



Academic Program Assessment Report: 2017-2018

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 2017-18 reported in fall 2018.

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 2017-2018, 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 2017-18 was on assessing learning outcomes through the Foundations and Ways of Thinking.

- **Foundations—Oral Communication:** Faculty decided on targeted changes following four terms of assessment. Follow-up will occur in 2018-19.
- **Literary Analysis:** Follow-up results confirmed learning as the new rubric was applied. The criterion was met.
- **Integrating Faith and Practice:** In 2017-18 follow-up results confirmed learning after five terms of assessment and targeted adjustments. The criterion was met.
- **Artistic Engagement:** The first full year of assessment results led the faculty group to targeted actions, such as revising the rubric and clarifying AE guidelines. Follow-up assessment will occur in 2018-19.

Assessment Practice and Progress

Faculty oversight of academic program assessment is provided through the Academic Program Assessment Committee, and in 2017-18, the committee:

- Provided in-depth formative peer review on assessment work for seven academic programs a year before their program review.
- Because only half of assessment coordinators have been utilizing the “follow-up” area in TracDat to document follow-up results, the TracDat query shows fewer programs closing the loop. APAC members worked with OAIR to conduct a workshop focused on effective use of TracDat to log follow-up assessment after taking actions. The May 2018 workshop was well attended and well received. In 2018, more programs were indicating follow-up results. This continues to be a growth area.
- Revised the Academic Program Assessment Framework and the Academic Program Assessment Committee charge and functions in spring 2018 to align with recent changes, such as the new college structures.

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	5
Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	5
Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	7
Artistic Engagement: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment	9
Use of Assessment in Academic Programs	
College of Business, Performing Arts and Leadership	11
Dahl School of Business	11
School of Performing Arts.....	20
College of Education, Engineering, Letters and Sciences	23
School of Education	23
School of Humanities.....	30
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics	34
College of Nursing, Health and Human Behavior	38
School of Nursing.....	38
School of Health and Human Behavior.....	41

Use of Assessment in the LIVE Core Curriculum

Foundations

Oral Communication: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Fall 2017- Spring 2018 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

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

Measurement: Oral Communication rubric

SPRING 2018 COURSE	FORM	INSTRUCTOR	ENRL
ARTS-350-001 Art Hist Early Modrnism	F2F	L. Steine	9
EDUC-255-001 Curr Instctn and Assmnt	F2F	M. Langeberg	11
ENGL-255-001 Intro Literary Studies	F2F	R. Samuels	12
MGMT-203-001 Professional Communcatn	F2F	C. Thaldorf	23
MGMT-203-002 Professional Communcatn	F2F	C. Thaldorf	10
NURS-240-001 Prfssional Commnication	F2F	J. Meyers	26
NURS-240-002 Prfssional Commnication	F2F	J. Castro	18
NURS-240-003 Prfssional Commnication	F2F	R. Haugh	26
NURS-240-004 Prfssional Commnication	F2F	J. Meyers	21
PSYC-270-001 Intrvw and Hlpng Rlation	F2F	S. Thorson-Olesen	17
SOWK-275-001 Intro Profssnl Pract	F2F	J. Holter	19
SPAN-306-001 Cnvrstion and Grammr II	F2F	J. Jambrina	10
SPAN-306-002 Cnvrstion and Grammr II	F2F	J. Jambrina	3
THTR-291-001 Theatre Hist and Lit II	F2F	J. McLean	6

FALL 2017 COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	Scores
AADM-200-001 Prncples Arts Admnstrtn	M. Ranscht	Y
MUSC-327-001 Music History I	M. Hauptert	Y
BIOL-250-001 Molcul Cell Basis of Lfe	J. Weber, C. Wright	Y
EDUC-226-001 Hlth in 1-9 Clssrm	M. Langeberg	N
MGMT-203-001 Professional Communcatn	C. Thaldorf	Overall score
COMM-150-001 Fundamentals of Speech	C. Thaldorf	Overall score
NURS-240-001 Prfssional Commnication	J. Meyers	Y
NURS-240-002 Prfssional Commnication	K. Warner	Y
NURS-240-003 Prfssional Commnication	J. Meyers	Y
PSYC-270-001 Intrvw and Hlpng Rlation	S. Thorson-Olesen	Y
PSYC-270-002 Intrvw and Hlpng Rlation	J. Richter	Y
SPAN-306-001 Cnvrstion and Grammr II	J. Jambrina	N

Oral Communication Assessment Results: Fall 2017 and Spring 2018

Of the 12 fall sections of OC courses, 8 sections supplied useable OC scores. The results are based on scores for the 130 students from these sections. Of the 14 spring sections, all supplied scores in alignment with the OC rubric. The results for spring are based on scores for the 211 students.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Total
Average	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.6	17.6
Lowest	1	2	0	0	0	3
Highest	4	4	4	4	4	20
Median	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	18.3
Mode	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	20.0

Analysis of 2017-2018 results:

Oral Communication Presentation Scores: 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. The mode for all five components is 4 on a 4-point scale, as is the median with the exception of delivery, indicating that the highest score possible is applied with great frequency. This has been a persistent issue stemming from lack of differentiation in evaluation.

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.”

Targeted actions and next steps:

- 1) Although we have met the criteria consistently, we consistently identify the issue of inflated scores. The mode continues to be 4 on a scale of 4.
- 2) The group identified the need to form a learning community to focus on OC teaching strategies:
 - a. Janet McLean volunteered to be involved in establishing a learning community.
 - b. Will hold a Fall 2018 in-service session (90 min.) on OC with a norming session and discussions about assessment.
 - c. Challenges of incorporating OC with course objectives
- 3) Follow-up assessment in Fall 2018
- 4) Build a video library from OC courses with consistently good audio and video quality.
- 5) OAIR provides faculty with individual section averages.

Ways of Thinking

Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Fall 2017-Spring 2018 Results, Targeted Actions, and Follow-up Results

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

Measurement: Current Literary Analysis rubric

Literary Analysis Assessment Results: Spring 2018

Results from 13 of 13 literary analysis courses for spring 2018 term were collected, with an enrollment of 232 students. The criterion of a 2.5 average for the literary analysis outcome components is met.

- 1) The faculty group is satisfied with the results.
- 2) The sole alignment is between literary analysis and critical thinking. The discussion centered on the observation that a student could demonstrate the ability to analyze literature orally, so that the particular outcome strand of LA is aligned with critical thinking.
- 3) The rubric language is working fairly well. The group worked on describing a “1” (benchmark) and refining the language.
- 4) What measures do we need to have in place to ensure that LA courses thrive?
 - a. The working group and LA faculty will work from the English department’s differentiation between 200 and 300 level courses in the guidelines.
 - b. The upcoming core review working group will review, not only courses used for degree audits but also the nurture and care of core element courses.
- 5) What is the alignment between the LA rubric and the CT rubric?
- 6) We commit to an annual meeting of the LA learning community.

	1-Interpret a literary text’s formal features	2.A. Interpret Content	2.B. Written Claim	2.C. Apt Evidence	2. Composite	Total
Average	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	5.6
Lowest	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highest	4	4	4	4	4	8
Median	3	3	3	3	3	6
Mode	3	3	3	3	3	6
F2F Av	2.6	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	5.4
ONL Av	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1	6.3

SPRING 2018 COURSE	FORM	INSTRUCTOR	ENRL
EDUC-280-001Child and Adolescent Lit	F2F	M. Langeberg	19

EDUC-280-002 Child and Adolescent Lit	F2F	K. Bringe M. L.	19
ENGL-208-001 (53992) The Short Story	OL	J. Hanifl	11
ENGL-221-001 Survey American Lit II	F2F	R. Samuels	14
ENGL-232-001 Survey British Lit II	F2F	A. Denny	8
ENGL-243-001 Lit and Healing Arts	F2F	K. Samuels	24
ENGL-326-001 British Novel to 1900	F2F	A. Denny	14
ENGL-336-001 Shakespeare	F2F	S. Ronnenberg	20
ENGL-347-001 Women Writers After 1700	OL	A. Denny	24
ENGL-354-001 Western Masterpieces	OL	A. Denny	22
ENGL-385-001 Modern / Contemporary Poets	F2F	E. Marzoni	22
SPAN-318-001 Lit of Spanish America	F2F	J. Jambrina	14
VUSM-252-001 Women in Theatre	F2F	J. McLean	21

Literary Analysis Assessment Results: Fall 2017

Results from 9 of 12 literary analysis courses for fall 2017 term were collected. The criterion of a 2.5 average for the literary analysis outcome components is not met.

	1-Interpret a literary text's formal features	2.A. Interpret Content	2.B. Written Claim	2.C. Apt Evidence	2. Composite	Total
Average	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.3	4.6
Lowest	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1
Highest	4	4	4	4	4	8
Median	2	2	2	2	2	4
Mode	2	2	2	2	2	4

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

Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Fall 2017-Spring 2018 Results, Targeted Actions, and Follow-up Results

	Outcome 1: Theological Constructs			Outcome 2: Theology in Practice		
	SP16	SP17	F17-S18	SP 16	SP17	F17-S18
Overall Average	1.8	2.4	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.6
F2F Average	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.6
Online Average	1.6	2.4	2.6	1.6	2.4	2.8
RLST		2.4	2.6		2.4	2.8
VUSM		2.2	2.1		2.3	2.2
SVLD Average	0.6			0.5		
Others Average	2.2			2.2		
VUSM 431			1.9			1.8
All Others			2.5			2.7

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

Measurement: Integrating Faith and Practice (IFP) rubric

Assessment process: Instructors scored the designated IFP assignment for all students in their courses and submitted the scores to Institutional Research for analysis.

