

Academic Program Assessment Report: 2016-2017

Assessment & Institutional Research Viterbo University

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 2016-17 reported in fall 2017.

Strengthening Learning through Assessment in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Of the 55 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.
- 98% (54/55) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action.

The academic programs regularly utilize assessment for targeted changes and confirming learning. The emphasis is on direct measures; indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

**In 2016-2017, 55 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 2016-17 was on assessing learning outcomes through the Foundations and Ways of Thinking.

- **Foundations—Oral Communication**: Faculty decided on targeted changes following two terms of assessment. Follow-up will occur in 2017-18
- Integrating Faith and Practice: Three terms of assessment, with adjustments and follow-up, have resulted in increased scores. Follow-up will continue in 2017-18 until the criterion is met.
- Theological Inquiry: The criteria have been met after actions were implemented.
- **Literary Analysis**: Although the criteria were met, faculty decided to follow-up with another round of assessment by applying the revised learning outcomes and rubric.
- **Artistic Engagement**: Faculty met to develop a common assessment rubric and prepare for assessment in 2017-18.

Assessment Practice and Progress

Faculty oversight of academic program assessment is provided through the Academic Program Assessment Committee, and in 2016-17, the committee:

- Provided in-depth formative peer review on assessment work for eight academic programs a year before their program review.
- Recommended the TracDat upgrade.
- Provided input to OAIR in creating user guides for the TracDat upgrade and for the five TracDat sessions held by OAIR.
- Confirmed the request to the VPAA that assessment time for departments would be included in spring out-service week. Those dates were May 18 and 19, 2017.
- Set the goal for 2017-18 to work with OAIR on a workshop focused on effective use of TracDat to log follow-up assessment after taking actions. Efficiencies can be gained if the query can capture all actions and follow-up.
- Established and communicated the goal of updated mission and goals in TracDat by Sept. 2017.

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

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Use of Assessment in the LIVE Core Curriculum	
Foundations	3
Oral Communication: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	3
Ways of Thinking	6
Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	6
Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	9
Theological Inquiry: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	11
Use of Assessment in Academic Programs	
College of Arts and Letters	14
School of Fine Arts	14
School of Humanities	18
College of Business and Leadership	23
Dahl School of Business	23
Degree Completion Programs	28
Servant Leadership Department	31
College of Education, Science, and Mathematics	33
School of Education	33
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics	42
College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior	45
School of Nursing	45
School of Health and Human Behavior	48

Use of Assessment in the Core Curriculum Foundations

Oral Communication: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

Method: Final oral presentation in all courses approved for Oral Communication Foundation

Measurement: Oral Communication rubric

Spring 2017 Oral Communication Courses				
Course	Instructor	Students		
ARTS 351	L Lenarz	13		
COMM 150	C. Thaldorf	11		
CRMJ 265 / SOCL 265	R. Anderson	11		
EDUC 255	M. Langeberg	13		
ENGL 255	R. Samuels	5		
MGMT 230	C. Thaldorf	9		
NURS 240 01	J. Meyers	34		
NURS 240 02	J. Meyers	29		
NURS 240 03	K. Warner	33		
NURS 240 04	K. Warner	33		
SOWK 275	C. Fossen	9		
SPAN 306	M. Bird	14		
THTR 291	J. McLean	9		
PSYC 270	S. Thorson-Olesen	20		

Working group: Derek Cortez, Stephanie Thorson-Olesen, Janet McLean All instructors teaching OC courses spring 2017 provided to AIR the following materials:

- A completed syllabus/assignment questionnaire.
- Section specific assignment description that will be used for assessment purposes.
- Section specific assessment assignment rubric.
- Course syllabus.
- OC presentation scores

On Thursday, May 18th, the group met from 10:30-12:00 to:

- 1) Apply the OC rubric to a recorded presentation and discuss results;
- 2) Reach a conclusion about spring 2017 OC assessment results;
- 3) Decide on targeted changes;
- 4) Decide on next steps in OC assessment or curriculum.

Participants: Maribel Bird, Melinda Langeberg, Lisa Lenarz, Julie Meyers, Janet McLean, Rolf Samuels, Carey Thaldorf.

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

Oral Communication Assessment Results: Spring 2017

All 14 sections of OC courses supplied scores. The results are based on scores for the 241 students from these sections.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Total
Mean	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.8	17.9
Lowest	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.1	2.8	13.3
Highest	4	3.9	3.8	4	4	19.1
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	18.4
Mode	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	19.0
Standard Deviation	.5	.5	.7	.6	.4	2.2

Oral Communication Assessment Results: 2011

2011 Results	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Mean	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.3

Analysis of results:

<u>Oral Communication Presentation Scores:</u> The criterion (the average score overall and for each component of the rubric will meet or exceed the novice level of 2) is exceeded for all five components and overall. Both the median and the mode for all five components is 4 on a 4-point scale, indicating that the highest score possible is applied with great frequency.

The framing language of the OC rubric indicates that the instrument "is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time" and that for group presentations "it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately."

The results, along with norming discussions about the meaning of defining terms in the OC rubric and varying applications and expectations, indicate a need for formal norming before follow-up results.

<u>Oral Communication Self-Evaluation Inventory</u>: Spring 2017 courses vary in the percentage of course activity dedicated to developing purposeful presentation skills from 10% to 80%. They also vary in the percentage of the final grade related to oral presentation projects from 12% to 50%.

Targeted actions:

1) Faculty development or learning community

One of the premises for oral communication as a foundation is that the novice level can be achieved in a variety of courses—from COMM 150, which is entirely focused on oral communication, to required courses in the majors, which focus on oral communication in addition to other outcomes. Another premise is that oral communication presentation skills are taught in in a manner that can be transferred to another discipline.

- Create a SharePoint site for all instructors of OC—with syllabi, assignments, rubrics, and other helpful course material
- Support new faculty teaching an OC course through onboarding and mentoring. The onboarding by department chairs includes sharing information about how a particular course fits in to the

- curriculum of both the major and of the core curriculum. Mentoring may be accomplished either by chairs or a designated mentor in the OC working group or learning community.
- Share best practices for teaching OC (effective OC texts and/or materials, effective scaffolding of
 instruction, effective assignment design and feedback methods) through a faculty development
 workshop.
- 2) Refine OC guidelines and CCC criteria for oral communication courses:
 - Should there be a requirement for course materials on prepared, purposeful oral presentations?
 - Should there be a threshold for percentage of OC instruction as percentage of overall course instruction?
 - Should there be a threshold for the OC assignments as percentage of final grade?
 - The syllabi should explicitly include the OC outcomes and identify the course as an OC course.
- 3) Assessment process and tools
 - Meet with working group to review results, finalize plan, and refine rubric (at least define or give example of qualifying terms).
 - Fall in-service OC workshop: 1) review rubric refinements, 2) apply rubric to at least two recorded presentations for norming, 3) share schedule and expectations for section OC assessment.
 - Explore the utility of providing support and logistics for recording a day of presentations for every section in F17?

Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
Jun-Jul	Review results, finalize plan, refine rubric	OC working group: Derek, Stephanie, Janet; Frank; Cari; Naomi
Jun	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun	Launch SharePoint site	AIR
Jul-Aug	Collect 2-3 recordings for norming	AIR / ID
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations and schedule. Communicate with chairs	AIR / CC / ID
In-service	OC workshop	AIR / CC / ID
Sep	OC best practices panel	OC working group / faculty development?
Oct	Schedule recording sessions	
Nov/Dec	Record sessions	
Dec	Collect OC scores & course materials	AIR
In-service	OC assessment session	OC working group; CC; AIR; ID

Feedback loop:

The working group and spring instructors receive a summary, with their own section results inserted. Working group finalizes action plan and communicates it with chairs, fall 2017 OC instructors, and ongoing OC instructors. Results uploaded into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

Ways of Thinking

Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

Method: Instructor-designated final literary analysis papers from all courses approved for Literary Analysis **Measurement:** Current Literary Analysis rubric

Assessment process:

Course Name	Faculty	Subj	Course #	Section	# Enrolled
Child and Adolescent Lit	L. Stroik	EDUC	280	1	25
The Short Story	N. Zavodski	ENGL	208	CAL (online)	26
Survey American Lit II	R. Samuels	ENGL	221	1	13
Survey British Lit III	E. Marzoni	ENGL	233	1	12
Lit and Healing Arts	K. Samuels	ENGL	243	1	21
Chaucer and His Age	V. Holtz	ENGL	328	1	10
Shakespeare	S. Ronnenberg	ENGL	336	1	14
Women Writers After 1700	A. Denny	ENGL	347-1	CAL (online)	19
Western Masterpieces	J. Wellik	ENGL	354-3	CAL (online)	16
Survey of Spanish Lit	J. Jambrina	SPAN	314	1	9
Drama American Repertory	J. McLean	THTR	320	1	14
Women in Theatre	J. McLean	VUSM	252	1	21

Working Group: Tammy Clark, Rolf Samuels, Sherri Lisota

All instructors teaching the 12 LA courses in spring 2017 were asked to provide to AIR the following materials:

- Assignment description
- LA scores
- A sample student essay from every section

On Wednesday, May 17th, the group met from 1:00-2:30 to:

- 1) reach a conclusion about LA assessment results;
- 2) review proposed changes in the LA outcomes;
- 3) begin the work of revising the LA rubric;
- 4) decide on next steps

Participants: Tammy Clark, Susan Cosby Ronnenberg, Vickie Holtz-Wodzak, Jesus Jambrina, Sherri Lisota, Beth Marzoni, Janet McLean, Rolf Samuels

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

Literary Analysis Assessment Results: Spring 2017

Three of the 12 sections were taught the first block of the term by two adjuncts and a professor on sabbatical. These materials were not collected. Results from seven of the nine literary analysis courses for the full or second block of the spring 2017 term were collected. 100 students out of 108 completed the courses and submitted the literary analysis assignment.

The overall average is 2.6. With the exception of 1-B (which is optional), the averages were at or above 2.5 for every component of the rubric. The averages of 200-level courses were lower than those of 300-level courses, which is expected.

Norming session: For the first norming essay, reviewers' scores differed by more than one point for "Identifies how language manifests meaning" and for "cites textual evidence." The group discussed differences and was in agreement on the second norming essay.

Analysis of results:

Overall, faculty were satisfied with the results, which align with the current outcomes and rubric. The group concurred with a criterion of a 2.5 average for the literary analysis outcome components. This criterion is met.

	1-A.	1-B.	2.	3.	4.	5.	Total
Mean	2.5	2.3	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0	15.6
Mode	2	2	3	3	3	3	18
Median	2	2	3	3	3	3	15
2XXX Av.	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.7	14.2
3XXX Av.	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.3	18.1

Discussion focused on the proposal from the working group to move from five outcomes to two outcomes, removing the strand of citing evidence from the literary analysis outcomes. One area of discussion was the concern that the reduction of outcomes is making the aims of literary analysis too simplistic or too generic. Following discussion, Rolf revised the second proposed outcome to read, "Derive apt evidence from a literary text to support an interpretive claim." Most faculty support the move from five outcomes to two outcomes.

Targeted actions:

- 1. The working group will develop the rubric for the proposed outcomes and will present the rubric to the full group of instructors by fall in-service.
- 2. Launch the SharePoint site for all literary analysis instructors.
- 3. Support new faculty teaching an LA course through onboarding and mentoring.
- 4. Fall in-service LA workshop: 1) review rubric, 2) apply rubric to norming essays, 3) share timeline and expectations for collecting section assessment.

Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
Jun	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun-Jul	Launch SharePoint	AIR / CC / ID
Jun-Jul	Develop rubric, connect to CC outcomes, finalize plan	Working group / AIR / CC / ID
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations and schedule	AIR / CC
Aug	LA workshop	Working group / AIR / CC / ID
Sep	Send e-mail with instructions and template	AIR

Oct	Collect LA scores & course materials from first block courses.	AIR
Dec	Collect LA scores & course materials	AIR
Jan	LA assessment session	AIR / CC / ID

Feedback loop: The working group and spring instructors receive a summary of results and action plan. Working group develops rubric and with AIR / CC / ID finalizes action plan. AIR uploads results into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

Method: Instructor-designated assignment in all courses approved for Integrating Faith and Practice.

