last, we will work to collect data from our alumni. Last year there were merely three responses. We will consider ways to work with other university groups, such as the alumni office to determine ways to improve response rate.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Stolder

Name of Program: Graduate Nursing

Date: September 27, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-16 we collected assessment data on two outcomes according to our scheduled cycle: Demonstrate ethical leadership and faithful service in chosen roles and settings AND Utilize technology to impact best practice. We continue to use the rubrics that have been developed for scheduled interim assessments of selected course assignments for each of these outcomes. Adherence from faculty to fill in the M assignment shared file has improved. The feedback on the rubrics has been minimal from faculty, but the scores received by the students have met benchmarks. It would be helpful to discuss how each course embedded assignment is designed to complement the knowledge, skills, and attitudes expressed on the rubrics. A faculty meeting to share this will be suggested. Perhaps there will be suggestions for rubric updates.

We continue to require that students post these assignments to their electronic portfolios. The portfolio process seems cumbersome to the students (and the faculty to monitor), and adherence to posting their artifacts are inconsistent. With the DNP program now the only program, and with the DNP Project serving as an exemplary Mastery assignment for all students, regardless of track, it is possible the portfolio is no longer necessary. That would be a suggestion to bring up with faculty. Existing students could consider the portfolio optional; new students would not start a portfolio.

For current students, evidence from the End of Program Survey, the One Year Alumni Survey, and the Course Embedded Assignment Rubrics indicate both of these outcomes are meeting benchmarks. With curricular changes and programmatic expansions, it will be necessary to monitor them both over time with the changes implemented. These areas were noted in the TracDat updates done in fall, 2016.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we will collect results for the next two learning outcomes according to our cycle: Practice in an expanded, specialized, and/or advanced practice role AND Facilitate the translation of research and evidence into practice. With potential curricular changes and possible expanded program options (Ethical Leadership as post MSN; DNP and CRNA combination degree, post BSN/MBA to DNP options, it will be important to monitor our processes and course content to insure we are meeting the outcome requirements of all DNP students. We will make a decision about the continued use of the portfolio. We will focus on making sure the DNP Project serves as an exemplary assignment for evidence of meeting all of the graduate outcomes. This may require fine tuning the Project Guidelines accordingly. A linkage of the DNP Essentials and the Graduate Outcomes has been established in the past, but they may not be transparently linked in the DNP Project Guidelines.

2016 Academic Program Assessment Summaries School of Health and Human Behavior

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Klitzke

Name of Program: Dietetics Date: September 12, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

We have completed assessment activities as outlined in our overall assessment plan. We have results for all CRDs, CO competencies and a few of the KRDs. Initially, we were unsure if we needed to assess the KRDs, and therefore we are behind on this part of our assessment plan. In any given year there are few competencies that are not met. We currently have 12 competencies needing follow-up. Most unmet competencies were related to coding of services, individual counseling ability, and interpretation of financial data. In five cases competencies were achieved because of a single individual's performance and it is unclear whether the CP was the cause of the problem. These instances are noted and are followed up the following year to see if a pattern emerges. There were six instances where changes were made and unmet competencies were achieved in the following year. There is no distinct pattern of unmet competencies by course, instructor, or domains, except that most unmet competencies are in 400-level courses.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Our assessment activities in 2016 will focus on following up on unmet competencies, beginning a new 5-year cycle of assessing learning outcomes, beginning with Practice Management and Use of Resources. This domain includes CRD 4.11, the competency on coding dietetics services, which we have had the most difficulty achieving. We will update our overall assessment plan to include the CRDN and KRDN competencies in the 2017 Standards of Education. We have been successful in achieving most of the competencies and will consider implementing higher standards for 100% of students, and/or "stretch" goals, i.e. stricter goals that will be met by 80% or fewer of students.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Karen Gibson

Name of Program: Dietetic Internship

Date: September 12, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In reviewing the overall assessment scheme, our plan was to evaluate each "group" of competencies (1 – 4) in separate years, with the fifth year of our assessment cycle the "review" year. 2015-2016 was our "review" year. Due to the new model we implemented in 2014-2015, we revised the courses by "rolling" together 471 and 450 along with part of Nutr 476 into Nutr 474 which the interns take in the fall. Nutr 475 and Nutr 477 have been combined into Nutr 475 in the spring and the community "final rotation" now takes place first summer session and is Nutr 480. This past year, the assessment plan was updated to reflect the new model to verify where each competency will be measured. Although all of the competencies were evaluated, the wording in TracDat has not been totally revised.