COURSE	Instructor	Course Type
RLST 317	Emily Dykman	F2F
RLST 352	Sr. Laura Nettles	F2F
RLST 433-1	Bill Reese	F2F
RLST 433-2	Bill Reese	F2F
RLST 433-4	Bill Reese	Online
VUSM 226	Michael Lopez-Kaley	F2F
VUSM 431-1	Bill Reese, Chris Rogers	F2F
VUSM 431-2	Larry Engel (1/15-3/6)	CAL-Online

Integrating Faith and Practice Assessment Results: Spring 2018

In spring 2018, 8 IFP courses were offered, and scores for 7/8 were submitted. In fall 2017, 9 IFP sections were offered, and scores for all 9 were submitted.

Analysis of results:

The criterion is an average of 2.5. The average for the 2017-2018 data is 2.4 for Outcome 1 and 2.6 for Outcome 2. The criterion is not met for Outcome 1 and is met for Outcome 2. Further analysis shows that averages for VUSM 431 (enrollments of 57) are significantly lower than for all other IFP courses: 1.9 and 1.8 compared with 2.5 and 2.7. Results indicate that for all courses except for VUSM 431 student learning is confirmed and that teaching strategies are in good alignment with the IFP learning outcomes, rubric, and designated assignment. VUSM 431 is currently undergoing significant curriculum revision, and the follow-up assessment will be focused solely on VUSM 431 after the curriculum revisions have been implemented. The criterion was determined to be met for all other courses.

Questions:

What specific changes in VUSM 431 are needed for 2018-2019? What is an action plan for implementing those changes? Fall 2018 assessment for VUSM 431 is needed. What guidelines and resources are needed to support ongoing quality in Integrating Faith and Practice courses?

Actions:

- 1) The Department will address issues in VUSM 431 and will follow-up with results of 431 in 2018-2019.
- 2) Ongoing care of co-counting is needed.
Adjunct mentoring and training for co-counting courses is critical. The department and Core Curriculum will focus on faculty training in 2018-2019.

Artistic Engagement: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Fall 2017-Spring 2018 Results, Targeted Actions, and Follow-up Results

Method: Instructor-designated assignment in all courses approved for Artistic Engagement.

Measurement: Artistic Engagement (AE) rubric

Assessment process: Instructors scored the designated AE assignment for all students in their courses and submitted the scores to Institutional Research for analysis.

	Application	Engagement	Synthesis	Total
Average	3.2	3.4	3.3	9.9
Lowest	0	1	1	3
Highest	4	4	4	12
Median	3.3	4	3.5	10.8
Mode	4	4	4	12
F2F Av	3.3	3.5	3.4	10.1
ONL Av	2.9	3.1	2.9	8.8
F17 Av	2.7	3	2.7	8.4
S18 Av	3.4	3.6	3.5	10.5
Clssrm	3.0	3.1	3.0	9.1
P/L	3.7	4.0	3.9	11.6

Artistic Engagement Assessment Results: Fall 2017 and Spring 2018

In fall 2017, only 20% (9/44) of AE courses participated in the assessment, with 32% (115/359) of the students enrolled reflected in the analysis. In spring 2018, 71% (25/35) of AE courses supplied scores, with 80% (285/354) of the students enrolled reflected in the analysis.

Analysis of results:

The criterion for Ways of Thinking elements usually is an average of 2.5, and faculty have discussed 2.5 as a reasonable criterion. That will need to be confirmed. The data raises several questions, which is not unexpected in the first round of assessment. The fact that the mode (the most commonly-occurring score) is 4 on a scale of 1-4 is problematic. The differences between face-to-face and online are not concerning. The differences between classroom-embedded assessment and the assessment in private voice lessons and ensembles is a focal point.

Follow-up norming and assessment will take place in fall 2018, with full participation.

Targeted Actions:

- 1) The Artistic Engagement rubric will be refined for August 2018
- 2) A norming session in August 2018 will prepare faculty for full participation.
- 3) The Core Curriculum director will work with faculty to identify courses to drop the Artistic Engagement designation.

Use of Assessment in Academic Programs

2018 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

College of Business, Performing Arts and Leadership

Dahl School of Business			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Accounting	09/27/2018	09/27/2018	09/07/2018
Accounting Degree Completion	05/24/2018	02/14/2018	09/07/2018
Business Administration	10/18/2018	10/18/2018	10/18/2018
Finance	New Program		
Health Care Management	09/12/2017	09/13/2018	09/13/2018
Health Care and Wellness Management	New Program		
Management and Leadership	09/27/2018	09/27/2018	09/09/2018
Management Information Systems (INFO) Online	10/14/2018	10/14/2018	10/15/2018
Marketing	09/27/2018	09/27/2018	09/15/2017
Master of Arts in Servant Leadership	09/13/2018	02/12/2018	09/10/2018
Master of Business Administration	09/11/2018	09/11/2018	09/05/2018
Organizational Management (Classroom-based)	10/16/2018	10/15/2018	10/15/2018
Organizational Management (Online)	10/17/2018	10/17/2018	10/17/2018
Professional Studies	10/17/2018	10/17/2018	10/17/2018
Sport Management & Leadership	09/27/2018	09/27/2018	05/19/2016
School of Performing Arts			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Arts Administration	10/18/2018	10/18/2018	
Music	08/22/2018	08/29/2018	08/24/2018
Music Theatre	09/09/2018	09/09/2018	
Theatre BFA core	09/03/2018	09/06/2018	09/06/2018

Dahl School of Business

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sabrina Steger

Name of Program: Accounting

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

For most measures, we met the criterion requirements during the 2017-2018 academic year.

For the Ethical Decision-Making learning outcome, we changed the measure to a single case study in ACCT 312. We used an ethical case study that appears later in the course, after the students have had some practice in addressing other ethical cases. We didn't meet the criterion requirements, because one student significantly

under performed. With such a small class, this alone brings the % down considerably. Faculty does not feel the assignment needs revisions.

For the Ethical Decision-Making and Communication learning outcomes, we had new faculty member use a new case study in ACCT 425. We didn't meet the criterion requirements, because of case study preparation: the professor assigned group prepared case studies throughout the semester only the final being an individual project. Professor will try in Fall 2018 course to have more individual case studies before the final to help prepare students better.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In all learning outcomes, we did a revision to our assessment techniques, we will continue to focus on updating the assessment plan to verify the measures remain closely aligned with the program learning outcomes. Where we still 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.

For 2018-19 we have added a retention goal to increase our 5th semester retention rate from 64% to 69% by 2024. We will work on attaining this goal through course work, enrollment management, and creating social events to integrate the students in our university culture.

Since we will have some new measures in the overall assessment plan, the primary focus for assessment work for 2018-19 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: Katrina Volkert

Name of Program: Accounting Degree Completion

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

For most measures, we met the criterion requirements during the 2017-2018 academic year.

For the Ethical Decision-Making learning outcome, we changed the measure to a single case study in ACCD 340. We used an ethical case study that appears later in the course, after the students have had some practice in addressing other ethical cases. We didn't meet the criterion requirements, because one student received a zero for not turning in the assignment. With such a small class, this alone brings the % down considerably. Faculty does not feel the assignment needs revisions.

For the Ethical Decision-Making and Communication learning outcomes, we had new faculty member use a new case study in ACCT 425. We didn't meet the criterion requirements, because one student did not even complete assignments with any regularity. This caused the percentage to drop considerably, due to a small class size. Faculty does not believe there are any flaws in the assignments but will reevaluate in Fall 2018.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Once again in BLAW 450, we did not meet the requirements in the Legal and Regulatory learning outcome. We recognize we need to discuss with the instructor how to address the shortfall that occurred. We'll identify an intervention that can be put into place for the sections of BLAW 450 we will run in the 2018-19 academic year.

In all learning outcomes, we did a revision to our assessment techniques, we will continue to focus on updating the assessment plan to verify the measures remain closely aligned with the program learning outcomes. Where we still 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.

Since we will have some new measures in the overall assessment plan, the primary focus for assessment work for 2018-19 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: Alissa Oelfke

Name of Program: Business Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

There are a few places in the assessment plan for BUSA where we need to check for close alignment of a particular course-embedded assignment with the learning outcome it is intended to measure, especially where there are new assignments being utilized.

Two years ago we altered the measurement criterion for the communications learning outcome, where the formal business report in MGMT 300 is used to measure the achievement of the outcome. Since then, the criterion has been met each year. It continues to be one of the more difficult courses in the BUSA major for students, but we also hear from them that they appreciate the course because of how much it has helped them to improve upon their writing skills.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- Two measures that support the complex business issues learning outcome have changed significantly (MKTG 351 – case study on integrating disciplines and MGMT 449 – simulation project), so new measures are needed.
- New measures have been proposed for the complex business issues (a financial analysis project in FINA 331) and the ethical decision making learning outcomes (a capital budgeting analysis in FINA 331), so the curriculum committee should take a close look at the assignment descriptions and rubrics and verify alignment with the outcomes they are intended to measure.
- The assignments in MGMT 374 have been enhanced over the last couple of years, so it is necessary to re-check the alignment of the panel presentation / paper assignment with the professional communications learning outcome.
- We need to investigate additional ways we can utilize the data from the Peregrine outbound exams (first conducted in 2017-2018) to further enhance our curriculum so that students can be more successful in demonstrating the entirety of what they have learned in their business education.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Brian Rotty

Name of Program: Health Care Management

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

With a new person leading assessment for Health Care Management (Brian Rotty), it was necessary to do some training on TracDat and our Viterbo Assessment Framework. Since this program relies heavily on adjuncts, we've focused 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, included deeper investigation into the measures and their alignment with the learning outcomes. We also attempted to correct the deficiencies in the measures that didn't meet the criterion in 17-18.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