Measurement: Integrating Faith and Practice (IFP) rubric

Assessment process:

Spring 2017 IFP Courses				
Section	Mode	Faculty	Enrollment	
RLST-222-001	F2F	W. Reese	14	
RLST-262-001	CAL Online	E. Dykman	20	
RLST-343-001	F2F	L. Nettles	27	
RLST-425-001	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	6	
RLST-433-001	F2F	L. Harwood	21	
RLST-433-002	F2F	W. Reese	21	
RLST-433-004	CAL Online	W. Reese	18	
RLST-433-005	CAL Online	S. Minnema	13	
VUSM-226-001	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	19	
VUSM-325-001	F2F	R. Kuhl	23	
VUSM-325-002	CAL Online	J. Eyster	21	
VUSM-431-001	F2F	W. Reese	24	

TI/IFP Working group: Michael Lopez-Kaley, Emily Dykman, Mary Therese Rinzel, Ward Jones, Michael Wodzak, Lynne Kuhl

Instructors teaching IFP courses spring 2017 provided to AIR the following materials:

- Assignment description
- Assignment rubric
- IFP scores
- Sample (mid-range, typical) student essay

On Thursday, May 18th, the group met from 3:00 – 4:00 to:

- 1. Reach a conclusion about IFP scores
- 2. Conduct a norming session on two essays
- 3. Decide on next steps: revising outcomes, guidelines, and/or rubric

Participants: Emily Dykman, Lynne Kuhl, Michael Lopez-Kaley, Laura Nettles, Chris Rogers

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier; Frank Ludwig; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl

Integrating Faith and Practice Assessment Results: Spring 2017

In spring 2017, 12 IFP courses were offered, with an enrollment of 226 students. Instructors submitted scores for nine of the 12 sections: one instructor submitted no materials or scores, the scores for one section were not useable because they were given as a range, and the instructor for one section submitted scores in alignment with the second Theological Inquiry outcome. The results are based on scores for the 169 students from the nine sections. The following assessment results reflect 75% of the students enrolled in the IFP courses.

Analysis of results:

The criterion is an average of 2.5. The average for the 2017 data is 2.4 for both outcomes. The criterion is not met. In 2016, the average was 1.8 for both outcomes, so the scores have increased significantly following targeted changes.

Norming session: The group in attendance was aligned on scores for the three norming essays. The conclusion is that there is a good common understanding among full-time faculty, and that a norming session at the beginning of fall term will be useful as a way of mentoring adjunct faculty and of sharing teaching and learning strategies around the common aims of IFP courses.

	Outcome 1: Theological Constructs	Outcome 2: Theology in Practice
Overall Average	2.4	2.4
Mode	2.0	2.0
Median	2.5	2.5
Standard Deviation	0.8	0.7
F2F	2.3	2.4
CAL Online	2.4	2.4
RLST	2.4	2.4
VUSM	2.2	2.3

Targeted actions:

- 1. The fall term will begin with a workshop for all faculty teaching IFP courses, which will include a norming session, discussion about teaching and learning strategies, and the process for follow-up assessment.
- 2. The goal for fall term is to collect useable scores for all IFP sections.
- 3. Clarify expectations for IFP with instructors of VUSM co-counting sections.
- 4. Establish a learning community and launch SharePoint site for course materials.

Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
June	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun-Jul	Review results, finalize plan, refine rubric, identify connection to CT and IL outcomes	IFP working group and CC, ID, and AIR
Jul	Launch SharePoint site for learning community	CC, ID, AIR
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations, and schedule.	AIR
In-service	IFP workshop	IFP working group and CC, ID, and AIR
Oct	Send e-mail with instructions and score template	AIR
Dec	Collect IFP scores & course materials	AIR
Jan	IFP assessment session during in-service	IFP working group, instructors, and CC, ID, and AIR

Feedback loop: The working group and spring instructors receive a summary, with their own section results. The working group, with Frank, Cari, and Naomi finalize plan for 2017-2018 and prepare for workshop. Results are uploaded into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

Theological Inquiry: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

Methods: Outcome 1—post-test multiple choice section; Outcome 2—post-test essay question 1 **Measurement:** Outcome 1—analysis of scores; Outcome 2—apply rubric to essay question 1 **Assessment process:**

Spring 2017 Theological Inquiry Courses			
Section	Location	Faculty	Enrollment
RLST-160-001	F2F	S. Minnema	27
RLST-160-002	F2F	R. Kuhl	23
RLST-160-003	F2F	L. Nettles	25
RLST-160-004	F2F	L. Nettles	24
RLST-160-005	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	23
RLST-160-006	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	24
RLST-160-007	CAL Online	C. Rogers	22
RLST-160-008	F2F	E. Dykman	21
RLST-342-001	F2F	S. Minnema	22
RLST-342-003	CAL Online	L. Jordan	17
RLST-342-004	CAL Online	L. Jordan	16
RLST-342-005	CAL Online	A. Hokenstad	17

Working group: Lynne Kuhl

Instructors teaching courses in spring 2017 provided to ID or AIR the following materials:

- Scantron or Moodle post-tests
- TI scores on post-test essay question 1

On Thursday, May 18th, the group met from 2:30-3:00 to:

- 1. Reach a conclusion about post-test scores
- 2. Reach a conclusions about essay scores
- 3. Decide on next steps

Participants: Emily Dykman, Michael Lopez-Kaley, Sr. Laura Nettles, Chris Rogers Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

Theological Inquiry Assessment Results: Spring 2017

Ten of the 12 sections of TI courses supplied complete materials. The results are based on scores for the 211 students from these sections.

Outcome 1 Results: Criteria: TI aims for a novice level. This is achieved when at least 80% of students achieve an overall score of 70% or higher. An average of at least 70% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions indicates an apprentice level.

Spring 2017 results: 84.6% (188/211) of students had an overall score of 70% or higher on the primary subset of questions. Students scored an average of 82.8% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions. Criteria met.

2015-2016 results (incomplete): 84.4% (157/186) of students had an overall score of 70% or higher on the primary subset of questions. Students scored an average of 83.7% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions. Criteria met.

Outcome 2 Results: Criteria: Students achieve an average of at least a 2 on Outcome 2.

Spring 2017 results: The overall average was 2.3. There were 8 sections of RLST 160 and 4 sections RLST 342 in spring 2017. One of the RLST 160 sections had used an older version of the post-test, so that section was not included. Scores were not submitted for the essay question for another RLST 160 section. The work of 190 students was included in the assessment process.

Outcome 2 was measured by applying the rubric to Essay Question 1 on the post-test.

	Outcome 2
Overall Average	2.3
Standard Deviation	1.0
Median	2.5
Mode	2.0
RLST 160 Average	2.1
RLST 342 Average	2.5
CAL Online Average	2.4
F2F Average	2.2

Analysis of results:

The criteria are met, the assessment methods are deemed to be valid and reliable, and learning is confirmed. The consistency of post-test multiple choice results between last year and this year is remarkable. Overall the results reflect perception of student performance. Although the criteria were met, faculty registered some disappointment in the results, in particular the RLST 160 scores.

Full-time faculty had normed the application of the rubric to essay question one in spring 2017. Emily Dykman then mentored adjunct faculty applying the rubric to essay question one.

Targeted actions:

Although the criteria are met, the following targeted actions will be taken:

- 1) Full-time faculty will refine the multiple-choice questions for clarity, working from questions with low performance.
- 2) In Fall 2017, the Religious Studies department, along with the Theological Inquiry working group, will hold a norming session for all faculty (full-time and adjunct) to apply the rubric to sample responses to essay question one. This exercise will launch discussion on effective teaching practices and learning strategies for the outcomes of TI courses.

Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
June	Finalize results documentation and share with TI group	TI faculty / CC: Frank / ID: Cari / AIR: Naomi
June	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Aug	Refine post-test questions	RLST faculty

Aug	TI session on norming, teaching &	RLST faculty and working group faculty
	learning strategies	

Feedback loop:

The summary of results is shared with the working group and spring instructors. AIR uploads results into the Core Curriculum unit of TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

Use of Assessment in Academic Programs

College of Arts and Letters

Assessment Report for the College of Arts and Letters: Sept. 2017 Updates

	School of Fine Arts			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Actions Taken	Follow-up on Actions	
Art	09/22/2017	Х	Х	
Arts Administration	09/22/2015	Х		
Music	05/11/2016	Х	Х	
Music Theatre	09/23/2016	Х	Х	
Theatre BFA core	09/21/2016	Х	Х	
School of Humanities				
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Actions Taken	Follow-up on Actions	
Broad Field Social Studies	07/12/2017	Х	Х	
English	09/26/2017	Х	Х	
History	07/12/2017	Х	Х	
Latin American Studies (minor)	09/27/2017	Х	Х	
Liberal Studies	09/24/2015	Х	Х	
Philosophy	10/02/2017	Х	Х	
Religious Studies	10/10/2017	Х	Х	
Spanish	06/01/2016	Х	Х	
Women's Studies (minor)	09/19/2016	Х	Х	

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Arts and Letters

School of Fine Arts

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sherri Lisota

Name of Program: Art

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Our anticipated primary focus for assessment work for 2016-2017 was 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 did not complete this work. We are developing a plan of action to address the areas outlined by APAC in the Art program's assessment review, including a second program assessment point.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The Art program's primary focus for assessment work in 2017-2018 is to conduct senior reviews through the senior exhibition process, and to develop the rubric for that assessment. We will also be working to make clearer the alignment between program outcomes and the sophomore review rubric.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Susan Cosby Ronnenberg

Name of Program: Arts Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

We reviewed the curriculum to eliminate unique courses required and streamline program requirements, especially in light of the SLO changes we made last year. This required close collaboration with the Dahl School of Business faculty. We eliminated the visual arts focus and AADM 350: Managing Visual Arts Organizations, replaced AADM 340: Arts Marketing Applications with MKTG 450: Integrated Marketing Communications, replaced INFO 150: Integrated Software Applications with INFO 200: Management Information Systems, Concepts, and Applications or MGMT 210: Management Systems, Concepts, and Applications, replaced AADM 400: Arts Administration Seminar with MGMT 375: Leadership, Power, and Influence, and added AADM 2xx/4xx: Marketing Practicum. We intended to gather data from two of the upper-level AADM required courses in 2016-2017, but given the changes to the SLOs last year and the curriculum this year, we are waiting to collect data from the midlevel courses as a baseline to begin assessment processes for this program.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Given the changes to the SLOs last year and the curriculum this year, we are will be collecting data from a midlevel course (AADM 200), as a baseline to begin assessment processes for this program. This course is being taught in the fall 2017 semester.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Haupert

Name of Program: Music

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

The music department trimmed its assessment methods to the following:

- Artistic Performance (i.e. Senior/Half Recital, Jury Performance, Sight Singing, Piano Proficiency
- Capstone Assignment (i.e. Student Teaching, Pedagogy Internships) | Field Placement/Clinical /Practicum (Should this be placed under CAPTSTONE?) | Internship/Research Experience (Should this be placed under CAPSTONE?)
- Embedded Course Assignment (i.e. Diction Final Project, Sophomore Composition Project)

The music department no longer assesses the following:

- Embedded Exam Questions (i.e. Form and Analysis | This Assessment Method isn't as direct or impacting as the projects for Diction, Arranging, or Theory IV – Composition Project)
- Enrollment (I'm not sure of the value of this Assessment Method.)
- Participation (Activity in the department; difficult to track and assess | We can do away with this category.)

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The music department will focus on the following goals for the coming year:

- Mary Ellen Haupert will seek help on how to use navigational tools in the new TracDat layout.
- Department members will review and update rubrics for each assessment method in all areas –
 Performance, Theory, History, and Teaching.
- The department is seeking ways to improve the Retention Plan for Title III. Assessment methods
 for these efforts will be explored as we strive for more effective recruiting and retention
 strategies.
- Given that sight singing will be embedded in Music Theory I IV for this year, teaching/learning/assessment methods will be developed and implemented in all theory courses for 2017 2018. Sight singing (MUSC 116/117) has not been eliminated from the curriculum; embedding the skill accommodates scheduling and lower enrollment, as well as reduces credit load. Assessment of SS as an embedded part of the theory courses will provide useful data for future curriculum development.
- Upload piano proficiency rubrics to the repository. Currently, paper rubrics are stored in file cabinets on the fourth floor.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Matt Campbell/Karla Hughes

Name of Program: Music Theatre

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Our Department continues to examine how the four core SLO's for the MUTH BFA (Think critically, Understanding the art and practice of theatre, Transfer skill to work, and Research and Synthesis) are achieved across the varied music theatre emphasis. For the past two years we have used Qualtrics to collect our responses and data during the freshman and sophomore evaluations. This evaluation is the primary assessment tool which we use to engage students in each emphasis. The results have shown that an average of 58.43% of our students achieve a score of either Superior Work or High Achievement. We have discovered the need for additional data measures in upper division classes.