In reviewing the reports, we also needed to follow-up on any "open" competencies. These include 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, 4.9 and 4.10 since it appears they were to be re-assessed in fall 2012 and this was not

done. These competencies were re-evaluated fall 2015 with successful results in the interns meeting the minimum criterion for each competency.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, we are transitioning to a new internship director. In addition, new competencies have been released by ACEND, our accrediting board, so the focus will be on reviewing the new competencies to ensure they are being evaluated and to revise language as needed in TracDat once again. We have also changed the model of the internship once again. This year we have admitted 12 students into the internship with 6 completing their MNT/Foodservice in the fall and Community in the spring and the remaining 6 interns completing their Community rotation in the fall and their MNT/Foodservice rotation in the spring. The curriculum has changed, so that we now offer a one-week boot camp in August with two courses in the academic year: DI rotation I and DI rotation II. TracDat will need to be updated to reflect these changes.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Deb Daehn Zellmer

Name of Program: Family Studies Minor

Date: September 1, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

There were no graduates with a Family Studies Minor in the 2015-2016 academic year, thus not assessment results were collected.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Collect assessment results from Family Studies Minors graduating in 2016-2017 for assessment analysis.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Anderson-Meger, Interim Gerontology Minor Coordinator

Name of Program: Gerontology Minor

Date: August 31, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

2015/2016 we assessed Outcome # 2 in the Gerontology minor: Students will apply gerontological concepts to practical experience with an elderly population. To achieve this outcome students have to either write a reflection paper with specific question prompts or have an interview with the Gero Minor Coordinator. A rubric is used to rate the student's ability to apply gerontological concepts to their experience in a gero setting. Students complete the experience either through an internship or course (usually Sociology 149/249/349). The papers are turned in via a moodle site for the minor. The Gerontology Minor Coordinator reads all the papers, conducts the interviews, and scores the rubrics. Nine students were involved in an experience course or internship for the minor in 2015/2016.

A specific section of the rubric addresses the career preparation/experience outcome for the minor. In this section students must score at least 3 out of 5 points to consider the outcome satisfactory. Of the 9 students, 100% met this criteria. The average score for the 9 students was a 4.5 . Hard copies of the rubrics are available from the Gero Minor Coordinator. A blank copy of the rubric is posted on Trac Dat in related documents.

The findings indicate that students are able to relate gerontology knowledge and course content to their experiences with the elderly. Students indicated a variety of theories, approaches, issues, etc. that they were able to use or see in action at their settings. The Gero minor coordinator considers the outcome met.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

All three outcomes have been measured over the past three years and outcomes have been successfully met. However, the minor has undergone curriculum changes due to lack of enrollment for certain classes. This year we will call an advisory committee meeting to review the assessment results over the past three years, discuss curricular issues, and consider possible changes. We anticipate either keeping or slightly changing the outcomes based on current curriculum availability and considering the requirements as a whole. We would also like to determine a process or criteria for determining whether or not a course is included in the minor.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Debra A. Murray

Name of Program: Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling

Date: September 25, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

For the 2015-2016 academic, fours areas of the eleven program learning outcomes as delineated in the MSMHC Master Assessment plan, were examined: Career and Life Planning, Helping Relationships, Counseling Continuum and Group Work

Career and Life Planning includes eight signature assignments and the results of the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examinations (CPCE) exam.

Helping Relationships includes ten signature assignments and the results on the CPCE exam. Counseling Continuum includes six signature assignments and the results on the CPCE exam.

Group Work includes four signature assignments and the results on the CPCE exam.

The Career and life Planning outcome has been on the radar the last couple of years, when students performed lower than expected on the CPCE exam in 2014. An Instructor who is a licensed career counselor agreed to teach the course, and developed a different set of assignments to synthesize the knowledge and skills necessary for students to increase competency in this domain. We continue monitoring, however, due to the three-year cycle for students graduating from the MSMHC program, the impact will not be evident until the 2017 CPCE results are analyzed. On another note the students who are licensing and taking the national exam are passing all areas on the first attempt. Outcomes for the other three categories Helping Relationships, Counseling Continuum and Group Work are all on target n(there are some results still being entered into Trac Dat).