We will continue to work on coordination and training for adjunct professors. This will include improved grade differentiation via robust grading rubrics; utilization of multiple sources of media; and ongoing opportunities for professional development and peer to peer support.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Terresa Bubbers

Name of Program: Health Care and Wellness Management

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Health Care and Wellness Management program started in 2016 and therefore does not yet have data for all seven outcomes. For the outcomes collected though, the program was successful meeting or succeeding eight out of nine criterion goals. The one criterion not met was in ethical decision-making outcomes. The goal was only missed by 1 student and therefore it was decided to reassess the data after fall 2018, and determine if there is a pattern with the data.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, we will collect results for the first time for three learning outcomes and will also following up results on ethical decision-making. One of our goals as a department is identify more health care internship opportunities for the students and review recruitment strategies for new students.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Rochelle Brooks

Name of Program: Management and Leadership

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-18, most of the student learning outcomes have been met for the Management and Leadership program. Results for demonstration of professional communication skills tend to vary and we have some non-business students in the two courses where this criterion is measured. Many changes and interventions have been implemented by instructors in communication improvement (MGMT 300 and MGMT 374) and they seem to be effective. The MGMT 474 course became MGMT 374 this past year and the course co-counted as VUSM 2XX and VUSM 3XX for the academic year which added some challenges but students did better in the second semester. Going forward, the VUSM 2XX course requirements will be removed starting in the 2018-2019 academic year

which will allow for a stronger focus on business outcomes in MGMT 374. In addition to the MGMT 374 changes, we had some new instructors teaching courses where measurements were taken and strong data of results and observations was not always provided. Some adjustments to the assignments used for measurements occurred this year and more clarity on those assignments need to be developed with the new faculty teaching these courses this year.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

This year's focus will be monitoring if grade inflation is affecting assessment results. Also, new instructors will need to become comfortable in their courses and contribute ideas to refine assignments that will most accurately reflect true student progress. Students continue to enter our courses with low writing skills based on students entering MGMT 300 this fall averaging a 55% score on a basic grammar quiz. It is a challenge for faculty to work with students needing remedial work in basic communication skills. Even with this challenge, we have made progress and employers and graduates are recognizing this progress made in our business programs to assist students to become better communicators. We will continue to work with the students and we hope to have more faculty give valuable feedback to students in the communication area (written and oral communication). Also, instructors should explore options to have students do more with the research process prior to the students taking MGMT 300. Time management improvement also needs to continue to be a major focus for students who are not experienced with completing larger projects. A student's lack of time management is a common reason for students not meeting our assessment criteria.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke
Name of Program: Management Information Systems (INFO)

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Going into 2017-2018, we expected to be making significant changes to the curriculum for this program. As a result, the curriculum committee decided to use the existing assessment measures during the 17-18 academic year, and create new measures appropriate for the curricular changes prior to Fall, 2018. However, as the academic year progressed, curricular discussions with a small group of faculty who teach in the MIS program led to the decision to discontinue this program rather than significantly modify it. As a result, resources that were being used by MIS can be re-directed to programs that have been attracting more students.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

We will continue to assess the program's learning outcomes as long as we continue to have students who are being taught out to graduation. In addition, some of the courses are also serving other majors. For example, OMGT 402 serves other business degree completion majors, and the assessment data shows the particular assignment in OMGT 402 is not meeting the criterion for the ethical decision-making criterion. The curriculum committee will need to address this and provide additional support to the students in the course. Future follow-up will be needed in OMGT 402.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Chandu Valluri

Name of Program: Marketing

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Overall, we are very pleased with our results to date. Our assessment report indicates that we are making upward strides in enveloping our students with decision making skills. Ethical training and ethical decision making is further being emphasized in the principles class as well as senior research course. While in the principles class they are largely introduced to ethical principles in the field, the research class requires students to conduct research by adhering to ethical research practices. We have chosen to remove the relationship model of selling as a learning objective for multiple courses. While, relationship selling is the basis for the sales management class (MKTG356) other classes don't lend well to such specificity. However, our assessment report shows strong evidence of relationship marketing in both the selling as well as the social media class. Our curriculum is becoming increasingly applied and relevant to students. All of the major classes have an applied real world project that is serving as the major assessment form. We also observe that the curriculum is emphasizing more quantitative elements and technical training. A future opportunity would be to emphasize more international components to marketing (international marketing). Without creating a specific course, the importance of this content can be emphasized in multiple classes: New Media Marketing, Social Media, IMC and Principles. Given this era of globalization, it is important to teach this more concretely.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

The marketing department made changes to the curriculum this year. 2 new classes were officially added to the program and one class was terminated from the program. The marketing program now has also incorporated more elements from the creative sciences as well. Elements of Buyer Behavior (MKTG352) will now be emphasized in MKTG353 (Marketing Research) and MKTG450 which in many ways are the capstone courses for the marketing degree. A new learning outcome and its measurement criteria was added. Based on our discussion with employers and learning of student experiences with internships, we realized the importance of equipping our students with the necessary technology tools to qualify to work in the marketing field. Consequently, we will emphasize training in marketing technologies in order to be relevant to employers. Consequently, students will be required to work with SPSS, R, various social media, Adobe as well as various web-technologies in our program. This will take place in the marketing research class (MKTG353), Social Media Class (MKTG354) as well as with New Media Marketing and Promotional Portfolio (MKTG362). The major capstone class will also allow an opportunity to put these technologies to use (MKTG450) through an applied project. We are also happy to report that assessment preparation, evaluation and sharing is becoming a more collaborative exercise among employees who teach marketing courses on campus.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Pamela Dixon

Name of Program: Master of Arts in Servant Leadership

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-18, data were collected on an administrative outcome (enrollment and retention), and all student learning outcomes. For the Enrollment and Retention outcome, the criterion was met. The goal for enrollment as 42 active students in fall 2018. We have 48 active students fall of 2018. Also, retention as of Fall 2017 was 100%. Assessment of students' application of theories of practice and servant leadership, in the course SVLD 690, continued to show improvement resulting from taking more time in class to discuss the rubric and practicing the oral presentation, and requiring drafts of the final paper to ensure more feedback throughout the semester; the

benchmark was met for the year. Performance on Theological and philosophical foundations of servant leadership, with the assessment in SVLD502 exceeded the benchmark with 95% compliance for direct measure #1, and 100% compliance with direct measure #2. This course was delivered online and therefore measure #1 was changed from an oral presentation to a written paper. We will continue with this mode of delivery and measurement. The third outcome, demonstration of ethical principles and theories also met the criteria for both direct measures. Final paper had over 90% of students who achieved higher than 80%. Also, 95% of students achieved over 80% across all reflection papers.

Overall, our focus on format and delivery changes seem to be effective based on results.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-19, we will again collect data on all four learning outcomes. There will be a continued focus on application of theories of practice and servant leadership outcomes measured through the colloquium (SVLD 690). The colloquium options of a systematic literature review and an action research project will continue to be used, with time in class to review drafts of student work, and time for practice and feedback for the final presentation. As students desire an online option within the MASL program, we'll continue using SVLD 502 as the online option. This is based on the measured results achieved in 17-18. Again, assessment results this year pointed to effective practices, and we will continue to monitor in the next cycle.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Dale Krageschmidt

Name of Program: Master of Business Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-18, data were collected on all four student learning outcomes. Assessment of students' application of business strategies continued to show improvement resulting from delivery changes implemented in 2016; the benchmark was exceeded for the year, and all corrective action loops have been closed. Performance on our ethical leadership outcome showed mixed results with the assessment in MGMT 525 exceeding the benchmark with 100% compliance and the assessment in MGMT 512 missing the benchmark with a 60%. Follow-up identified a communication and cultural gap that decreased course understanding in a segment of the population of students. The integrative/critical thinking outcome also had mixed results with two scores of 52% in Accounting 510. An action plan has been proposed and will be implemented in 2018FA. The instructor will give sample papers to demonstrate expectations. The communication courses missed the goal with 75% compliance. The instructor said that the students initially struggled with voiceover on PowerPoint. She plans to revisit this technology in the future to determine if it is the best technique.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-19, we will again collect data on all four learning outcomes. Although we showed some improvement, we will investigate the differences and similarities of the online, blended and face to face formats. There will be a continued focus on critical thinking and communication outcomes measured through the capstone. The capstone directions will continue to be more explicit and communications between the students and the capstone advisors will be more frequent and formal than in the past. The focus of our capstone to applied, action oriented projects (including quality improvement projects) has been successful and will continue to be implemented in 2018-19. The implementation of capstone projects where students directly impact their organizations has more deeply engaged the students in creatively solving real organizational problems, and improved their critical thinking skills. Interactive capstone projects will remain a focus in 2018-19. Again, assessment results this year

pointed to room for improvement in clarifying expectations for a particular demographic segment of our students. We will make this a major focal point for this academic year.



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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Overall, there were only 3 sections of OMGT courses offered in the face-to-face format during the 2017-2018 academic year. With consistently low numbers in the face-to-face sections, and more students choosing the completely online format, it is very difficult to gather enough data to get a good representation of the assessment results for the program. All three course sections offered in the face-to-face format in 2017-2018 had good results, and met the criterion measures. No additional actions are needed at this time.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

The OMGT courses will no longer be offered in the Face-to-Face format going forward. A decision was made in 17-18 to discontinue the F2F course sections due to consistently low enrollments. Future sections will be fully online, and will be assessed in the OMGT Online program assessment in TracDat.