In addition to the evaluations mentioned above, we have also revised the rubrics to assess student growth in each of the areas of emphasis within in BFA (THTR & MUTH). The student specializing in music theatre are assessed annually during departmental auditions and during their senior capstone projects. The rubrics assess the four above mentioned SLO's as they pertain to the particular focus. The data on the auditions and senior capstones are forthcoming. Each assessment event has an individual faculty member who compiles and shares the data.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The primary assessment work for our department during this school year will be to evaluate, update and, implement an existing assessment rubric for the BFA (Theatre/Music Theatre) capstone as it relates to the stated SLO's. This rubric will assess the student's process, performance and written portion of the senior capstone. We hope to create an assessment tool which addresses the departments SLO's as well as the growth in each specific emphasis. Like the freshman and sophomore evaluations, the senior

capstone is a requirement of all students, regardless of emphasis. It would be beneficial to programing and future planning to collect consistent data for the capstone experience.

Our department (theatre and music theatre) also hopes update our list of internal courses in which the SLO's as well as skills specific to each emphasis are identified as being introduced, developed and mastered. Our SLO's and portions of our curriculum have changed since we have identified the courses on our previous document.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeff Stolz

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Our Department continues to examine how the four core SLO's for the THTR BFA (Think critically, Understanding the art and practice of theatre, Transfer skill to work, and Research and Synthesis) are achieved across the varied emphasis with in that degree which are Performance, Design tech, and Stage management. For the past two years we have used Qualtrics to collect our responses and data during the freshman and sophomore evaluations. This evaluation is the primary assessment tool which we use to engage students in each emphasis. The results have shown that an average of 58.43% of our students achieve a score of either Superior Work or High Achievement.

In addition to the evaluations mentioned above, we have also revised the rubrics to assess student growth in each of the areas of emphasis within in BFA. The student specializing in performance are assessed annually during an audition. Those students pursuing the design/tech and stage management track are assessed annually by means of a portfolio review. The rubrics assess the four above mentioned SLO's as they pertain to the particular focus. The data on the auditions and portfolio reviews is forthcoming. Each assessment event has an individual faculty member who compiles and shares the data.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The primary assessment work for our department during this school year will be to evaluate, update and, implement an existing assessment rubric for the BFA capstone as it relates to the stated SLO's. This rubric will assess the student's process, performance and written portion of the senior capstone. There are capstone rubrics for the design/tech, stage management, and performance emphasis capstones. We hope to create an assessment tool which addresses the departments SLO's as well as the growth in each specific emphasis. Like the freshman and sophomore evaluations, the senior capstone is a requirement of all students, regardless of emphasis. It would be beneficial to programing and future planning to collect consistent data for the capstone experience.

Our department also hopes update our list of internal courses in which the SLO's as well as skills specific to each emphasis are identified as being introduced, developed and mastered. Our SLO's and portions of our curriculum have changed since we have identified the courses on our previous document.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Arts and Letters

School of Humanities

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Andrew Hamilton Name of Program: Broad Field Social Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-2017 gave the department the opportunity to make about a dozen assessments of BFSS and History majors at the introductory level. There were 2 BFSS and 5 History majors in these survey courses over the two semesters, many taking multiple survey courses. Students met the criterion for these courses. None of the students received lower than a B on any assignment in these survey courses. We had one senior taking the combined capstone senior thesis course. That student satisfactorily met the criteria of the oral presentation, and also most of the benchmarks set for a research paper. Further consideration needs to be given to how this assessment is made, and which rubric(s) should be used (see notes in TracDat). Two History students submitted their mid-way interview materials. Those students satisfied the apprentice criteria for all five outcomes. The BFSS and History programs gained three new majors (combined) for the 2016-2017 academic year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

A few adjustments will need to be made for continuing assessment work. The BFSS.BA degree has been eliminated (BFSS.BS remains) so all TracDat assessment documents need to be reviewed to reflect that change. More significantly, changes will have to be made in administering the mid-way interview. Of eight students contacted via email to submit their mid-way interviews, only two complied. We may have to consider building this assessment task into classes that the identified students are taking in the majors in order to encourage cooperation. Rubrics for the capstone course need to be revisited (see above), and some consideration should be given to merging the two units (BFSS and History) on TracDat for assessment purposes. In addition, the Title III Retention plan is being developed by the department and will need to be assessed at the program level, so those changes will need to be developed and incorporated into our assessment plan.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Apryl Denny

Name of Program: English

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-17 English Assessment at the basic level has been very successful this year. Every student who completed the assignments for SLO 4 (literary history and genre) and SLO 5 (understanding the development of the English language) in ENGL 220, 233, or 253 passed the basic-level assessments. One student did not complete the SLO-4-history assignment in ENGL 233; he has since left the major.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Our focus for 2017-18 is to create assessment criteria and sample assignments to measure SLO 4-genre and SLO-4 history at all levels beyond the basic. We are realizing that trying to assess six SLOs at three levels of development in multiple classes is much more difficult than we anticipated. Insufficient numbers of majors mean that we have had to eliminate our majors-only seminar classes, which

complicates our assessment method, especially at the 300/400 level. Since each majors-only, required 300/400-level, historically-based literature course (4 courses) now has 3 or 4 alternatives for majors to choose from, we are having trouble forming multiple assignments that guarantee standardized measurements across 12 or more classes. We will continue to progress toward resolving this issue—working first on SLO 4—genre and history-- at all levels in the next year. We have reformed our Curriculum Taskforce and intend to work bi-weekly to create assessment charts and assignments for each SLO at each level. This is a long process; our minimum goal is to finish two SLOs at 2 or 3 levels of development within the next year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Andrew Hamilton

Name of Program: History

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-2017 gave the department the opportunity to make about a dozen assessments of BFSS and History majors at the introductory level. There were 2 BFSS and 5 History majors in these survey courses over the two semesters, many taking multiple survey courses. Students met the criterion for these courses. None of the students received lower than a B on any assignment in these survey courses. We had one senior taking the combined capstone senior thesis course. That student satisfactorily met the criteria of the oral presentation, and also most of the benchmarks set for a research paper. Further consideration needs to be given to how this assessment is made, and which rubric(s) should be used (see notes in TracDat). Two History students submitted their mid-way interview materials. Those students satisfied the apprentice criteria for all five outcomes. The BFSS and History programs gained three new majors (combined) for the 2016-2017 academic year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

A few adjustments will need to be made for continuing assessment work. The BFSS.BA degree has been eliminated (BFSS.BS remains) so all TracDat assessment documents need to be reviewed to reflect that change. More significantly, changes will have to be made in administering the mid-way interview. Of eight students contacted via email to submit their mid-way interviews, only two complied. We may have to consider building this assessment task into classes that the identified students are taking in the majors in order to encourage cooperation. Rubrics for the capstone course need to be revisited (see above), and some consideration should be given to merging the two units (BFSS and History) on TracDat for assessment purposes. In addition, the Title III Retention plan is being developed by the department and will need to be assessed at the program level, so those changes will need to be developed and incorporated into our assessment plan.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Vickie Holtz-Wodzak

Name of Program: Liberal Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

For 2016-17, two students enrolled in the Liberal Studies capstone courses. Both completed the work and demonstrated mastery of the learning outcomes. These results suggest that no change is needed.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In the upcoming academic year, we will also have 2 students completing capstone work. Since last year's assessment demonstrated no significant weaknesses, we will implement no significant changes.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jason Howard

Name of Program: Philosophy

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

We still have limited data to draw any significant conclusions from given the small number of majors that we have. However, looking at the results of the exit exam for the one student who took it (Riley Tuma), the results are encouraging. The last few students who graduated (in 2015 and 2016) indicated a limited grasp of the history of philosophy and some confusion over the thematic differences between different branches/themes of philosophy. 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 about the history of philosophy and different branches of philosophy, and how these align with different learning outcomes of the program. The student score from the 2017 exit exam average 3.5/4. This is an increase from the last two years and meets our benchmark of 3/4.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

We continue to discuss the integration/organization of a formal oral defense as a regular part of the capstone experience for our majors. We have decided to require that our majors take the joint humanities cap-stone thesis (offered once every academic year). Since all of our majors are double-majors hopefully this additional requirement can be fit in without too much difficulty. We continue to face considerable challenges scaffolding our courses for our major and will try to meet these challenges as best we can. We have also decided that students are required to give at least one public oral presentation of their work- either at 7 Rivers, Scholars Day, Philosophy and Pop Culture conference, or some other official presentation venue.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Lopez-Kaley

Name of Program: Religious Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Because we have so few majors, we assess all course that the majors are a part of. In 2016-17, we assessed RLST 222, RLST 331, RLST 343, RLST 380, RLST 425, and RLST 433. In RLST 222, the outcomes were met by 100% of the students in the major paper (3/3). In RLST 331, one major was proficient, one at the apprentice level. We believe the course is good, but the student was not fully involved enough with her work. In RLST 343, 100% of students met the outcomes for the class (1/1). In RLST 380, the one major met all outcomes. In RLST 425, the two majors exceeded expectations, meeting all outcomes. In RLST 433, one major met all outcomes.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

This year's focus for assessment will be RLST 465, RLST 338, and RLST 352, the first two taught in the fall, the last one taught in the spring. Our past assessment on these has been positive. However, in RLST

465, a new book and assignment (45 minute class presentation) has been introduced, so this course will need to be closely monitored to make sure that student learning continues at a high level. One of our tenured professors, who taught RLST 433, is retiring this year, so the department will be reviewing the course for possible changes.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

The program met its goals at the beginning level for all three outcomes in WMST 100/VSUM 290. (Goal: 75% of students will score 80% or above on three outcomes--Diversity, Interdisciplinary Learning, Service.) Diversity (loop closed): 18 out of 20 students score 80% or better. Service (loop closed): 20 out of 20 students score 80% or better. Interdisciplinary Study (loop closed): 15 out of 20 students score 80% or better. Follow up for Interdisciplinary Study: Even though we met this outcome by the skin of our teeth at exactly 75%, I want to follow up. Due to time pressures during this particular semester, I didn't allow students to rethink and revise their interdisciplinary projects. As a result, scores were lower than usual. To be sure that students have ample time to work through the process of applying women's issues to their majors in their interdisciplinary project, I have omitted another writing assignment from the class that doesn't directly relate to our assessment plan. This will allow more class time to be dedicated to this project, as well as more instructor time to be dedicated to helping students revise this project. (Please remember also that this class judges all students, not just minors. The one minor in the class—Monica Burt--scored above 86% in all three areas!)

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Current Progress:

Our biggest problem has been, not the quality of our students but, the quantity of our students. The work done last year to improve numbers in the minor is really paying off! In 2016, we had one official minor. In September of 2017, I have had 10 students contact me already to indicate that they are pursuing a minor. The change results, I believe, from last year's revisions in programming and visibility:

Reducing the number of credits required for the minor from 21 to 18

Clearly cross listing on the fall and spring course schedules

Allowing additional VUSM 200-level courses to be taken for WOT and WMST credit

Updating our brochure with clear explanation of how to cross-count credits for WMST

Updating our brochure with a fixed course rotation so that students can plan ahead

Advertising the minor in the Admissions Office and through first-year advising

Adding a minor to COAL requirements

Improving visibility through on-campus WMST events—minors fair, the return of the WMST film festival,

etc.