The significant conclusions drawn include the following:

First, the MSMHC program is "gathering information about the knowledge, abilities, and values of program graduates; and 3. Students from the MSMHC program are licensing and securing career placement before and after graduation. Second, MSMHC program utilizes assessment "information to improve teaching and learning in the program". The faculty diligently review the signature assignment results at the end of each semester (before going on break) and results are recorded into the Core faculty meeting minutes. the process has been very useful for continuous improvement in the teaching and revising of courses. Third, the MSMHC "program communicates assessment results with

stakeholders (students, faculty, administrators, and advisory boards) the assessment results are found in annual reports, presented the Advisory Board and to students as the course revisions are rolled out. Finally, the current assessment plan is not sustainable, given the number of assignments for each of the eleven outcomes ranges between 6 and 10 signature assignments.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

In summer 2016- the assessment plan was carefully reviewed and changes to streamline the plan are under development. The new assessment plan will be effective for the 2016-2017 academic year. At the time of implementation, a different faculty member will assume the assessment for the MSMHC department.

In 2017, we will collect results for the next four learning outcomes; Professional Orientation, Ethics, Diversity & Advocacy, Human Growth and Development.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Liza Ware

Name of Program: Psychology Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

We continued to focus on outcomes 2 (Research Skills) and 5 (Career Assessment) this year.

Outcome 2 (Research Skills): The criterion for outcome 2 was not met at the foundational level, but was met at the baccalaureate level. At the baccalaureate level, more instruction time was spent on synthesizing literature, and the instructor met regularly with each student group to discuss their research project, hypothesis generation, purpose of the study and ways to identify gaps in the literature. We are closing the loop at this level. At the foundational level, we were pleased with the continued improvement seen after we modified our assessment method for this outcome. We plan to work on closing the loop when the courses is taught this fall by providing students with earlier and more frequent practice on activities similar to the assessment activity.

Outcome 5 (Career Assessment): The criterion for outcome 5 was partially met at the foundational level, but was met at the baccalaureate level for the consecutive second year. We are therefore closing the loop at the baccalaureate level. At the foundational level, students are reporting the personality and career exploration assignment helpful for identifying their strengths and interests, but not as helpful for identifying a suitable career path.

We also modified the wording of Outcome 1 (Knowledge of Psychology), which we will begin assessing this year. The outcome previously read, "Students will be able to describe key concepts, principles, and theories in primary content domains of psychology," and we changed it to read, "Students will demonstrate knowledge of key concepts, principles, and theories in primary content domains of psychology." This modification was made to better align the outcome with the assessment methods we intend to use.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

Outcome 1 (Knowledge of Psychology): This outcome will be assessed starting this fall in Psyc 171 (foundational) and Psyc 499 (baccalaureate). We will be using test scores in 171 and psychology GRE scores in 499 to capture students' knowledge of the various content domains of psychology.

Outcome 2 (Research Skills): We will continue to assess this outcome in Psyc 230 (foundational), implementing the action plans described above and in our TracDat report. We are pleased to see that the criterion for the outcome was met at the baccalaureate level and are interested to see if this is maintained this year. We hope to close the loop on this outcome this year.

Outcome 3 (Ethical Principles and Standards): This outcome will be assessed starting this fall across four courses. Two methods (one foundational and one baccalaureate) will assess students' understanding of ethics in psychological science, and two (one foundational and one baccalaureate) will assess students' understanding of ethics in psychology practice.

Outcome 4 (Communication Skills)(: This outcome will be assessed starting this fall across three courses. Two methods (one foundational and one baccalaureate) will assess students' communication skills as they relate to psychological science, and two (one foundational and one baccalaureate) will assess students' communication skills as they relate to psychology practice.