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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

There are a couple key areas where the data indicates students may need some additional support or the assessed assignment needs to be modified to more closely align with the learning outcomes:

- The assessment methods used to measure the HR Management learning outcome may not be clearly aligned with the outcome, and the rubrics being used may not show the intended achievement of the learning outcome.
- Students may not be getting enough content to support the group behavior and teamwork learning outcome. Assessment measures have not been consistently applied for this learning outcome in the past few years.
- As in the past, we continue to show that students aren't meeting the Communication learning outcome at a high level.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Assessment work for 2018-2019 should focus on these primary initiatives:

- The leadership research paper used in OMGT 306 as an assessment method for the HR Management outcome should be checked for alignment.
- The grading rubric for the HR Policy manual assignment in OMGT 400 needs to be adjusted to allow for greater grade distinction. May need to work with faculty/adjuncts on norming the use of the rubric for this assignment as well.
- Focus some attention on the assessment methods used to measure the achievement of the Group Behavior and Teamwork learning outcome.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

SPML’s program learning outcomes will be maintained, with an additional awareness – and addressing – “5th Semester Retention Rates,” with College emphases to increase this rate by 5% by 2024. It is suggested to continue to communicate positive results to our majors, employers, and alumni. This could be accomplished with improved College branding, as well as assistance by Communications and Marketing. Some ways to do this will be through on-campus invitation of graduates, interfacing with employers through job shadow and/or interviews, Skype calls in-class with industry professionals, and others. Assessment of in-class projects will continue such as Request For Proposal (SPML 455), creating a sport business (SPML 330), and risk management protocols (SPML 340). Data for the major Agency Assessment (SPML 490) will be disaggregated, studied, and reported. The SPML program is beginning its 10th year and numbers of students selecting this major continue to be strong with class sizes ranging as high as 30 students (SPML 220), though a more typical size is 10-12 students.



School of Performing Arts

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alisa Oelfke

Name of Program: Arts Administration

1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Currently there are two main courses listed in the AADM assessment plan where measures of the learning outcomes are taken. Because of the lengthy rotation schedule, and the low number of majors, neither of these two classes (AADM 340 and AADM 400) was conducted during the 2017-2018 academic year, so there was no data available to collect. Notes and action items regarding this issue and the re-design of the AADM curriculum have been placed in the TracDat system.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The AADM program recently went through sustainability review, and is now in the process of significant curricular modifications. The curriculum committee working on the modifications will also be re-designing the assessment plan for the program to develop measures that can be conducted in the new course arrangement. The new curriculum will take effect in the 2019-2020 catalog, with the first courses offered in the new arrangement in the Fall of 2019. In the meantime, the existing measures will be gathered if AADM 340 and AADM 400 are conducted during the 18-19 academic year.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Hauptert

Name of Program: Music

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Last year we focused on retention, adding it to TracDat so that we could monitor our progress. We’ve added two areas that we think will make a difference in recruiting and retention. We placed experienced faculty in the MUSC 151-152 sequence, which encouraged music composition and bonding. The addition of the Freshmen & Sophomore Showcase Recital has been an initiative that has offered a boost of confidence for our younger music majors. Under the guidance of coach-accompanist Judy Staflien and master teachers Dan Johnson-Wilmot and

Ann Schoenecker, students have more readily grounded themselves in the discipline of practice and performance. Programs for these performances have been added to the repository in TracDat.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

The music department has identified two foci for 2018-2019:

1. The primary focus of the music department’s assessment for 2018-2019 will be to re-evaluate courses impacted by modification. Trimming our current degree offerings (dropping the B.A. in Music) will require revision of the course catalog, as well as TracDat reporting.

2. The music department will also continue to refine and improve recruiting and retention for 2018-2019:
 - RECRUITING: Nancy Allen will continue to be our Recruiting Director for the Music Department.
 - RECRUITING: The High School Voice Competition (which is scheduled for November 10, 2018) has attracted students to Viterbo, so we will consider adding “results” in TracDat that show the number of majors generated (each year) from the competition.
 - RECRUITING: The High School Piano Competition (which is scheduled for February 2, 2019) attracted students who weren’t yet eligible for college, but may yet yield students.
 - RETENTION: The Freshmen & Sophomore Showcase Recital is scheduled for November 10, 2018.
 - RETENTION: MUSC 151-152 (Music Theory I & II) will engage in a music composition project that connects students with *Gateway Christian School* in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa. Dr. Mary Ellen Hauptert will continue to teach these courses.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Karla Hughes

Name of Program: Music Theatre

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

During the 2017-2018 school year, the Music Theatre area focused on catching up on assessment work. Where we had been delinquent in the past concerning the entering of data on TracDat, we discovered through lengthy discussions we had been collecting data for years within our separate areas (Voice, Acting, and Dance). It was our data collection and reading of one another’s rubrics that helped us to realize where our teaching philosophies align and where we need more communication. Each area worked to streamline and simplify rubrics for classes and engage with students more at the start of the semester about the rubric and grading process.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, we are working to align the Music Theatre area closer to current industry standards and unify teaching philosophies as we move forward. First, we are moving our annual Department Auditions from mid-September to late October. This move is intended to do several things including giving the students the opportunity to gain an additional month of training prior to a major audition call and allowing the repertoire for the New Works Festival to be solidified prior to auditioning so appropriate casting choices can be made. We will also be revising the Departmental Audition rubric as a full faculty (not just the Performance Faculty) to better reflect current industry standards of Music Theatre & Theatre performance. Finally, our area will begin a transition process as we begin the process of becoming a Conservatory within the University. Many of our department and school of fine arts meeting will be dedicated to this process and will include discussions on assessment within the new model.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeff Stolz
Name of Program: Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theatre - Core

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

We have revised our assessment plan so that we have methods by which to better assess all four of our outcomes. The freshman and sophomore evaluations have been revised to better address our outcomes, by clarifying and streamlining the language of the survey. This was done by reducing the number of responses available to students and faculty. We now have a question that relates to each of our outcomes, with statements that better clarify how each question relates to our various emphasis.

We decided as a department that it would be very beneficial to use an assignment embedded in a course that is required of each student. We have added a research paper from THTR 291, as further means of assessing our outcome of Research and Synthesis. It was decided to use this tool as there is data from past years that we can begin to use immediately.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

During the 2018 -19 academic year we will continue to collect data from our freshman/sophomore evaluations, audition and portfolio reviews and exit interviews. We have also expanded our Senior Exit Survey and the Senior Thesis Rubric to better address all area of emphasis within our BFA degree.

The addition of the course embedded assignment will also give us useful information as we move forward. We have scheduled time in our out service department meetings to review our outcomes and the data collected throughout the year. This spring will begin reviewing the data of our odd numbered outcomes during our 2019 out service. We will review the even numbered outcomes and data during our 2020 out service faculty meeting. We will continue this rotation so as to be perpetually analyzing our results so as to better train our students and to report out to interested alumni, etc.

The specifics of our assessment is included in the report for each individual outcome.



2018 Academic Program Assessment Summaries
College of Education, Engineering, Letters, and Sciences

School of Education			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
IA GRAD: Educational Leadership Program	09/05/2018	09/05/2018	09/05/2018
Master of Arts in Education	08/21/2018	08/21/2018	09/26/2017
Undergraduate Education	09/05/2018	09/20/2016	
WI GRAD: Cross-categorical Special Education License	08/21/2018	08/21/2018	08/23/2018
WI GRAD: Director of Instruction License	09/12/2018	09/12/2018	
WI GRAD: Dir. of Special Ed. & Pupil Services License	09/12/2018	09/12/2018	09/12/2018
WI GRAD: Post Baccalaureate Teacher License	08/31/2018	02/03/2012	
WI GRAD: Principal License	09/12/2018	09/12/2018	09/11/2018
WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License (WI 17)	09/05/2018	09/05/2018	
WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License (WI 316)	09/05/2018	09/05/2018	09/15/2010
WI GRAD: Superintendent License	09/12/2018	02/16/2016	09/11/2018
School of Humanities			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Art	09/04/2018	10/02/2013	08/28/2018
English	09/18/2018	09/18/2018	09/18/2018
History	08/16/2018	07/15/2014	08/16/2018
Liberal Studies	09/24/2015	09/25/2014	
Philosophy	04/27/2018	09/22/2016	
Religious Studies	07/24/2018	08/19/2016	
Spanish	06/01/2016	10/14/2013	
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Biochemistry	06/10/2018	06/10/2018	10/11/2017
Biology	09/07/2018	10/16/2017	09/09/2018
Biopsychology	09/07/2018	09/09/2018	
Chemistry	06/10/2018	06/10/2018	06/10/2018
Engineering	NEW PROGRAM		
Environmental Biology	09/09/2018	09/09/2018	09/09/2018
Mathematics	09/13/2018	10/31/2017	
Sport Science	09/09/2018	10/01/2016	09/01/2011

School of Education

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Page

Name of Program: IA GRADUATE Educational Leadership Program

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

100% of students met proficiency in all standards according to the Portfolio Presentation Scoring Rubric. (One scorer marked NP on an ethics standard, but the other two scorers did not.) 9 of the 54 (17%) students were noted as having negative language/grammar habits that affected their professional presentation skills. (Last year,

the number of students with language/grammar concerns was 28%.) We will continue the goal of providing students increased formal opportunities for honing presentation skills. Feedback will be provided to students based on the same rubric we use for the Portfolio Presentations.