Adding a new regularly occurring capstone course that counts for WOT as well as WMST credit

Primary Assessment Plans for 2017-18:

When our first student or our first group of students arrives(s) at the advanced (junior/senior) level of assessment (coming in fall of 2018), we must have a revised course-embedded advanced-level assessment plan ready to go. Marlene Fisher (who will teach the new capstone course) and I will coordinate this process in the coming year so that we are ready by fall 2018. Outcomes will remain the same, but the new capstone course will likely cause the means of evaluating the outcomes to change. Also, I updated (and am continuing to revise) course and assessment materials to reflect recent changes

in the way gender and sexuality are defined. For example, I updated the Diversity Assessment Materials to eliminate the oversimplified bifurcation of gender reflected in the original assignment and rubric. (The revised assignment and rubric are attached to my email.)

College of Business and Leadership

Assessment Report for College of Business and Leadership: Sept. 2017 Updates

Dahl School of Business				
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up*	
Accounting	09/15/2017	09/15/2017	09/28/2013	
Business Administration	09/20/2017	09/20/2017	09/30/2016	
Creative Media Design	09/29/2017	09/29/2017		
Finance	New Program			
Health Care and Wellness Management	New Program			
Management and Leadership	09/28/2017	09/30/2016	09/25/2014	
Marketing	09/15/2017	05/15/2017	09/15/2017	
Master of Business Administration	09/26/2017	09/26/2017	09/26/2017	
Sport Management & Leadership	09/27/2017	08/28/2015	05/19/2016	
Degree Completion Programs				
Accounting Degree Completion	09/15/2017	09/15/2017	05/18/2011	
Health Care Management	09/12/2017	09/12/2017		
Management Information Systems (INFO) Online	09/30/2017	09/28/2017	08/31/2011	
Organizational Management (Classroom-based)	09/25/2017	09/25/2017	09/20/2012	
Organizational Management (Online)	09/25/2017	09/25/2017	09/02/2011	
Professional Studies	09/30/2017	09/30/2017		
Servant Leadership Department				
Master of Arts in Servant Leadership	10/13/2017	10/13/2017	10/13/2017	
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query pulls only the information input into the follow-up section.				

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Business and Leadership

Dahl School of Business

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sabrina Steger

Name of Program: Accounting

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

For most measures, we met the criterion requirements during the 2016-2017 academic year.

For the Ethical Decision-Making learning outcome, where we didn't meet the criterion requirements, we will change the measure to a single case study, and only take this measure in ACCT 312 (rather than in both 311 and 312). We will use an ethical case study that comes later in the course, after they have had some practice in addressing other ethical cases. This should help them to learn and apply a method for addressing these ethical cases.

In all learning outcomes, with new accounting faculty who may have designed slightly different assessment techniques, we will work on updating the assessment plan to verify the measures remain

closely aligned with the program learning outcomes. Where we currently have multiple assignments contributing to a single measure, we will work towards selecting a single assignment that speaks directly to the learning outcome it is intended to measure.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Since we will have some new measures in the overall assessment plan, the primary focus for assessment work for 2017-18 will be to implement the new measures, collect the data from these new measures, and reassess alignment with the learning outcomes when our first round of data is evaluated at the end of the 17-18 academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Derek Cortez Name of Program: Business Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Most criteria were met during the 2016-2017 academic year, with a couple exceptions. In the Professional Communication measures, we did not meet the criterion in MGMT 300 (Business Reporting). The instructor suggests we look at implementing a scaffolded research approach, introducing business students to some research processes earlier than MGMT 300. We will consider this suggestion for 2017-18, possibly incorporating an annotated bibliography or literature review exercise in a lower division course.

In addition, our students who took the MFT did not meet the criterion related to their exam scores. We're looking at a potential new vendor, and will investigate preparation activities as well.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In addition to the changes recommended above, we also need to review the measures in MGMT 449, MKTG 351 (where there is a new full-time faculty member) and MGMT 474 (where the course has changed significantly to add the requirements of co-counted mission seminar components). New measures will be recommended for the 2017-18 academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeff Nyseth Name of Program: Creative Media Design

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

For the 2016-17 academic year, we collected 4 results in 3 out of 4 learning outcomes. Outcomes were met in critical and innovative thinking and visual communications. One outcome was nearly met in conceptual and technical skills. To remedy this shortfall, additional time will be spent on the technical aspects of web layout. One follow-up item is recorded in TracDat for this purpose. CRMD faculty are spending time in MKTG courses to discuss the CRMD minor and answer student questions.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Additional work will be done with the minor to include potential stacked courses at introductory and advanced levels. (Ex: Ad Design I/II, Web Design I/II, Illustration and Infographics I/II, Video, Film and

Animation I/II). We'll continue to talk to students about the minor and will focus on ways to make it attractive to business majors.

However, no additional students in the CRMD major have been accepted for Fall 2017 or thereafter. CRMD faculty will work on a teach-out plan to be completed over the next 2 years for courses in the major.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: John Robinson

Name of Program: Finance

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Not Applicable, the Finance major was new in 2016-17. No assessment data has been collected for the 16-17 academic year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, we will focus on the implementation of an assessment program for this major. As new courses are developed, assessment measures will be identified. Data will be collected for the first time in 2017-2018 for some of the learning outcomes (for those courses that are running in the 17-18 academic year), and analyzed at the end of the year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Brian Rotty

Name of Program: Health Care and Wellness Management

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Not applicable. The Health Care and Wellness major was new in 2016-17. No assessment data has been collected for the 16-17 academic year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

We will focus on the implementation of an assessment program for this major, especially in regards to the outcomes as they relate to Wellness Programs, since this is not an element of the HMGT major. As new courses are developed, assessment measures will be identified. Data will be collected for the first time in 2017-2018 for some of the learning outcomes, and analyzed at the end of the year.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-17, most of the student learning outcomes have been met for the Management and Leadership program. One of the measures was below our criterion requirements – in the collaboration with diverse groups outcome. In MGMT 474, the teamwork component scores were low. We will look at some

additional methods for increasing students' accountability and motivation in the team project in this course.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

We will need to modify the measures previously taken from MGMT 474 to align with the coursework in MGMT 374, which is being offered as a co-counting mission seminar course starting in 2017-18 (covering both living in a diverse world and serving the common good). There is both an individual presentation on the students' service learning experience, as well as a group presentation on race and ethnicity. The individual presentation will be used as a measure of the professional communication skills learning outcome, and the group presentation will be used as a measure of the learning outcome devoted to ethically leading change through collaboration with diverse groups.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Marketing

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

During the 2016-17 academic year, all of the Marketing criteria were met. We will spend some time re-evaluating our Marketing learning outcomes, and the measures that are used. With new faculty, we will have new and different assignments, and corresponding rubrics so this will be a timely exercise. This will likely also impact the course offerings in the major and the program requirements, which may require catalog changes. We will also be revising the course rotation, since it seems most of the courses and assessment measures occur in the fall term currently.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

We will initiate work immediately on the learning outcomes and associated measures. Our goal is to have the assessment plan fully revised by mid-Fall so we can gather the data for the 17-18 academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Annette Roter Name of Program: Master of Business Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

The 2016-2017 results show performance tends to be higher in the face-to-face sections of our MBA courses, versus the blended sections. Our action item related to these results will be to work with faculty to provide additional support to the students in our blended sections. Another issue related to the blended sections is that we have a number of international students who prefer this format. We'd like to take this opportunity to investigate whether or not this is good practice.

MGMT 584 (Advanced Business Communications) – results are lower than the criterion required pretty consistently. This course will become an elective in the future. We think it will serve the students well to have smaller class sizes, and the change to an elective will facilitate these smaller classes. We will also review the criterion used in 584.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

With new leadership in the MBA program, we will prioritize a complete review of our assessment program. We've been operating the current assessment plan for a number of years, so a review of the plan by the new leadership is timely. The most immediate work will be to review the program learning outcomes and the measures we are currently using, and to involve faculty in this process. From there we will make sure the learnings outcomes and criterion are up-to-date in TracDat, and that the data is being collected consistently by both our full-time and adjunct faculty in this program.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In most measures, we've been meeting the criteria pretty consistently over time. We had 2 measures in 2016-2017 that fell short of the criteria. In SPML 455, we are measuring students' performance on the final strategic sport marketing plan. We had 6 out of 8 students (75%) score above 80%. We will look at making this an individual project when the course enrollments are low, since this is more manageable with a smaller number. In SPML 350 we used a new assignment to measure the finance and budgeting learning outcome. 9 out of 13 students (69%) scored above 80%. We will further develop this assignment for the next year, and follow up again the next time it's run.

Overall, it's notable that even though our primary full-time faculty member for the SPML program was on sabbatical during 16-17, we maintained high standards and accomplished most of the learning outcomes to meet our expectations.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-18, we will have 3 measures stemming from the comprehensive assessment of agency project in SPML 490 (a capstone project), and we will draw the measures from separate components. We will adjust the rubric for this assignment so we can get clear measures of each component. These measures will inform 3 of the program learning outcomes. In addition, we'll carry out the follow up noted above. We'll maintain the same program learning outcomes for the coming year.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Business and Leadership

Degree Completion Programs

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Katrina Volkert Name of Program: Accounting Degree Completion

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

For most measures, we met the criterion requirements during the 2016-2017 academic year.

For the Ethical Decision-Making learning outcome, where we didn't meet the criterion requirements, we will change the measure to a single case study, and only take this measure in ACCD 340 (rather than in both 330 and 340). We will use an ethical case study that appears later in the course, after the students have had some practice in addressing other ethical cases. This should help them to learn and apply a method for addressing these ethical cases.

In BLAW 450, we will discuss with the instructor how to address the shortfall that occurred in the Legal and Regulatory learning outcome. We'll identify an intervention that can be put into place for the sections of BLAW 450 we will run in the 2017-18 academic year.

In all learning outcomes, with new accounting faculty who may have designed slightly different assessment techniques, we will focus on updating the assessment plan to verify the measures remain closely aligned with the program learning outcomes. Where we currently have multiple assignments contributing to a single measure, we will work towards selecting a single assignment that speak directly to the learning outcomes it is intended to measure.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Since we will have some new measures in the overall assessment plan, the primary focus for assessment work for 2017-18 will be to implement the new measures, collect the data from these new measures, and reassess alignment with the learning outcomes when our first round of data is evaluated at the end of the 17-18 academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Brian Rotty Name of Program: Health Care Management

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

We need to identify and relate program goals to our learning outcomes (academic goals, retention goals, and/or operational goals), as these goals are not currently in the TracDat system.

There are currently two outcomes that only have one direct measure in place, so a second measure is needed – in Health Care Informatics and Management and Leadership.

We also noted several places where grade distinction is needed, and likely needs development of rubrics to allow for this distinction, in addition to some adjunct faculty development, to help them understand the importance of distinguishing work quality from one student to the next.

Many of the measures for the 2016-2017 data met the criterion requirements. However, there are a couple outcomes where we didn't meet the criterion, specifically in HMGT 306 for Management and Leadership and HMGT 340 for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. We'll address these low scores with course developers and the faculty who have taught these courses, to identify additional tools or explanations that might help students to be more successful.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

With a new person leading assessment for Health Care Management (Brian Rotty), we'll do some training on TracDat and our Viterbo Assessment Framework. Since this program relies heavily on adjuncts, we'll focus on a program for adjunct training, coordination, communication, recruitment and retention. Assessment work this year, with a faculty member devoted to managing this program's quality, will include deeper investigation into the measures and their alignment with the learning outcomes. We will also attempt to correct the deficiencies in the HMGT 306 and 340 measures that didn't meet the criterion in 16-17.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Management Information Systems (INFO) Online

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Due to low enrollments in the MIS program, the class sizes in all of the INFO courses have been small. In addition, we've noted several courses where there isn't a great deal of distinction in grading, which leads us to believe that rubrics need to be improved and faculty need some additional development related to grade distinction issues.