Outcome 5 (Career Assessment): For the foundational level assessment in Psyc 171, we will be modifying the assignment to meet the learning outcome, particularly in terms of identifying suitable career options as this is where the criterion has not yet been met. No further action will be taken at the baccalaureate level - the loop is closed and we will continue to use this assignment to achieve this learning outcome.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Deb Daehn Zellmer

Name of Program: Social Work Date: September 1, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

Composite benchmarks for all competencies/outcomes with the exception of the course embedded measure for EP2.1.7 Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment. This composite score was viewed as an anomaly as it was greatly influenced by the course embedded measure for EP2.1.7a Theory guides practice and likely was due in part to a data collection error resulting in only 2/3rds of the data being available for analysis.

The course embedded assignments for the following outcomes fell below benchmark and the following actions recommended:

• EP 2.1.2b Make ethical decisions using the NASW Code of Ethics: 88% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on course embedded assignments connected to this competency/outcome thus meeting and exceeding our overall benchmark. However, on one measure tied to EP 2.1.2b Make ethical decisions (the course embedded assignment in SOWK 482 Ethics Paper), only 67% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on this specific assignment. Students have had difficulty meeting the benchmark on this measure for 3 out for the past 4 years. Thus action is warranted. Action to be taken: The faculty leading SOWK 482 will review the wording of the Ethics Paper assignment and the rubric to

ensure that there is clarity around applying the NASW Code of Ethics to make ethical decisions. Monitor results next year.

• EP 2.1.6b Research informed practice: 82% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on course embedded assignments connected to this competency/outcome thus meeting and exceeding our overall benchmark. However, on one measure tied to EP 2.1.6b Research informed practice 71% of students achieved a score of 80% or better on this specific assignment. Students have had difficulty meeting the benchmark on this measure for 2 out for the past 4 years. Thus action is warranted. Action to be taken: Revise assessment measure for this outcome this year and monitor results next year.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

The social work program will be revamping all assessment measures to respond to new CSWE Accreditation Standards and Educational Policy. While results falling below benchmarks mentioned above should be reviewed, primary attention will be devoted to revising or developing new assessment measures.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Liza Ware Name of Program: Substance Abuse Counseling

Date: September 23, 2016

1. Assessment Results from 2015-2016

In 2015-2016, we continued assessing Outcome 2 (Research and Practice Skills), Outcome 3 (Ethical Principles and Standards), and Outcome 4 (Communication Skills).

Outcome 2 The criterion was not met for either the research or practice skills components of this outcome. The sample of SAC majors was very small this year, making it difficult to interpret these results. This is especially the case for the practice skills component which did meet the criterion in 2014-2015. Nevertheless, instruction in the coming year will focus more heavily on conveying connections to students between research and theoretical principles and examples/applications of them.

Outcome 3 The criterion was met for this outcome but the high overall average suggests that the assignment could challenge students to think more critically about ethical issues. We will explore ways to modify the assignment to incorporate more application of ethical principles.

Outcome 4 WRITTEN & ORAL COMPONENTS: The criterion was met for these components; however, similar to last year's results, the high scores on these assignments suggest that they can be made more

rigorous and/or assessed more critically. We will refine our grading rubrics for these assignments to isolate and more precisely capture the communication skills component of these assignments.

2. Plan for 2016-2017

We have identified the goals listed below for our 2016-2017 assessment work in this program. (a) As indicated above, we will continue to work on improving our instruction for Outcome 2 and refining the assessment methods and rubrics for Outcomes 3 and 4 to ensure that they sufficiently challenge students to think critically about ethical principles and standards and communicate effectively.

(b) Assess the interpersonal component for Outcome 4. (We have thus far only directly assessed the written and oral communication skills components of this outcome.) We will use a rubric to assess

interpersonal interaction during mock counseling sessions in Psyc 270: Interviewing and the Helping Relationship and/or ADCT/PSYC 427: Alcohol and Drug Abuse Professional Skills.

(a) Refine assessment methods and develop rubrics to begin assessing Outcomes 1 (Knowledge) and 5 (Career Assessment) in Fall 2016 courses. We are planning on assessing Outcome 1 through specific test questions in courses that focus on the four approaches specified in the outcome: developmental (ADCT 445), multicultural (ADCT 440), biopsychosocial (PSYC 305), and counseling (ADCT 464). We are planning on assessing Outcome 5 through a short written assignment in ADCT 423 that will ask students to reflect on their interests, strengths, and career options.