The goal, started last year, of developing syllabi that have common references, assessments, and activities will continue this year to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum. We developed an overview document (attached) of the courses so instructors and supervisors could have an understanding of the global program, not just his/her assignment. We held two formal collaboration meetings (one via Zoom and one in person) to revise the Portfolio Presentation Rubric (attached), discuss the Guaranteed & Viable Curriculum work, and to determine ways to collaborate across the state. Just recently, we decided to add course-alike instructors to each Moodle. Instructors then, have access to each other's course outline/materials/assignments/assessments. Finally, we are contemplating using Moodle for all internship documents. This would create efficiency and serve as a repository for evidence of completion.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Wisconsin and Iowa Educational Leadership Program Specialists have agreed that common formative assessments help our programs become stronger. Scott Mihalovic and Carol Page met to determine which courses should start with common formative assessments: Management, Curriculum, and School Law. Iowa has discussed the need for common formative assessments with the instructors of these three courses. Management will require an ENTRY PLAN. Curriculum will require an ACTION PLAN, and School Law will use the MIDTERM and FINAL EXAMS. Formal data collection in Iowa will start with the fall, 2018 semester. If rubrics need to be developed to ensure consistent scoring, we will develop them.

The assessments used in these three courses are relevant, authentic, and rigorous. The data from these courses will be collected and analyzed to ensure all students are proficient in this extremely important work. We will use these data to support our determination whether students should be recommended for Iowa BoEE Licensure for the PK-12 Principal/Supervisor of Special Education.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage

Name of Program: Undergraduate Education

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

While all of our students met the target goal of scoring 2.5 on each of 15 edTPA rubrics, we closely examined the data to determine additional curricular needs. Based on the scores, we determined that our students need more experience with teaching and assessing writing, therefore we added a new course, EDUC 403, *Teaching Writing and Language Arts*. The highest average edTPA score was 3.7 on rubric 12, indicating that we are successfully instructing our students in quality feedback. The lowest average score was 2.7 on rubric 8, *Deepening Children's Learning*, which refers to the pre-service teacher's ability to respond to children in a manner that promotes a deeper understanding of language and literacy. We continue to address this component of student feedback in our curriculum courses. During the 2017-18 academic year we formalized our writing assessment process, administering assessments to all of our new students, in order to identify and address writing deficiencies. Of the 32 students who took the assessment, 13 were put on writing contracts with the ARC. An additional 6 were flagged as potentially needing writing support.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

We are going to realign our scope and sequence using the Charlotte Danielson framework and specific edTPA rubrics, in order to specifically address areas needing further development as indicated by rubric scores. For example, the lowest rubric scores were related to classroom discussion—rubrics 8 and 9 (2.7 and 2.8 respectively). We are furthermore going to add an objective to each methods class on how to produce productive discussion and elicit feedback.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Hines

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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The 2017-2018 data reveal that our passing rate on the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Tests is up significantly. Of the 34 students who took the test in this period of time, 30 successfully passed the test. Our students' greatest area of difficulty on the exam is in Domain 4 which deals with integration of knowledge and understanding.

In the upcoming redesign of the Cross-Cat licensing program (explained below), we will incorporate more opportunities for students to assess students, create and analyze a data set, and synthesize the information in order to create an instructional plan to meet the needs of their students, particularly in the area of literacy.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In October of 2017, the Wisconsin State Legislature passed a budget that made significant changes to the ways in which Wisconsin educators receive and maintain teaching licenses. For the Cross Categorical Special Education license (WI 801), the biggest change is the elimination of the age bands. Prior to these changes, our students picked an area of emphasis (cognitive disability, learning disability, or emotional or behavioral disability) along with an age band (Early Childhood to Middle Childhood OR Early Adolescence to Adolescence level). All Cross Categorical licenses will now be issued for Kindergarten through twelfth grade. Our coursework will need to be revised to make sure all of our completers are prepared to teach a wider variety of ages.

In addition to the age band change, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has determined that students who hold a current teaching license no longer need to take the Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT) in order to receive a license. Since many students will not have to take the FoRT, it will no longer be an effective way to measure our program outcomes.

These two significant changes will give us the opportunity to revisit and redesign our program outcomes and assessments to align with the new structures in place within the state of Wisconsin.

Until these changes are implemented, we plan to follow our current assessment protocol, using the Signature Assignments and FoRT scores to determine whether we are meeting student learning outcomes.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

Name of Program: WI Director of Instruction

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The Final Reflection rubric has been completed and was used to score the Dir of Instruction taking the Practicum in Fall 2017. Instructors reported a 3.6 average on a four point 3 cohorts in La Crosse, Middleton, and Green Bay. This will become part of the scored data for the 2019 report.

Portfolio Assessment: Scores for three locations tallied 42 students. The average of all scores was above the 3.6 benchmark in each of the five Standards assess, Standard 1,2,3,4,7. Standards 5 and 6 are not assessed as only one course is assessed in the Director of Instruction program, EDUL 704, Collaborative Leadership for Learning. However, the total percentage of those who scored 3.6 or higher did not meet the 90% benchmark. I would say this is something to watch more closely in the next year, but because there are only 6 Essential Questions that are evaluated in the EDUL 70-4 course, these results can be misleading because of the very small sample size.

Program Assessment/Evaluation: The Program Survey Summary results for 2017 are excellent for the DI program. As part of the Final Practicum, the program summary is given each fall. The ratings were consistent from all 3 cohorts and final summary as follows: ST 1- 97%, 2-96%, 3-98%, 4-90%, 5-89%, 6-95%, 7-95%. The results of the Summary from each of the last two years where we have run three cohorts have been consistent and students have given the DI program high marks.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- a) We will provide online opportunities with the three instructors of EDUL 704 Collaborative Leadership for Learning course to review the Essential Questions for summer 2019. Looking at the Standards and because we evaluate only the one course, maybe we need to consider 7 Essential questions that link directly to each of the 7 Standards.

- b) We have two new Practicum Instructors in Green Bay and La Crosse. The three adjuncts have participated in several email exchanges as the Middleton Instructor has led the conversations. After the Practicum completes this fall, we will offer professional development time to the three instructors to review the Practicum Handbook, the course content for the three Saturday class dates, and the processes for collecting documentation for licensing.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The Final Reflection rubric has been completed and was used to score the Director of SEPS taking the Practicum in spring 2018. Instructor Kim Little scored the Final Reflection using the new scoring rubric. 14 of 15 students scored 3.6 or higher meeting the benchmark of 90%.

Portfolio Assessment: With the addition of 3 new instructors in 2017, the results will likely improve next year based on instructor evaluations I have seen from our new instructors. The results from the 2016 group are as follows with 23 students who had been assessed. Standards 1- 100%, 2-82%, 3-100%,4-62%, 5-82%, 6-71%, and 7-82%. The averages scores for each standard all met the 3.6% or higher benchmark. Students have noted in verbal

and written feedback that if one starts the Director of Special Education and Student Services without a background in Special Education, those students really struggle during the program.

Program Assessment/Evaluation: The overall Program Assessment had not been done for 2014 or 2015 when the instructor failed to provide the assessment to students. The 2016-17 Summary had nine students respond. Standards 1,2,6,and 7 all met the 90% benchmark. Standard 3 was below at 74%. Standard 4 was 81%, and Standard 5 was 67%. While these lower scores need to be reviewed again next year, the students who represent the 9 had suffered through a couple classes with our past instructors who have since been replaced.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- a) The three core course instructors participated together in a summer training 7/20/2018 in Madison. The three core courses (EDUL 651,654,655) were reviewed for course alignment. Changes to course content, assessments, and class activities were noted and will be implemented in 2018-19. This will be the primary focus of the annual review in 2019.

- b) Focus of the professional development for our news instructors will be to review specifically Standards 3 (The Culture of Teaching), 4 (The Management of Learning), and 5 (Relationships with the Broader Community). During the past four years, the student feedback has been consistent with respect to these three areas and the need for improvement.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Val Krage
Name of Program: WI Grad Post-Baccalaureate Education

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Because the State of Wisconsin has identified the edTPA portfolio as an authentic assessment of pre-service teacher proficiency, setting a cut (passing) score of 38, we have aligned our assessment work with this measure of content mastery. The lowest average score of the 15 rubrics was 2.5 on rubric 8, *Deepening Children’s Learning*, which refers to the pre-service teacher’s ability to respond to children in a manner that promotes a deeper understanding of language and literacy, and 2.5 on Task 13, *Children’s Understanding and Use of Feedback*. We continue to address these components of student feedback in our curriculum courses, particularly our secondary methods course.

Our two Spanish education students submitted portfolios that were identified as not scorable by Pearson reviewers, indicating to us that we are not meeting the needs of our language students. We have determined that we need to obtain support for these students from someone with expertise in Spanish language and pedagogy.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

We will continue to work alongside the undergrad program to collect and scrutinize data that reflects pre-service teacher proficiency. We will refine student teaching evaluations in order to collect more thorough data on student mastery of classroom skills and intend to add an objective to each methods addressing the strategy of engaging students in productive discussion and eliciting feedback to guide learning.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

Name of Program: WI Principal License (51)

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

FINAL REFLECTION: During the past two years, we have worked to implement a third indicator of success. In 2017, we piloted a new rubric to assess our Final Reflection paper as part of the culminating Principal Practicum course. After input from instructors in summer 2017, we tweaked the scoring rubric and in 2018 have results that indicate strong consistency across cohorts that the learning and application of the Wisconsin Administrator Standards is meeting our benchmarks. Eau Claire 3.56 (on a 4.0 scale), Middleton 3.4, La Crosse 3.68, West Allis 3.56, Green Bay 3.44. Final Cumulative for Final Reflection 3.53. We have established a benchmark of **3.3. on a four point** scale for this indicator.

Portfolio Assessment: With respect to benchmarks on assessment of the 7 Standards, the results are as follows: Standard One average for all cohorts was 3.83 on a four point scale, much improved over 2017. However, the benchmark for Standard One was only 75% scoring 3.6 or higher and this was lowest of the 7 Standards. There are only two measures of that Standard and many averages landed at 3.5 under the 3.6 benchmark. This was being reviewed this past year as a result of lower scores in the La Crosse Cohort in 2016 and 2017. Standard 2- 88%, 3- 94%, 4- 95%, 5- 86%, 6- 93%, 7- 88%. All meet or are very close to the 90% benchmark. Standard 5 was 87% in 2017 data, and we will continue to review more closely for one more year.