Overall, all measurements met the criteria requirements for the program this year. We expect some curricular developments in the near future, as we shift some of the focus of this program to data analysis tools and techniques. As a result, new learning outcomes and assessment measures may need to be developed.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Since the program curriculum may change significantly for fall 2018, we will use the current assessment measures during the 17-18 academic year. However, we will discuss issues of grade distinction and make improvements to rubrics as well. The new curriculum will be measured with new criteria for the 18-19 academic year.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Rochelle Brooks / Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Organizational Management (Classroom-based)

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

We are running fewer and fewer classroom-based sections of the OMGT courses as more students have chosen the online format. Most of the measures we were able to take in the 2016-2017 academic year met the criterion requirements. However, one measure in OMGT 400 fell short of the requirements. We moved to a poster presentation in OMGT 400 (Human Resource Management) rather than a research paper as the measurement contributing to the HR Management learning outcome. If we plan to continue to use this new poster assignment, it appears to need some additional development, and the students may need some additional tools in order to be successful in the poster presentation and annotated bibliography.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Assessment work in the 2017-2018 academic year will focus on making sure the master content used in the OMGT courses has up-to-date information regarding the assessment measures. The change outlined above for the OMGT 400 course will need to be updated as part of this process. While conducting this review, we will also re-evaluate the alignment of each of the measures with the program learning outcomes they are intended to measure, and make modifications if the alignment isn't clear.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Rochelle Brooks / Alissa Oelfke Name of Program: Organizational Management (Online)

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Most of the assessment measures met the criteria requirements during the 2016-2017 academic year. We continue to struggle with meeting the criterion for the OMGT 302 formal business report, which contributes to the Communication learning outcome. Although, in 2016-17, we had 60% of students meet the criterion requirements, which is an improvement over the 48% from the prior year. Our action item for this result is to work with adjuncts on use of the assignment structure, scaffolding, and rubric, and the use of APA formatting, so they can better support students in the writing process.

While reviewing the 16-17 assessment data, we also noted a number of placed where grade distinction was not clear, indicating the need to do some work on rubric development and working with faculty to help them adhere to the scoring rubrics.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Assessment work in the 2017-2018 academic year will focus on development of the formal business report project tools and helping faculty administer the project. In addition, we will focus on further development of rubrics and the use of the rubrics to facilitate greater grade distinction for all measures. Finally, we will re-evaluate the alignment of each of the measures with the program learning outcomes they are intended to measure, and make modifications if the alignment isn't clear.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Professional Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Due to low enrollments in the PRFS program, the class sizes in the four courses devoted to this major have been small.

Overall, all measurements met the criteria requirements for the program this year, with only one exception, yet many of these measures were used for the first time to analyze the learning outcomes. Only 71% of the students in ORST 495 met the criterion requirements for the literature review and analysis paper, while the goal is 80%. Since there were only 7 students in the class, one additional student reaching 80% would have meant the goal was met. We will review the tools made available to the students for this project, to make sure they are properly supporting the learning outcome.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Because many of the measures were used for the first time, we'll focus our attention in the 2017-18 academic year on verifying the measures are in close alignment with the program learning outcomes. In addition, we will look at the tools for students in the ORST 495 course, as mentioned above.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Business and Leadership Servant Leadership Department

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Pamela Dixon Name of Program: Master of Arts in Servant Leadership

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-17 a change to the colloquium was made. Instead of a two-course, two-semester capstone sequence, it was modified to consist of one course conducted over one full semester (16 weeks). Further, the focus of the project is an extended literature review on a servant leadership topic relevant to the student's work or community experience. The goal is to 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. Further, students will have the flexibility to conduct Action Research, including a robust literature review. The course is currently in session (fall 2017) and the instructor, will obtain formative and summative feedback from students in order to monitor and identify the extent to which this model achieves the goal.

Our Administrative Assessment goal was focused on increasing enrollment and the measure used was graduation rates. It is the intent to change the measurement to include percentages to enrollment increase, the goal being 10% year over year for the next three years. Using a baseline of 38 active enrolled students during fall 2017, our goal will be to achieve 51 actively enrolled students by fall 2020. In order to help streamline measurement and promote retention of actively enrolled students, we'll initiate a cohort model beginning fall 2018. Further, we will implement a course rotation whereby all core courses (SLVD 501, 502, 504, and 690) will occur in the same semester year over year, with the

addition of one summer core course every year. Finally, we'll continue the plan to recruit younger students interested in community transformation as well as nonprofit leaders.

Learning Assessment goals: In some instances learning goals included achieving "100% meets expectations." While this was achieved in some instances, due to the small class size in some courses, it is not always an attainable goal. The new measure for all Learning goals for 2017-18, will be a goal of "90% meets or exceeds expectations (80% or above)."

The oral presentation have historically been a highlight of the program and will remain unchanged. We will continue to focus time in the classroom on practice for the oral presentation.

The vocation reflection paper will also remain unchanged, as it is a good indicator of learning outcomes achieved and insights about student's personal insights gained.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, we will continue to work on the assessment plan to ensure it aligns with program learning outcomes. This will be a transition year, due to a new program Chair who is learning the systems and measures. We will continue the work that has been started on a new assessment map in which the learning outcomes from three required courses, 501, 502, and 504 will each have two direct measures. For 2017-18, SVLD 501 learning goals will be assessed based on summative data from the capstone.

A second focus will be to measure active enrollment and retention as part of the Administrative measure. We'll use data from alumni survey to develop recruiting materials and review personal statements submitted as part of the application to better understand the type of students who are drawn to the program and how to continue to expand our reach geographically. We intended to start the work this past year, but due to the change in leadership, it has been delayed.

College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

Assessment Report for the College of Education, Science, and Mathematics: Sept. 2017 Updates

School of Education			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up*
IA GRAD: Educational Leadership Program	11/01/2017	11/01/2017	09/22/2014
Master of Arts in Education	09/28/2017	09/26/2017	09/26/2017
Undergraduate Education	09/28/2017	09/20/2016	
WI GRAD: Cross-categorical Special Education License	10/03/2017	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: Post Baccalaureate Teacher License	09/28/2017	02/03/2012	
WI GRAD: Principal License	09/22/2017	02/16/2016	
WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License (WI 17)	10/03/2017	09/25/2015	
WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License (WI 316)	10/03/2017	09/29/2015	09/15/2010
WI GRAD: Superintendent License	09/23/2015	02/16/2016	
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Biochemistry	10/06/2017	10/11/2017	10/11/2017
Biology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Biopsychology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Chemistry	10/06/2017	10/06/2017	10/06/2017
Environmental Biology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Mathematical Physics	05/11/2016	05/11/2016	
Mathematics	10/31/2017	10/31/2017	
Sport Science & Leadership	10/01/2016	10/01/2016	09/01/2011
*Dates are based on information in TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query	pulls only the information in	put into the follow-up secti	on.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

School of Education

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Page

Name of Program: IA GRAD: Educational Leadership Program

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

While 100% of our students scored proficient or highly proficient on the Portfolio Presentation Rubric, a common theme emerged in scoring on the presentation section. 20 of 89 presenters scored low on language use. It is clear our students need experience in articulating using professional language. There are three goals for the year: the first is to collaborate with supervisors to revise the current rubric. A robust rubric, with observable indicators, is necessary to ensure scoring fidelity. Inter-rater reliability will be part of this work. Second, I will review course syllabi to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum for the Educational Leadership Program. After reviewing syllabi, I will create a curriculum map showing standards, course outcomes, and signature assessments. This document will serve as a collaborative

opportunity with adjuncts and supervisors. Finally, we will build an overview of each course's emphasis, assessments, and opportunities for presentation. All supervisors and adjuncts will participate in developing this overview document.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The lowa Educational Leadership Program is like a puzzle broken into individual pieces. The goal of this next year is to put those pieces together so all supervisors, students, and adjuncts understand how courses and experiences are inter-related. Common Formative Assessments (CFA) will help articulate the goals/outcomes of the program. One CFA will be a formal presentation, providing an opportunity for experience and feedback. While the presentation will be an opportunity to apply learning, it will also serve as an opportunity to highlight the importance of LANGUAGE USE, a deficit area from our 2016-2017 data. Another CFA will encompass situational awareness, requiring application of knowledge in the area of management, ethics, and societal context. (Of all standards, students scored lowest in these areas) The final CFA will focus on using data to drive decisions as a building principal. It will require the application of knowledge from EDUL 606 (Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment) and EDUL 607 (Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners).

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Based on the review of the previous year's data, during the 2016-17 academic year there were a number of critical changes that were made to improve outcomes for our students. Under the Research Outcome, EDUC 602 (formerly a three credit course) was split into a one credit course that will always be offered in the fall to facilitate teachers' data collection process. The remaining two credits were rolled into a new course, EDUC 606 that will always be offered during the spring semester to facilitate teachers' analysis and interpretation of data and writing of the research paper. In addition, the faculty worked together over Moodle in the spring of 2017 to increase interrater reliability on the use of the rubrics for the Growth Portfolio and for the Synthesis Paper. Under the Synthesis Outcome, based on the results over the past two years, instructors in all of the core courses have been asked to provide additional opportunities for students to complete writing assignments that require them to synthesize information from a number of sources; in comparing the scores reported in 2015 to those reported this year, there has been a 17% increase in students' ability to perform in this area.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In the 2017-18 academic year, two specific goals will be addressed: (a) all instructors who teach in any of the areas of emphasis that feed into the master's degree as elective courses will be provided with resources so that they can continue to instruct in the area of synthesizing information into a written product. In the past year, these resources were provided only to instructors who teach a core course for the degree. By expanding the net and providing the resources to a greater number of instructors, it is our hope that we can continue to see improvement under the Synthesis Outcome. Based on feedback from both students and instructors, we will meet to make changes to the rubric that is used to score students' research presentation as well as the rubric that is used to score the Synthesis paper.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-17 we focused on the implementation of authentic assessments of student progress, particularly those that indicate student capacity to pass the edTPA assessment. New evaluations were implemented for students in field and student teaching placements, for the purpose of gathering more specific and useful data, and continue to be refined as necessary. We have also worked to refine the scoring rubric for student portfolios, to ensure consistency and relevancy across scorers, but need continued work in this area.

We have determined that edTPA data provides valuable information to guide instruction across the curriculum, as it assesses student ability to plan, implement, and assess their performance in the prek-12 classroom, and the faculty's ability to guide them in mastering skills and abilities in these areas. Since the inception of the edTPA assessment, student performance on Task 2 (instruction) has plateaued at 13.5, and in response we are going to create a rubric to ensure that we are addressing all components of effective instruction. Efforts to address previously lower scores on Task 3 (assessment) have resulted in improved student performance in this area, resulting in a 100% passing rate on the edTPA portfolio assessment (this is scored by external reviewers).

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-18, we will continue to scrutinize data, to ensure that it provides the information that we need in regard to student learning. We will continue to revise rubrics assessing student performance in the field, and will identify a more effective evaluation of student progress throughout the course of the program than was previously provided by the portfolios submitted for entry to teacher education and student teaching. We have also determined that the student teaching evaluation, which was converted to a Qualtrics survey last year, must be further revised to a more user-friendly and useful format for cooperating teachers.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeanette Armstrong

Name of Program: WI Cross-Categorical Special Education License (801)

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-17 data reveal that the cross-categorical program is performing less than average in preparing students to pass the state mandated Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT). During the 2014-2015 year, components of the test were embedded into three courses in the program. Since this time, data continue to reveal that students are still consistently earning less than average scores, as compared to state averages.

Year	Viterbo 1 st time pass rate	State average 1 st time pass rate
2016-2017	47% (36 test takers)	62%

Scores on the individual subsets of the FoRT reveal that students are struggling in all areas of the test. Our greatest strength lies in Reading Assessment and Instruction (69% of students answered most-many questions correctly). Our greatest area of weakness is in Integration of Knowledge and Understanding (less than 1% of students answered most-many questions correctly).

Portfolio 1st time pass rate is 77%; less than the goal of 85%.

100% of students earned *meets* or *exceeds* scores on all signature assessments.

We have identified the need to increase students' exposure to literacy instruction and assessment. A new text book is being explored and components of the text will be included in three of the seven courses in the program. Additional training will be provided to adjunct instructors.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

During 2017-2018, we will focus our efforts on improving students' knowledge in literacy instruction and assessment. A new text will be introduced and components of the text will be used in three courses: Intro to Individual Education Assessment; Advance Individual Education Assessment; Teaching Students with SLD/ID/EBD. Additional training will be provided to adjunct instructors. We will explore ways to remediate students during/after each course rather than at the end of the program.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic Name of Program: WI Director of Instruction

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Notable Information prior to Assessment Overview:

- 1. We expanded the DI to Middleton and Green Bay starting the summer of 2016 adding to the La Crosse group and had 53 students in the three cohorts.
- 2. Only 6 Essential Questions (EQ's) are scored for one course, EDUL 704 Collaborative Leadership for Learning. Therefore, not all Standards are assessed.

2016 Overview:

Program Portfolio Assessment: In assessing the learning of our students, we met or exceeded the 3.6 and 90% average in all of the Standards 1-7.

Program Survey Summary: Exit Survey results indicate we are meeting benchmark of 90% and above in all 7 Standards. Considering we just recently expanded to three sites, this is really strong indication that the instructors for the two courses, EDUL 704 and the Practicum EDUL 768.

Action from 2016: It was determined with the additional cohorts and instructors we would need professional development to assure continuity and consistency in the program. The results are positive in this respect.

Results: We did have two of our new instructors in the DI program attend the Summer Training of Adjuncts in June of 2017. We also held online conferences with the 3 instructors teaching the Practicum course, EDUL 767.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

a) Final Reflection Paper was piloted in 2016 and as a result, the rubric in 2017 will be expanded to score 3 targeted areas, overview of the 7 Standards using a synthesis paper, using concrete examples, and use of APA format to demonstrate knowledge and understanding for the Director of Instruction administrators' position.

b) Ongoing: With the addition of a new instructor for the Practicum in La Crosse in 2018, Middleton in 2017, and Green Bay 2016, another specific online training session will be developed to focus on data collection around the 7 WAS Standards, including a review of Essential Questions and assessments for EDUL 704.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Action from Goals 2016: For the purpose of this evaluation, we have been collecting information from all program completers for the past 3 years (2015-17).

Results: Program Portfolio Review- Standards (WAS) 1-3 exceeded the benchmark of scoring above 90%. Standards 5 and 6 were close at 82% respectively. However, Standards 4 (62%) and 7 (71%) were both well below the benchmark.

Action: As a result of poor performance evaluations of faculty and the Director of SEPS program, we have conducted a more thorough review of the program since summer 2016. With an eye to making big changes moving forward, we have made instructor changes in three of the four courses, EDUL 654, EDUL 651, and the Practicum EDUL 769. All three NEW instructors are currently in the Director's role in their respective school districts and have experiences, accolades and achievements to help bring stability to this program.

Program Survey Summary: Previous to this year, the survey for Program review had not been collected for three years. Standards 4, 5, and 7 continue to score below the benchmark of 90% and 1, 2, 3, and 6 are above the benchmark. Survey Comments about the program show lack of information or understanding about the following: Budget, IEP's, Role of LEA teacher rep at IEPS, Mediation processes, and seclusion and restraint. It has been noted that for anyone who does not have a Special Education background these concerns are magnified.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

During the Program Reviews for the Director of Special Education and Student Services we will complete the following in 2017-18:

- a) Each course and All Essential Questions and the designed assessments are being reviewed by the new instructor team and the program director.
- b) Training time for all four of the instructors will be a priority with a focus on course content and the areas previously identified in part one. Budget, IEP's and facilitation, Role of LEA teacher rep at IEPS, Mediation processes, and seclusion and restraint.
- c) Final Reflection Paper was piloted in 2016 and as a result, the rubric in 2017 will be expanded to score 3 targeted areas, overview of the 7 Standards using a synthesis paper, using concrete examples, and use of APA format to demonstrate knowledge and understanding for the Director of SEPS administrators' position.

Name of Program: WI Grad Post-Baccalaureate Education

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-17 we continued efforts to identify and implement authentic assessments of student achievement across the post-bac program, particularly those that indicate student capacity to pass the edTPA assessment. Portfolio submissions have not provided an accurate picture of student performance, as evidenced by the fact that criterion for every learning outcome are consistently met each year, and this data point will no longer be included in our TracDat data submission. New evaluations were implemented for students in field and student teaching placements, for the purpose of gathering more specific and useful assessment data, and continue to be refined as necessary.

As in the undergrad program, we have determined that edTPA data provides valuable information to guide instruction across the post-bac curriculum, as it assesses a student's ability to plan, implement, and assess effectiveness in the prek-12 classroom, as well as the faculty's ability to guide them in mastering skills and abilities in these areas. Since the inception of the edTPA assessment, student performance on Task 2 (instruction) has plateaued at 13.5, and in response we will create a rubric to ensure that we are addressing all components of effective instruction. Efforts to address previously lower scores on Task 3 (assessment) have resulted in improved student performance in this area, resulting in a 100% passing rate on the edTPA portfolio assessment (this is scored by external reviewers).

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-18, we will work alongside the undergrad program in continuing to scrutinize data, ensuring that it provides the information that we need in regard to student learning. We will continue to revise rubrics assessing student performance in the field, and will identify a more effective evaluation of student progress throughout the course of the program than was previously provided by the portfolios submitted for entry to teacher education and student teaching. We have also determined that the student teaching evaluation, which was converted to a Qualtrics survey last year, must be further revised to a more user-friendly and useful format for cooperating teachers.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

One Goal from 2016 was to develop a 3rd indicator of success.

Action: Final Reflection paper, one pilot year (2016) and one consequential year in 2017. Results: Overall 3.81 Average for 5 cohort groups which exceeds the benchmark of 3.6 on a 4 point scale. Second, when broken down by cohort group only one group was below the benchmark, La Crosse was at 3.55.

Program Portfolio Summary:

Action: In 2016 all Essential Questions had been revamped and there are now 6 Essential Questions for each course. There are 42 EQ's in all scored for those who completed the program in 2017. Results: Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are all above the 90% benchmark and only standards 5 (89%) and 7 (85%) are slightly below the benchmark, however, both improved from 2016 summary report. Further review by cohort showed the following as it relates to the 90% benchmark: Eau Claire 75% on Standard

3, Middleton 82% on Standard 5, Tomahawk 88% on Standard 3,5,and,6 and Green Bay 75% on Standard 3.

Program Survey Summary: All completers fill out an exit survey in their final course, the Practicum. Survey results indicate that students believe our program meets or exceeds the 90% benchmark in Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Only Standard 5 (Relationships with broader community), scored at 81% below the 90% benchmark. This continues to be an area targeted for improvement (see below).

2. Plan for 2017-2018

- A) In evaluating the Final Reflection as our new 3rd indicator of success, it has been determined that instead of one score on a scale of 1-4, we are moving to a new rubric and evaluating 3 parts of the Final Reflection paper, a culminating program activity. In addition to evaluating the skills and knowledge of the 7 Wisconsin Administrator Standards, we will assess the synthesis within the paper by use of concrete examples to demonstrate learning and growth, and writing in APA format.
- B) Standard 3- Culture of Teaching and Learning is below the benchmark in 3 of the 5 cohorts so we will examine the Essential Questions and courses where Standard 3 is assessed.
- C) Standard 5- Consistent with the Exit Survey results and the Program Portfolio summaries, we will evaluate Standard 5 (Relationships with the Broader Community) and examine the Essential Questions and the courses where Standard 5 is assessed.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong

Name of Program: WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License (WI 17)

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-17 data reveal that the reading specialist program is performing better than average in preparing students to pass the state mandated Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT).

Year Viterbo 1st time pass rate State average 1st time pass rate

2016-2017 70% (10 test takers) 68%

Scores on the individual subsets of the FoRT reveal that our greatest strength is in the area of Foundations of Reading Development and Reading Assessment and Instruction; in both areas, 90% of students answered most-many questions correctly. Our greatest area of weakness was identified as Integration of Knowledge and Understanding; 30% of students answered most-many questions correctly.

100% of students demonstrated competency in all outcomes of the field experience.

We have identified the Integration of Knowledge and Understanding (constructed response), as related to overall reading instruction and assessment as being an area in need of attention. A new text book is being explored and additional training will be provided to instructors.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

During the 2017-2018 academic year, we will focus on improving students' integration of knowledge and understanding by developing signature assessments for two of the four program courses: Supervision

and Staff Development; Administration and Supervision of Reading Programs. We will explore ways to remediate students during/after each course rather than at the end of the program.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong

Name of Program: COESM: WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License (WI 316)

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

2016-17 data reveal that the reading teacher program is performing better than average in preparing students to pass the state mandated Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT). During the 2014-15 year, components of the test were embedded into each course in the program. Since this time, data reveal that students consistently earn higher than average scores, as compared to state averages.

Year Viterbo 1st time pass rate State average 1st time pass rate

2016-2017 88% (112 test takers) 66%

Scores on the individual subsets of the FoRT reveal that our greatest strength is in the area of Reading Assessment and Instruction (96% of students answered most-many questions correctly. Our greatest area of weakness was identified as Integration of Knowledge and Understanding (44% of students answered most-many questions correctly).

Portfolio 1st time pass rate is 96% --exceeding the goal of 85% of students earning a *meets* or *exceeds* expectation on the portfolio submission.

We have identified the Integration of Knowledge and Understanding (constructed response), as related to overall reading instruction and assessment as being an area in need of attention. A new text book is being explored and additional training will be provided to instructors.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

During 2017-2018, we will focus our efforts on improving students' integration of knowledge and understanding in three of the seven reading teacher courses: Emergent Literacy, Child/Adolescent Literature, and Assessment and Treatment of Reading Difficulties. We will utilize a new text book in these courses and provide training to adjunct instructors specifically pertaining to the use of the new text. We will explore ways to remediate students during/after each course rather than at the end of the program.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Program Portfolio Assessment-

Overall review of student performance related to (WAS) Standards 1-7 shows we are meeting the benchmark in average score related to the scoring of the Essential Questions specific to the Standards. Result: Only Standard 5, which has a scoring average of 3.75 out of 4, did not meet the 90% benchmark of those scoring at least 3.6 or higher. (Standard 5- 75%) Secondly, in reviewing the data we have

learned that the instructors in the two Ethics courses have not been providing assessment data for their courses. Thus Standard 6 had no results.

Program Survey Summary-

Result: Exit Survey results indicate students' perception of the program is still strong with 6 or the 7 standards scoring above the benchmark of 90% and only Standard 3, The Culture of Teaching and Learning was below at 89%, however improved from 82% in the previous year.

Action--Capstone Paper: This was changed in 2016 and is now a Reflection paper on the Wisconsin Administrative Standards and part of the final Practicum course EDUL 771.

Result: Because of the complexity of when people complete the program, it will take 2-3 years to effectively evaluate the new 3rd indicator, the Final Reflection paper.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

- a) Final Reflection Paper was piloted in 2016-17 and as a result, the rubric in 2018 will be expanded to score 3 targeted areas, overview of the 7 Standards using a synthesis paper, using concrete examples, and use of APA format to demonstrate knowledge and understanding for the Director of Instruction administrators' position.
- b) Review the Organization of the Essential Questions by course with a focus on review of Standard 5 (Relationships with the Broader Community).
- c) After consideration of comments on the 2015 and 2016 Exit Surveys we are going to offer more information and learning on the state budgeting system and school financial and business services to courses EDUL 700 Supt I and EDUL 701 Supt II. Many have commented that the instructor and the information provided in EDUL 661 Business Office/Operation and Management is outstanding and meaningful and more of that kind of information would be helpful to improving the program.
- d) Work with instructors to develop new Scoring Rubrics for Ethical Leadership I and II so we can consistently collect the Essential Questions assessment data from all courses.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Biology

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we conducted year two of our focus on two of our five outcomes. We have made substantial changes to our research series three years ago by including an internship, then data-driven internship to the research related outcomes. Overall our methods met the criteria for written and oral presentation of scientific research at the upper-level. However the assessment data suggests we are still struggling with student data analysis including statistical design and application and aspects of sophomore year writing. This work starts in the sophomore writing intensive course BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution), followed by BIOL 397 (introduction to research), BIOL 489 (field experience), BIOL 498 (directed research) and finally BIOL 499 (capstone research course). We are working with new stats class format in MATH 230 (new software and programing skills required) and changes in staffing in math department as well as first year stats experiences in BIOL 160 and 161 to address issues. From our senior surveys, although too few students completed the survey to report in TracDat, we see a trend that students in BIOL, BIOP, EBIO, and SPSL are not as confident in their abilities as we would have predicted. Student typically rank their abilities in many aspects asked on the senior survey as average, we would like to see them self-report as above average or superior. We see these responses from previous years as well as in other science majors this past graduating senior class. We will assess the validity of this method (in light of the Dunning-Kruger effect) and decide if we should continue to track these responses.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, the biology department will continue to review our research series for all majors as we continue to make changes to support students. Our larger initiative is to focus on our retention goals. We plan to closely track data on incoming students including ACT, HS GPA, major choices, reasons for coming to Viterbo and reasons for leaving the major (if appropriate). We will develop a system and begin to collect data to address student recruiting and retention and moving between majors in the sciences and others. We will also research nationally recognized assessment exams to administer as a new means to assess program science specific objectives (i.e., topics taught in the sciences related to the specific majors in biology department).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Biopsychology