Program Assessment/Evaluation: Results- Standard 1- 94%, St2-95%, St3-93%, Sr4-87%, St5-86%, St6-93% and St7- 95%. Except Standards 4,5 all others are above the benchmark.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- a) In 2018-2019, we will collect results for the scoring of the Electronic Portfolio used to record activities and hours (150) toward the Final Practicum. The rubric has been developed and piloted, and this score will be combined with the new Final Reflection score for completion of the third indicator of success.
- b) Regarding the benchmarks for the WI Administrator Standards 1-7, we will have instructors review Standard 1 the Teaching Standard where there are only 2 scores recorded throughout the program and out of the 41 Essential Questions. This can skew the results so we must determine whether to add three more measures or simply not score Standard One against the benchmarks.
- c) Standard 4 (Management of Learning) and Standard 5 (Relationships with Broader Community) will be the main focus of our work during the next year and for our adjunct training in June 2019. In courses where Standard 5 is taught, instructors will be engaged in online discussions and reviews.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong

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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The 2017-2018 data reveal that our passing rate on the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test average score (265) continues to be greater than the state average (246). Of the 3 students who took the test in this period of time, all successfully passed on their first attempt. Historically, our students' greatest area of difficulty on the exam is in Domain 4 which deals with integration of knowledge and understanding.

In the upcoming redesign of the Reading Specialist 17 program (explained below), we will incorporate more opportunities for students to assess students, create and analyze a data set, and synthesize the information in order to create an instructional plan to meet the needs of their students, particularly in the area of literacy.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In April 2018, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction announced that administrators who possess a current professional (life) license will no longer be required to pass the Foundations of Reading Test. This has had and will continue to have a direct impact on the ways in which we measure outcomes in this area. As a result of this change, our data for this past year does not measure this outcome for all students, nor will it measure this outcome for all students going forward. As a result, new program outcomes will need to be determined during the 2018-2019 academic year. The FoRT is no longer an effective way to measure out program outcomes.

This changes to teacher licensing will give us the opportunity to revisit and redesign our program outcomes and assessments to align with the new structures in place within the state of Wisconsin.

Until these changes are implemented, we plan to follow our current assessment protocol, using the Signature Assignments and FoRT scores to determine whether we are meeting student learning outcomes.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jeannette Armstrong
Name of Program: WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License (WI 316)

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The 2017-2018 data reveal that our passing rate on the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test average score (265) continues to be greater than the state average (246). Of the 61 students who took the test in this period of time, 52 successfully passed the test (85%) on their first attempt. Our students' greatest area of difficulty on the exam is in Domain 4 which deals with integration of knowledge and understanding.

In the upcoming redesign of the Reading Teacher 316 program (explained below), we will incorporate more opportunities for students to assess students, create and analyze a data set, and synthesize the information in order to create an instructional plan to meet the needs of their students, particularly in the area of literacy.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In April 2018, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction announced that teachers who possess a current professional (life) license will no longer be required to pass the Foundations of Reading Test. This has had and will continue to have a direct impact on the ways in which we measure outcomes in this area. As a result of this change, our data for this past year does not measure this outcome for all students, nor will it measure this outcome for all students going forward. As a result, new program outcomes will need to be determined during the 2018-2019 academic year. The FoRT is no longer an effective way to measure out program outcomes.

This changes to teacher licensing will give us the opportunity to revisit and redesign our program outcomes and assessments to align with the new structures in place within the state of Wisconsin.

Until these changes are implemented, we plan to follow our current assessment protocol, using the Signature Assignments and FoRT scores to determine whether we are meeting student learning outcomes.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic

Name of Program: WI Superintendent License

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

The Final Reflection rubric has been completed and was used to score the Superintendents taking the Practicum in spring 2018. Instructor Kember reports a 3.6 average on a four point scale for 11 students taking the course. This will become part of the scored data for the 2019 report.

Portfolio Assessment: Scores improved in Standard 5 (Relationships with Broader Community) which was a goal for this year. Instructors met in June 2017 and discussed their assessments related to this standard. We did not make any changes to the Essential Questions as we had projected, but will continue to keep that as a short term goal.

Standard 6 Integrity, Fairness and Ethics in Learning scored at 90% and met benchmark in 2017 and 100% in 2018, which was previously lower and a goal from 2016 and 17. Closed Loop.

Standard 4, The Management of Learning scored below benchmark at 80%.

Program Assessment/Evaluation: Once again, a small sample size, but all Standards were at 100% and the comments on the program continue to be most favorable regarding the design, the curriculum, and the instructors' knowledge and experience.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- a) Specific review of Superintendent I and II curriculum and Essential Questions. Both instructors will meet this year to make recommendations that reflect school finance and state budgeting inclusion to assessments and Essential Questions.
- b) We will assess Standard 4 more closely to see if this lower score for 2018 was a result of a small sample size or something we need to review in our instructional practices or assessments.
- c) Due to budget constraints, we had to cancel our adjunct summer training for the Superintendent adjuncts. We are committed to alternate year training so we will do a thorough review of Essential Questions in all courses during the year using online platform and during our June 2019 adjunct training.

School of Humanities

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sherri Lisota

Name of Program: Art

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Last year we focused on implementing a senior level assessment method for each of seven Art program outcomes. We conducted senior reviews, and developed a senior level review rubric for collecting assessment scores in each category, taken from our assessments of the Senior Exhibit and the Senior Research Paper. We began assessing seniors in the spring 2018 semester. Results indicate that seniors are meeting at least competent levels of achievement in each outcome area.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019 we will continue to collect results at the senior level through the Senior Exhibit and the Senior Research Paper in order to begin to identify trends for the next four years. We will continue to work on making clearer the alignment between program outcomes and the sophomore and senior review rubrics. Also, as Art is in a teach-out process beginning this fall, our primary focus for assessment work for this year may involve art and/or art education concentrations in a new liberal studies major.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Apryl Denny

Name of Program: English

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Background:

We are pleased to see that our new curriculum is working well. Nearly all students are achieving the expected skills at expected levels of development. Also, our new curriculum guarantees that students are being taught all the required skills at three levels of development in one class or more—a problem that our portfolio system never addressed. Formerly, when students failed to attain a skill, we had a hard time pointing out where the process went awry. The portfolio simply judged whether students attained a particular skill, not whether and where they were learning and practicing it in our program. Our most recent program review advised us not to have so many assessment points, but now that the embedded assignments and rubrics are in place, assessment is much quicker and cleaner than it was when we were using a portfolio method.

Our goal from the beginning of the assessment process has been to use the system to do two things—to evaluate the program’s effectiveness, but also to allow students to see their progress at three points of their growth toward developing important skills. Because we have very few majors, we cannot offer all-majors classes that teach every skill at every level. Our 300-level courses contain mostly non-majors. This means that we lack common assessment points for our program and our students. Consequently, we have developed one rubric for use in multiple classes. The problem with this process for program assessment is that students sometimes get evaluated twice or more. For example, if a student takes more than one literature survey, for example, s/he gets evaluated and “counted” twice. The up-side for student growth is that s/he gets plenty of practice and feedback and has an opportunity to attain skills s/he may have failed to achieve in a previous course without repeating that course.

Assessment Results:

Our 2016-17 assessment shows that students attained the skills expected at the basic and developing levels. Our new assessment program is still so young that we have only just begun to measure students at the third level of development (competency), but the results for this level are proving positive as well. The one course where students failed to attain expected skills was ENGL 255. This course, the midpoint for English assessment, is packed with assignments and measurements. As a result, students sometimes don’t get to the final polishing stage of revision that we hope for. In other words, requiring too many assignments means that students don’t have time to perfect every one. English teaches writing as a process—from the stage of conception to final draft, and this takes time—lots of it! As a result, more than 80% of students in 255 showed problems with final polish that concern us—a failure to use grammar, mechanics, and style effectively and a failure to use citation form accurately. Since students passed higher-level skills related to conceiving, organizing, and executing an argument effectively in this class, we are inclined to see these detail-oriented problems as fallout from expecting one course to teach and evaluate too many skills. **See below for the particular actions in place for solving this problem.**

2. Plan for 2018-2019

We will continue to evaluate skill development in our courses as they are taught, on an annual or biannual basis. As we revise our major for “viability” in the next year, we will attempt to reduce the number of assessment points and assessment methods in the program. We will modify and continue to use many of our current embedded assessment methods in the new incarnation of the major rather than returning to a portfolio method. As we “teach out” the majors currently in the program, we will follow through with the actions for student success that we have indicated in TracDat (Sept. 2018): ensuring early intervention to make sure students solve sentence-level and citation problems in 255; continuing to monitor the changes made last year to improve students’ close reading skills in 255 (a near miss at 73%, 8 of 11 students); and relocating the assessment point for “comparing two genres” to make sure that every class evaluating the course is suitable to do so. We will also work toward creating clear outcomes for retention and recruitment. We currently have methods for attaining information about retention and recruitment but don’t yet have methods for improving our numbers. This will be part of the process of modification and will take time to clarify, but we expect to have at least one clear method for each goal (for retaining majors and for recruiting two new majors per semester) in place by next year.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Andrew Hamilton

Name of Program: History

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

2017-2018 gave the department the opportunity to assess one major at the introductory level, and 2 students at the senior level.

100% of History majors earned an average grade of C or better on the exams and/or paper assignments in the history survey classes. We had 1 History major taking survey courses over the two semesters and that student earned above a B on all assignments but one, and that single instance seemed to be a fluke as the student was suffering from a severe illness at that point in the semester.