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we conducted year two of our focus on two of our eight outcomes. We have made substantial changes to our research series three years ago by including an internship, then data-driven internship to the research related outcomes. Overall our methods met the criteria for written and oral presentation of scientific research at the upper-level. However the assessment data suggests we are still struggling with student data analysis including statistical design and application and aspects of sophomore year writing. This work starts in the sophomore writing intensive course BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution),

followed by BIOL 397 and PSYC 330 (introduction to research), BIOP 489 (directed research) and finally BIOP 499 (capstone research course). We are working with new stats class format in MATH 230 (new software and programing skills required) and changes in staffing in math department as well as first year stats experiences in BIOL 160 and 161 to address issues. From our senior surveys, although too few students completed the survey to report in TracDat, we see a trend that students in BIOL, BIOP, EBIO, and SPSL are not as confident in their abilities as we would have predicted. Student typically rank their abilities in many aspects asked on the senior survey as average, we would like to see them self-report as above average or superior. We see these responses from previous years as well as in other science majors this past graduating senior class. We will assess the validity of this method (in light of the Dunning-Kruger effect) and decide if we should continue to track these responses.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, the biology department will continue to review our research series for all majors as we continue to make changes to support students. Our larger initiative is to focus on our retention goals. We plan to closely track data on incoming students including ACT, HS GPA, major choices, reasons for coming to Viterbo and reasons for leaving the major (if appropriate). We will develop a system and begin to collect data to address student recruiting and retention and moving between majors in the sciences and others. We will also research nationally recognized assessment exams to administer as a new means to assess program science specific objectives (i.e., topics taught in the sciences related to the specific majors in biology department).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Tammy Clark

Name of Program: Chemistry

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

This year we aggregated data from the past three years for Communication Outcomes and did a follow up analysis for Problem solving and Data analysis Outcomes. We were happy to see that the change we made 3 years ago to the Chem 397 course of reducing group sizes seems to have had a positive impact on the presentation scores. As a result the criteria has been met and the loop has been closed on that assessment method. Although we revisited both the Problem Solving and Data Analysis assessment data, neither required any follow up, as all loop were closed.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

As we look to the future, we will be excited to see how Scott Gabriel's "gamification" of Chem 120 may impact student learning. Overall, we are confident that our assessment plan is providing data that we can use to improve our courses.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri

Name of Program: Environmental Biology

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we conducted year two of our focus on two of our six outcomes. We have made substantial changes to our research series three years ago by including an internship, then data-driven internship to the research related outcomes. Overall our methods met the criteria for written and oral presentation of scientific research at the upper-level. However the assessment data suggests we are still struggling with student data analysis including statistical design and application and aspects of sophomore year

writing. This work starts in the sophomore writing intensive course BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution), followed by BIOL 397 (introduction to research), BIOL, 489 (field experience), BIOL 498 (directed research) and finally BIOL 499 (capstone research course). We are working with new stats class format in MATH 230 (new software and programing skills required) and changes in staffing in math department as well as first year stats experiences in BIOL 160 and 161 to address issues. From our senior surveys, although too few students completed the survey to report in TracDat, we see a trend that students in BIOL, BIOP, EBIO, and SPSL are not as confident in their abilities as we would have predicted. Student typically rank their abilities in many aspects asked on the senior survey as average, we would like to see them self-report as above average or superior. We see these responses from previous years as well as in other science majors this past graduating senior class. We will assess the validity of this method (in light of the Dunning-Kruger effect) and decide if we should continue to track these responses.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, the biology department will continue to review our research series for all majors as we continue to make changes to support students. Our larger initiative is to focus on our retention goals. We plan to closely track data on incoming students including ACT, HS GPA, major choices, reasons for coming to Viterbo and reasons for leaving the major (if appropriate). We will develop a system and begin to collect data to address student recruiting and retention and moving between majors in the sciences and others. We will also research nationally recognized assessment exams to administer as a new means to assess program science specific objectives (i.e., topics taught in the sciences related to the specific majors in biology department).

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Alfieri Name of Program: Sports Science and Leadership

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we conducted year two of our focus on two of our seven outcomes. We did not have students in the research/internship series this year to complete this analysis. From our senior surveys, although too few students completed the survey to report in TracDat, we see a trend that students in BIOL, BIOP, EBIO, and SPSL are not as confident in their abilities as we would have predicted. Student typically rank their abilities in many aspects asked on the senior survey as average, we would like to see them self-report as above average or superior. We see these responses from previous years as well as in other science majors this past graduating senior class. We will assess the validity of this method (in light of the Dunning-Kruger effect) and decide if we should continue to track these responses. We are also currently working with the program review committee to assess the viability of this program.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, the biology department will continue to review our research series for all majors as we continue to make changes to support students. Our larger initiative is to focus on our retention goals. We plan to closely track data on incoming students including ACT, HS GPA, major choices, reasons for coming to Viterbo and reasons for leaving the major (if appropriate). We will develop a system and begin to collect data to address student recruiting and retention and moving between majors in the sciences and others. We will also research nationally recognized assessment exams to administer as a new means to assess program science specific objectives (i.e., topics taught in the sciences related to the specific majors in biology department).

College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

Assessment Report for the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior: Sept. 2017 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	09/29/2016	04/22/2010
BSN Completion	09/26/2017	09/30/2014	
Graduate Nursing	09/26/2017	09/26/2017	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	09/08/2017	09/08/2017	09/30/2010
Dietetics	09/14/2017	05/19/2017	05/17/2017
Dietetics Internship	09/29/2016	09/07/2016	
Diversity Studies (minor)	New Program		
Family Studies (minor)	09/28/2017	09/28/2017	
Gerontology (minor)	09/29/2017	10/17/2013	
Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling	09/25/2017	06/26/2017	09/25/2017
Psychology	09/27/2017	09/27/2017	09/21/2017
Social Work	09/22/2017	09/22/2017	06/17/2011
Substance Abuse Counseling	10/20/2017	10/20/2017	10/20/2017
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query pulls only the information input into the follow-up section.			

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

School of Nursing

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Toni Wissestad

Name of Program: Nursing BSN

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we focused on the outcome related to Health Promotion to include disease management and safety principles. The outcomes for Health Promotion were met with some areas for improvement in the following courses: NURS 465 Leadership in Professional Nursing met the criteria however the rubric will be revised to include more rigor/points for the evidence and application to practice, and not as many points for the professional components of the presentation. NURS 332 met the criteria and this course has now been combined with maternity and no longer exists so we will not make further recommendations on this course. NURS 240 met the criteria and the new faculty in this course made significant changes in pedagogy to align the assignment used with the outcomes. NURS 221 met the criteria, however the student skill evaluation form will be revised to better capture and measure this introductory level outcome.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

1. In 2017-2018, we will be collecting results for the learning outcome for Health Care Policy to include policy, finance, and regulations, and will also follow-up on results for Health Promotion.

- One of our goals in the undergraduate nursing program is to educate new faculty on curriculum, the
 assessment process and to provide a clear understanding of responsibilities and resources available
 to them. Mandatory faculty meetings will be scheduled in early January to assist in this education
 process.
- 3. We will define responsibilities for Curriculum and NAQE committees in order to better streamline work related to assessment, and provide a visual algorithm for deployment of duties.
- 4. An additional goal is to schedule regular assessment meetings as well as working meetings for review of progress in meeting outcomes and to assist faculty with questions and curriculum and assessment educational needs.
- The assessment coordinator is new in this role and will continue to seek opportunities to gain knowledge, as well as work closely with the Dean and Program Coordinator on alignment with other committees.
- 6. The new assessment coordinator will work with the Dean and Program Coordinator to identify gaps in reporting and enter the data required.
- 7. We will examine closely the impact dual enrollment has for measuring outcomes as they are being taught multiple times in an academic year. The assessment committee is working on an assessment schedule for all courses.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Hedrick-Erickson Name of Program: BSN Completion Program

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we focused on two of our six outcomes: 2) Interpersonal and Interprofessional Communication and Collaboration and 2) Healthcare Policy, Finance, and Regulation. 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 6.5 and "overall learning" at 6.54, both up from last year. 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 heavy. After the creation of the Applied Statistics course for nurses, some commented on the difficulty of taking this online; however, the previous course, Intro. to Statistics was online. Course Assessment and Analysis (CAA) reports generated for each course and are also consistently meeting the benchmark on questions for program assessment, being >4.0/5.0 scale. Themes from feedback include assuring consistency in the syllabus and online courses. Most describe the courses as being beneficial learning experiences.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In an effort to improve marketing of program and update courses for meaningful and relevant content to practicing nurses, all course titles, descriptions, and outcomes are being updated this fall and will continue into the 2017-18 year with all BSNC faculty involved in the process.

We are updating our curriculum map based on new courses and will seek the most meaningful results to determine student's ability to achieve outcomes. Adult students tend to be high achievers and most, if not all, are achieving 80% or better on the previous selected assignments.

2017-2018 is the first offering of the program in a hybrid format with the students meeting three times in an eight week session. We will monitor student satisfaction to assure each face to face class is meaningful for the student's needs.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Stolder

Name of Program: Graduate Nursing

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-2017 we collected assessment data on two outcomes according to our scheduled cycle: Practice in an expanded, specialized, and/or advanced practice role AND Facilitate the translation of research and evidence into practice. We continued to use the rubrics developed for the scheduled interim assessment of selected course assignments for each of the outcomes. The adherence of faculty to fill in the M assignment shared file has been variable this past year. Scores received by students have met benchmarks. The rubrics will need to be updated, however, due to recent curricular changes and anticipated programmatic expansions.

We no longer require students to post M assignments to their electronic portfolios. The cumbersome nature of this process and the lack of adherence for little appreciable benefit to students were considerations. Given that the DNP Project itself serves as the exemplary assignment for meeting of the graduate outcomes and that there will no longer be any enrolled master's students, there was less justification for this process.

Evidence from the End of Program Survey, the One Year Alumni Survey, and the Course Embedded Assignments rubrics indicate both of these outcomes are meeting benchmarks.

Please see TracDat for specific findings.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018 we will collect results for the next two learning outcomes: Affirm the dignity of life and human diversity AND Advocate for quality outcomes for individuals, families, populations, and systems. Our focus will be to carefully monitor whether our current processes and course content insure that we are meeting the outcomes requirements of all DNP students, given the substantive curricular sequencing changes and expanded program options in place this year (MBA/DNP Dual Degree) and planned for next year (CRNA/DNP). The DNP Project guidelines were reviewed and revised last year to ensure that it serves as an exemplary assignment for evidence of meeting all graduate outcomes. Accordingly, we will collect data with questions specific to the DNP Project in the End of Program Survey.

2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

School of Health and Human Behavior

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Marlene Fisher & Ryan Anderson

Name of Program: Criminal Justice

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Between spring 2016 and spring 2017 five assessment measures were collected for three outcomes (Theory, Research, and Communication). All but one criteria were met across these measures:

Theory: Three measures were assessed for theory in CRMJ/SOCL 351.

- 1. Using embedded exam questions, students were expected to score an average of 80%. The average score on the exam among CJ majors was 89.1% for spring 2017.
- 2. Students were given an embedded course assignment on theory application and were expected to score an average of 80%. The average score on the theory application paper was 97.1% among CJ majors for spring 2017.
- 3. Student complete a presentation for embedded course assignment and were expected to score an average of 80%. The average score on the presentation was 100%.

Research: One measure was assessed for research in CRMJ/SOCL 364.

1. Students were given a literature review assignment for an embedded course assignment; students were expected to average 80%. The average score for the assignment was 72.75% for fall 2016.

Communication: One measure was assessed for communication in CRMJ 365.

1. Students were given a writing assignment for embedded course assignment; students were expected to average 80%. The average score on written communication for CJ majors was 87.86% for spring 2017.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The Criminal Justice curriculum was recently revised. This revision was done to stream line the course offerings. The most notable being SOWK 340 as the primary CJ research methodology class. The CJ department also reinitiated the diversity outcome for the CJ major. The CJ department will continue to improve outcomes and assessment methods as well as focusing on recruitment and retention of CJ majors.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Klitzke

Name of Program: Dietetics

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we focused on CRD 4.6, CRD 4.11, and KRDs 4.1 and 4.2, which were not met the previous year. We closed the loop on CRD 4.6 by changing the way I assigned the Budget Case Study in Nutr 352, and by reducing the amount of lecture in that course, allowing more time for practice problems, and

slowing the pace of the course. Karen has been working on improving scores on the quiz for coding and billing of nutrition services (CRD 4.11). She has used new resource materials provided by ACEND, and the proportion of students meeting the criteria increased from 80% to 89% but did not meet the criteria of 100%. Karen plans to add another assignment and we will re-evaluate next year. We again found that fewer than 100% of students met the criteria for one or more competencies in Nutr 476. Karen has narrowed the problem to students placed in sports nutrition rotations and plans to create a packet of materials to orient students to those rotations; we will follow up next year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In spring 2017 we implemented new ACEND standards and competencies. We are also in the process of implementing a comprehensive medical education tracking software program that will enable us to obtain richer and more complete data about competency achievement. We will report aggregated results for competency achievement on TracDat, rather than entering data for individual competency statements. As part of these changes we developed a new scale for preceptors to use when rating our students. It is based on Dreyfuss' model of Skill Acquisition and uses terms rather than numbers. We have defined the terms at the top of the evaluation. We believe this will make scoring more consistent between preceptors.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Maria Morgan-Bathke

Name of Program: Dietetic Internship

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

All of the competencies from our previous 5 year plan have been met, therefore, last year we focused on developing our new 5 year SLO plan in accordance with our accrediting board ACEND. We had no competencies to be assessed in the 2016-2017 year.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018 we will collect assessment data for the competencies outlined in the attached Excel document in accordance with ACEND requirements.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Deb Daehn Zellmer

Name of Program: Family Studies Minor

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

The criterion benchmarks for the Family Studies Minor learning outcomes were met. Overall the students in the minor appear to be achieving learning outcomes.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

While the average of the scores met the benchmark, for the first time one student's scores for the outcome "Students will demonstrate and understanding of the complexity of individual and family development across the life span" did not meet a minimum score of 5. Need to monitor this.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Anderson-Meger

Name of Program: Gerontology Minor

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

During this assessment cycle we examined Outcome 2 Knowledge. This outcome is measured with two exams from SOCL 244/244. In the spring 2017 semester, 8 students enrolled in SOCL 244/344, 6 of whom were Gerontology minors. The average score for minors on exam # 1 was 96/100. The minors' scores ranged from 86-112 out of 114 points possible. The average score for minors on exam # 3 was 93/100. The minors' scores ranged from 73-104 points out of 108 points. For the two exams, Gerontology minors averaged 94.5% Notes: Students demonstrated knowledge and understanding of multidisciplinary perspectives in gerontology as evidenced in test scores of 94% exceeding the minor benchmark of 80% of the students achieving at least 80% score on two exams in SOCL 244/344.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Outcomes were met on Outcome 2 Knowledge. Focus for next year will be examining Outcome 1 and 3.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Debra A. Murray

Name of Program: Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

In 2016-2017, the focus was to review and consolidate the Student Learning Outcomes in the assessment plan. The assessment plan was unsustainable with over 127, each measured 3 times, and embedded into 41 assignments which is in addition to the CPCE comprehensive exam that MSMHC students take in their last semester.

The revisions are now measured twice. The revised assessment plan has been entered into TRAC DAT and went into effect summer of 2017.

As delineated in the comprehensive assessment plan, we focused on three of our ten outcomes, Professional Orientation and Ethics, Diversity and Advocacy, and Human Growth and Development. Student Performance in these areas are satisfactory as evidenced by the assessment of assignments. Modifications in assignments for these three outcomes have included the development of exams that measure the CACREP criteria in COUN 510 and COUN 520. One of the most important measures of student learning is students' performance on the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE). Students consistently score above the mean on the CPCE (specifics found in the Annual report posted on our web page).

2. Plan for 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, we will collect results for the next four learning outcomes in our assessment cycle (Career and Life Planning, Helping Relationships, Counseling Continuum and Group Work). A priority will be to follow up on Action Plans and Open Loops in all domains. Currently there are 54 open loops, many of which are in the second cycle of review.

The major initiative for this year will be to build an assessment plan for the Ed.D program. The goal is that the plan is comprehensive, succinct and sustainable

The current process for Assessment in the MSMHC program includes that all faculty prepare the results of assignments then are reviewed by all CORE faculty at the end of each semester. We have found this to facilitate rapid attention to areas requiring attention and to assist with scaffolding.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Liza Ware

Name of Program: Psychology

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Overall, our psychology majors demonstrate strengths in some of the assessed outcomes, but room for growth and improvement in others. Specifically, our students demonstrate a strong ability to explain and apply ethical principles and standards (SLO #3) at the foundational level and strong oral communication skills (SLO #4) at both the foundational and baccalaureate levels. However, there is need for improvement at the foundational level in developing their content knowledge of psychology (SLO #1) and ability to think critically about research (SLO #2), and at the baccalaureate level in their ethical reasoning (SLO #3) and written communication skills (especially APA Style; SLO #4). To help students grow and improve in these areas, we will focus on providing additional or modified instruction and classroom activities/discussion to target particular knowledge and skills. In areas where students are demonstrating strengths and meeting criteria, we might develop instructional and assessment methods that will push them to further develop skills and apply knowledge in more advanced ways.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Outcome 1 (Knowledge of Psychology): For the foundational level of this outcome, we will focus on developing techniques to help Psyc 171 students better prepare for exams. For the baccalaureate level, we collected preliminary data in our Psyc 499: Psychology Capstone course in fall 2016, using the practice psychology GRE test. Students' scores were quite low overall (M = 49%, SD = .04) but, because it was merely a practice test, we are unable to compare their scores to a standardized distribution. Therefore, we did not enter this data into TracDat. This year we will be purchasing a standardized test to be used to assess this outcome more reliably.

Outcome 2 (Research Skills): For the foundational level, we will focus on developing additional instructional methods and activities to help students think critically about research.

Outcome 3 (Ethical Principles and Standards): Students readily met the criterion for this outcome at the foundational level, so we will focus on developing instructional methods and activities to further develop their ethical reasoning skills. We will also focus on developing and refining methods to assess ethical reasoning at the baccalaureate level.

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Anderson-Meger

Name of Program: Social Work

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Field Learning Contract Data

The Learning Contract data cannot be merged with the explicit curriculum course embedded spreadsheet because the contract reflects the 2015 EPAS. Our benchmark for the Learning Contract is a 3.5/5.0. All students in spring 2017 met the benchmark. See Learning Contract spreadsheet for details.

Course Embedded Measures (Explicit Curriculum)

The following summary highlights competencies and practice behaviors that did not meet benchmark or moved above benchmark in 2016/2017.

Competency 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide practice. (Competency below benchmark at 79.54)

EP2.1.2a Recognize and manage personal values. 91.67 (2015/16) to 72.72 (2016/17). Assignment: Ethics paper in capstone.

EP2.1.2b Make ethical decisions. 66.67 (2015/16) to 54.54 (2016/17). Assignment: Ethics paper in capstone.

EP2.2.2d Apply ethical reasoning strategies. 66.67 (2015/16) to 94.4 (2016/17). Rose above benchmark.

Competency 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgements. Overall Competency at 98.07

EP 2.1.3c.2 Written communication. 77.80 (2015/16) to 92.31 (2016/17). Rose above benchmark. Assignment: Policy Analysis.

<u>Competency 2.1.4 – Engage in diversity and difference in practice. Overall competency at 84.61.</u> EP2.1.4a Recognize oppression. 91.7 (2015/16) to 53.85 (2016/17).

Raw data indicates 6 out of 13 students in the class received grades in the C and BC ranges. Most were just points below. Jennie reviewed rubrics – students who fell below 80% were students that are "weaker" overall (Nikki R., Angela R., Susan T., Taylor M., Andi B., and Cearah K.).

Competency 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social justice. Overall competency at 82.05.

EP 2.1.5c Advance social and economic justice. 94.4 in (2015/16) to 61.54 (2016/17). Assignment: Advocacy Project.

<u>Competency 2.1.6 Engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research. Overall competency at 63.63.</u>

EP 2.1.6b Research informed practice. 71.4 (2015/16) to 63.63 (2016/17). Assignment: Research paper. Literature review.

<u>Competency 2.1.10 Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate individuals, families, groups, and communities. Overall competency at 79.48</u>

EP 2.10.b.3 Goals and Objectives. 76.9 (2015/16) to 53.84 (2016/17). Assignment: Final Case Plan. EP2.10.d.4 critically analyze and evaluate interventions. 76.90 (2015/16) to 83.3 (2016/17). Assignment: Final Case Plan.

2. Identify the program's primary focus for assessment work for 2017-2018.

EP2.1.2a Discussion: We thought we were not aligning with our grading. We redesigned the rubric to address it and scores went down. Students still not going deep enough with their responses. They can identify on the surface but not go further. Chunk the assignment and go into more detail. Move the timing for this assignment. Cannot have seniors writing this in week 14 of the semester.

EP 2.1.4a Discussion: The paper is changing for a new class. We need to see if there are ways. Push for more explicit and directive about diversity and oppression conversations. Helping students process what

recognizing oppression really means. Model first and then have students follow. Guide the conversation... students come from privilege and have difficulty seeing. Also the students will have policy I before they have the new class. Could have an impact on the mindset of the students.

EP 2.1.5c Discussion: Group project. 35 students, 5 students got barely below the 80%. Students struggle with this assignment. Are our expectations too high? We modified the assignment to a letter to fit the students' development level.

EP 2.1.6 b Discussion: Is it essential for an undergraduate to understand methods? Change focus of measure to literature review section to find relevant articles, interpret and analyze for informing practice. Revise rubric.

EP 2.1.0.b.3 Discussion: Stressed the importance. Students need more practice learning how to write the goals and objectives. Not appropriate to introduce in interviewing. Iterative feedback on their work. Do more in relation to case study – move to having to write goals and objectives that are outside of their own experience. Move earlier in the class. Use a document that requires goals. The section of the assignment that measures goals/objectives is at the end of a longer paper. Students may be fatigued.

EP 2.1.10 b.3 Discussion: More focus on what evaluation is and making it relevant to practice.

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

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Because this is program has a small number of students, it is challenging to develop firm conclusions from our assessment results. For example, we have yet to meet the criterion for SLO #2 (Research and Practice Skills), but we consistently have some students meeting the criterion and are confident that the assessment process has helped us to develop more effective instructional methods.

In refining our assessment method for the written component of SLO #4 (Communication), we learned that students writing skills do not meet the assessment criteria. Thus, it is important that we continue to refine our assessment methods to focus more specifically on our learning outcomes (e.g., and not on global scores for assignments that might capture several learning objectives).

On the other hand, students readily met the criterion for SLO #1 (Knowledge), SLO #3 (Ethics), and the oral communication component of SLO #4 (Communication), suggesting that we might develop more challenging assignments to further advance student learning.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

Outcome 1 (Knowledge): Determine how to assess additional components of this outcome (developmental, biopsychosocial, and counseling knowledge) and refine assessment methods for components assessed this past year (multicultural).

Outcome 2 (Research and Practice Skills): Continue to assess the effectiveness of the instructional methods introduced this year.

Outcome 3 (Ethics): Modify the assignment and grading rubric to require more application of ethical principles and further advance students' ethical thinking.

Outcome 4 (Communication): Use a modified rubric for the oral communication component. Provide additional instruction and feedback for written communication component. Develop and implement assessment method for the interpersonal component of this outcome.

Outcome 5 (Career Assessment): Develop and implement assessment method for this outcome.