During the year we had two students taking HIST 481, the combined humanities capstone course sequence. Those students satisfactorily met the benchmark criteria set for the research proposal, the oral presentation, and the research paper. One student received an A for the final essay, the other earned an AB.

2. Plan for 2017-2018

The History program came under review in SP 18. The major was determined to be unsustainable and will be discontinued after the current History majors graduate. We have determined three main changes that will result for program assessment:

- 1) Consideration of merging BFSS and HIST assessment units (discussed in earlier notes) will be tabled. BFSS has moved to Education.
- 2) Consideration had been given to reworking the mid-way interview but given the closure of the major it has been decided to administer the midway interview to the remaining students who still need it without any changes.
- 3) Given the closure of the major, teaching HIST 100 The Historian’s Craft is no longer feasible. Waivers will be issued for those students who still need that required course, and the course content will be incorporated into other history curricula where necessary.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Vickie Holtz Wodzak
Name of Program: Liberal Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Both of the students who graduated in 2017/18 successfully completed their projects and their final exercise that asks them to integrate their two areas of study.

Conclusions—no follow up required.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Because this program is being eliminated, there will be no adjustments to assessment.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Michael Lopez-Kaley
Name of Program: Religious Studies

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-18, the Religious Studies department assessed three courses for the majors: RLST 348, Franciscan Theology; RLST 465, Christian Morality; and RLST 481, Senior Seminar. As we do yearly, RLST 160 was assessed on the university level so is assessed by the Core Curriculum office.

In Religious Studies 348, two majors were assessed using the tool of a 10-12 page paper. The goal of achieving a score of 80% or higher on the paper, while covering the outcomes named, was achieved. No action needs to be taken.

RLST 465 assessed two majors, using the tool of a 12-14 page paper. In this particular course, a new book was used, which worked better than the book previously used. The goal of achieving 80 % or higher on the final paper, while meeting the outcomes, especially the outcome of highlighting the common good, was achieved. No action needs to be taken.

RLST 481 assessed two students, with their final 25-30 page paper being the tool used, along with their public presentation of the paper. Both students achieved the intended goal, including drawing in all areas of theological study adequately.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, the department will be assessing five required courses for the majors, presuming there will be majors in the courses: RLST 222: Survey of Biblical Literature; RLST 331: Church History; RLST 343: Theology of Justice and Peace; RLST 425: Christology; and RLST 433: World Religions. All of the above courses are required for the majors in the department. We will also be going through a sustainability review with the intent of keeping the major program at the school.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Vickie Holtz Wodzak

Name of Program: Spanish

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Two students surpassed intermediate/high which is the target for the department. One student is a Heritage Speaker, so he is at the Advanced/Mid level. All students applied the 5 C's and their presentations reflected skills acquired in class-embedded with study abroad and personal experiences.

No action or follow up required.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Because the program is undergoing significant modification, and because all students met or surpassed targets, no additional assessment work is anticipated for 2018-19.



School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Tammy Clark

Name of Program: Biochemistry

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018 and Plan for 2018-2019

We continue to use the assessment to improve curriculum. This year we analyzed techniques and safety, both of which our students are doing well in. As we enter data for Outcome A: Problem Solving, we see that this may be a problem area for the biochemistry students. This is scheduled to be looked at closely next year, so we anticipate changes to improve those outcomes.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Sadowski

Name of Program: Biology

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

This year we focused on the research series (BIOL 397, 498 or 489, and 499), in particular, student ability and perception of their own ability in performing data analyses using statistics. While many outcomes were met (both at the sophomore level and the senior level) we would like to continue to follow and support statistics through our curriculum. In Spring 2018, we will collaborate with the Math department to have a math faculty member teach one credit of our BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution) lab component that focuses on biostatistics. We believe this will create great continuity across MATH 130/230 and BIOL 251, thus better preparing students for data analysis in the research series.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, we will focus on incorporating and developing the AAAS national standards for biology curricula (called "Vision and Change") into our assessment plan.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Sadowski
Name of Program: Biopsychology

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

This year we focused on the research series (BIOL 397, 498 or 489, and 499), in particular, student ability and perception of their own ability in performing data analyses using statistics. While many outcomes were met (both at the sophomore level and the senior level) we would like to continue to follow and support statistics through our curriculum. In Spring 2018, we will collaborate with the Math department to have a math faculty member teach one credit of our BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution) lab component that focuses on biostatistics. We believe this will create great continuity across MATH 130/230 and BIOL 251, thus better preparing students for data analysis in the research series.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In Spring 2018, the decision was made to significantly modify Biopsychology as a major. We plan to change the program name to Neuroscience. We are currently working on curriculum changes informed by other peer and aspirational institutions, as well as, a recently published article on Neuroscience curriculum in the Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education (June 2018).



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Tammy Clark
Name of Program: Chemistry

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018 and Plan for 2018-2019

Our assessment plan is working well. We are using it to find weaknesses in our students. This year we found that clarification of expectations was useful in increasing safety scores. This major has been closed, but many of the assessment methods are also being used for the biochemistry major. We will start to see how this change will impact the assessment of biochemistry major.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Sadowski
Name of Program: Environmental Biology

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

This year we focused on the research series (BIOL 397, 498 or 489, and 499), in particular, student ability and perception of their own ability in performing data analyses using statistics. Unfortunately, we did not have any graduating EBIO seniors this past year, so we could not assess their perception of their statistics ability. We did assess one student in the sophomore level for statistics ability in BIOL 251. We would like to continue to follow and support statistics through our curriculum. In Spring 2018, we will collaborate with the Math department to have a math faculty member teach one credit of our BIOL 251 (Ecology and Evolution) lab component that focuses on biostatistics. We believe this will create great continuity across MATH 130/230 and BIOL 251, thus better preparing students for data analysis in the research series.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In Spring 2018, the decision was made to terminate Environmental Biology as a major. Our main goal is to support our remaining EBIO students until they graduate. We hope to consider changes to the BIOL major (e.g., course offerings) that will make the BIOL major more flexible and attractive to incoming students who may have an interest in environmental biology.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sheldon Lee

Name of Program: Mathematics

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Last year we focused on four of our six outcomes. We looked at deductive reasoning at the lower division level, specifically with our introduction to proof course. We were happy with the results, with 6 of the majors in the course meeting our goals. We looked at technology at both the lower and upper division levels, this time using our new outcome that students be able to write and interpret procedural computer code. Results were mixed at both levels. Some students struggle with this skill, while some are already adept coming in as a freshmen based on previous experiences with technology. We will continue to assess this measure and point out why it is an important skill to our students. We looked at our written communication outcomes at both lower and upper division levels by using graded written assignments, which are designed for students to explain their reasoning behind their answer. Results continue to be mixed at both levels. As observed in previous years, the ability to communicate in written form is heavily dependent on their understanding of the material. We will discuss combining this outcome this with the deductive reasoning outcome, as they are difficult to separate. We assessed independent research at the lower division level. We had slightly modified the way we measured independent research, in order to ensure that students were being assessed on an individual basis, instead of as a larger team of students. We are also measuring the students' ability to truly work independently and avoid using a single source, while putting less weight on the quality of the work itself. To put this in perspective, all six of the students made a perfect score on the presentation, but the independence of research ranged from completely independent to what was essentially a book report.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Here are some considerations for our 2017-18 assessment plan:

- Assess deductive reasoning at the upper-division level in MATH 450 and 420.
- Continue discussion of retention, as we continue to lose majors in the calculus I and II sequence.
- Assess problem solving in MATH 220, 450, and 344
- Continue to ensure that students in MATH 260 are capable of succeeding in upper division courses such as MATH 420. This requires deductive reasoning skills, written communication skills, as well as having a strong mathematical ability.
- Review exit interview results and use to inform our major assessment.
- Since written communication is difficult to assess, we are considering combining this with the deductive reasoning outcome. These two outcomes are difficult to separate in an assessment setting.
- Refine our rubrics for independent research to make clear what we mean by independent work, as well as that we want to target individual students.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Sadowski

Name of Program: Sport Science

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

There were low numbers of Sports Science majors this past year, making assessment difficult. We had no graduating seniors so we could not assess student perception of ability via the senior survey. We focused on assessing understanding of human physiology in the freshmen year. We also updated our retention plan and hope that these efforts will retain our current Sports Science majors.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In Spring 2018, the decision was made to terminate Sports Science as a major. Our main goal is to support our remaining SPSC students until they graduate. We hope that the retention efforts will help support these students and make them feel connected to the Biology department.



2018 Academic Program Assessment Summaries

College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

Assessment Report for the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior: Sept. 2018 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)	09/10/2018	02/21/2018	09/19/2017
BSN Completion	08/30/2018	08/30/2018	08/30/2018
Graduate Nursing	09/04/2018	09/04/2018	09/26/2017
School of Health and Human Behavior			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Criminal Justice	09/24/2018	09/08/2017	09/30/2010
Dietetics CP (2017 Standards)	08/23/2018	08/23/2018	05/17/2017
Dietetics Internship	09/12/2018	09/07/2016	
Family Studies (minor)	05/14/2018	05/14/2018	
Gerontology (minor)	08/24/2018	10/17/2013	
Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling	08/31/2018	08/08/2018	09/25/2017
Psychology	09/07/2018	09/07/2018	09/07/2018
Social Work	09/04/2018	09/04/2018	06/17/2011
Substance Abuse Counseling	09/13/2018	10/20/2017	09/13/2018

School of Nursing

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Toni Wissestad

Name of Program: Nursing BSN

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-18, we focused on one of six outcomes- Health Care Policy at the mastery level. There are three areas of focus under Health Care Policy that are addressed, Policy, Finance and Regulations. The benchmark of 80% of students would have a grade of 80% or better. 100% of students received 80% or better on the assignment. This assignment has been utilized to assess this program outcome for many years and has a long standing history of being an effective assignment to highlight the achievement of this program outcome. There are no recommendations for action or follow-up.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-19, we will be collecting results on all key assignments related to the program outcomes. We will be doing so to establish a firm baseline of all the key assignments associated with the introductory, mid-point and mastery level of the program outcomes. We will also be updating the Total Program Assessment to ensure its alignment with the new/updated 2018 Commission on Colligate Nursing Education (CCNE) Standards & Professional Nursing Guidelines.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Hedrick-Erickson

Name of Program: BSN Completion Program

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Last year we focused on two of our six outcomes: 3) Assimilate professional values of altruism, autonomy, human dignity, integrity, and social justice and 4) Integrate health promotion, disease prevention, and safety principles for individuals and populations.

While assessment data drawn from assignments meets current benchmarks (see p. 3-4), faculty discussed the need to improve formative evaluation by incorporating strategies for mid-point or “developing” the outcome for assessment using valid and reliable tools.

Nursing 340 and Nursing 353 were revised and taught for the first time fall semester, resulting in only minor changes to class scheduling in spring semester. As well, the two courses were taught for the first time in a hybrid format. Students in hybrid classes were surveyed to determine their learning needs. Student’s preferences during face to face classes included (in ranking order): answer questions and troubleshoot needs, learn through lecture, and last was learning through interaction with colleagues.

Implemented Nursing 472, Nursing 476, Nursing 450, and Nursing 451. While Course Assessment and Analysis (CAA) statistical means were all greater than benchmark 4.0/5.0, evaluation will be ongoing incorporating faculty feedback and student comments.

Nursing 315 – Applied Statistics for Healthcare course was significantly revised resulting from BSN-C faculty input and course evaluations to include course outline, online teaching and evaluation strategies, and relevancy to course outcomes in upcoming revised research course; as well, considered the upcoming new nursing research course to assure outcomes would be met with these modifications. CAA showed significant improvements with statistical means results of “course teaching-learning methods supported course objectives” 3.38/5.0 (2016-2017) to 4.43 (2017-2018); “technology was used effectively in this course” 3.59/5.0 (2016-2017) to 4.5 (2017-2018); “textbooks and/or learning materials were used appropriately in this course” 3.29/5.0 to 4.14 (2017-2018).

Nursing 450 and Nursing 451 went through modifications improving the clinical placement process. Primary focus from the prior year included the clinical assignment process. A flow chart was created to show a timeline and steps in the process to be more transparent and improve lines of communication and efficiencies with the clinical coordinator and faculty. The CPPP, Part I assignment was continued without changes; 16% of students received a grade of less than 80%.

Overall program feedback has been consistently meeting benchmarks, with our end of program report means result 6.55/7.0 Likert scale of “overall satisfaction” and 6.53/7.0 “overall learning”. Narrative responses include a few themes of those responding: several commented that the amount of coursework in specific core courses is not as manageable for adult learners, which was a theme in the previous academic year and years past; students also commented that they had positive experiences in nursing classes.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Implementation and evaluation of all newly revised courses, N462, N472, and N476, paying particularly close attention to course evaluations. In addition, utilizing information collected from the mid-program survey.

Curriculum map was updated and assignments determined; will continue to improve assessment measures to assure valid and reliable evaluation results, not including the overall assignment grade, as was done in the past,

rather assuring a reliable index of achievement for the specific program outcome as it is being “developed”, according to our curriculum map.

Final course for updates include Nursing 481 – Professional Nursing Capstone. Narrative evaluation results state this to be a meaningful learning experience with statistical means result from CAA “Course teaching-learning methods supported course objectives” 4.68/5.0. However, will assess this as a final means of program outcome assessment by conducting a literature search of best evidence for end of program capstone experiences to assure meeting accreditation, market, and student needs.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Mary Ellen Stolder

Name of Program: Graduate Nursing

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-2018 we collected assessment data on two outcomes according to our scheduled cycle: Affirm the dignity of life and human diversity AND Advocate for quality outcomes for individuals, families, populations, and systems.

The DNP Project guidelines were reviewed and revised summer 2016 to insure that it serves as an exemplary assignment for evidence of meeting all six graduate outcomes. Accordingly, we collected data with questions specific to the DNP Project in the End of Program Survey. There were a couple of helpful comments, related to more guidance for post BSN students, which we will implement to insure student satisfaction, including webinars and required on-site course meetings.

Evidence from the End of Program Survey, the One Year Alumni Survey, and the NURS 825 course rubric indicates both of these outcomes are surpassing benchmarks. In particular 2018 graduates indicated that they had substantive input into curricular design and experienced meaningful and respectful faculty interactions.

Please see TracDat for specific findings.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019 we will collect results for the next two learning outcomes: Demonstrate ethical leadership and faithful service in their chosen roles and settings AND Utilize technology to impact best practices. 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 the past two years (MBA/DNP Dual Degree) and planned for this year (CRNA/DNP). We will monitor whether curricular sequencing is effective in providing the foundation for students to be successful in the design and execution of their DNP project while making their work manageable. We will continue to explore alternatives for online teaching modalities to attract post MSN applicants. This is a year of major transition, with the influx of two new faculty members with no formal teaching experience. They will need to be oriented to assessment process and to the importance of curricular congruency, sequencing, teaching/learning practices, and the linkage of graduate and course outcomes.



School of Health and Human Behavior

Name of Assessment Coordinator: Ryan Anderson & Marlene Fisher

Name of Program: Criminal Justice

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Since 2017, criminal justice students have been taking SOWK 240 and SOWK 340 for their research sequence. The results indicate criminal justice students particularly struggle with the communication (analytical writing) and research outcomes. Students are meeting all other assessment criteria. Further discussion is needed on how to better prepare criminal justice students in written communication and research skills. A plan of action will be incorporated or developed into other criminal justice courses to improve student's scores in these areas.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

- Continue to execute the 2018 retention plan (plan updated and added to TracDat 9/18).
- Develop and implement a plan to improve upon student's communication outcomes for the literature review assignment in SOWK 240; related to the communication outcome.
- Monitor SOWK 340 research outcomes to see if students not meeting benchmarks was an outlier.
- Develop and implement a plan to better prepare students for the communication and research benchmarks.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Klitzke

Name of Program: Dietetics

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

We submitted a self-study and had a site visit from our accrediting body during this school year. The site visitors gave us compliments on our assessment plan, results, and analysis. We closed our TracDat unit for the years reflected in that self-study and began a new assessment unit. This reduces clutter and helps us to focus on the 2017 competencies for the next seven years. We discovered a fault in our strategy for assessing competencies: we assessed one domain each year; there was one competency that was never assessed because it was new in 2012, but the domain it was in had been assessed in 2011. The ACEND standards now specify that all competencies be assessed every 7 years, and that at least one competency from every domain be assessed every year. Alida drafted a plan to achieve this. We identified only 3 instances where the competencies in the plan were not met. Two were related to difficult student's behaviors that were beyond our control. For one competency, a preceptor marked "not applicable" for a required competency, suggesting that faculty should check mid-semester to assure that preceptors are able to provide experiences to meet all competencies, while there is time for the instructor to provide an alternate experience, if necessary.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

During this school year E*Value will be fully operational in all supervised practice courses. Four of five faculty members have had E*Value training and will be able to begin to decentralize some of the assessment reporting. We are poised to begin streamlining the assessment process, while getting more informative analyses of the data we are collecting. With our fresh slate on TracDat, we are simplifying data reporting and linking supporting documents. This will save faculty time and will provide a safe and handy location for storing the CAA reports that we find to be very useful. In 2018-2019 we will be assessing these CRDNs: 1.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 4.1, 4.4, and CO2.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Maria Morgan-Bathke
Name of Program: Dietetic Internship

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

We have met all of your Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for the 2017-2018 year. This is due to our clearly defining the SLOs to both the interns and preceptors at the beginning of each rotation. We will continue with this practice to ensure SLOs are met each year.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019 we will assess SLOs in each domain as outlined in the attached Excel spreadsheet.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Deb Daehn Zellmer
Name of Program: Family Studies Minor

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Criterion was met for both Learning Outcomes. However the benchmark was barely met for the 2nd outcome “Students will demonstrate an understanding of the opportunities and challenges for families to access and utilize community resources from their disciplinary lenses”. There were four students (30%) who fell below the benchmark. We are unsure if this is really due to not having been exposed to information about community resources in their Family Studies courses or if they simply did not elaborate sufficiently in the assessment essay. This uncertainty about these results is furthered complicated by the small number of respondents (only 12). This outcome will be monitored another year to determine if this is an ongoing pattern that warrants action.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

Continue efforts to collect assessment essays from all graduating Family Studies minors for more confidence in assessment results. Monitor assessment results for the learning outcome “Students will demonstrate an understanding of the opportunities and challenges for families to access and utilize community resources from their disciplinary lenses”. If results fall below benchmark (or barely meet benchmark as was the case in 2017-2018), revisit course content on community resources in courses for the minor.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Anderson-Meger
Name of Program: Gerontology Minor

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

During this assessment cycle we examined Outcome 2 Knowledge. This outcome is measured with looking at the cumulative average of three exams from SOCL 244/344. In the spring 2018 semester, 13 students enrolled in SOCL 244/344. The benchmark was 80% of students will score 80% or better on the cumulative average. 100% of the students earned an average of 80% or better closing the loop of no further action needed.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

The Gerontology minor has been losing courses in the minor. Many have been discontinued or were never offered. The original outcomes for the minor have dwindled to one (Knowledge). Department chairs who have classes offered in the minor will meet fall semester 2018 to examine the viability of the minor and relevant future outcomes.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Debra A. Murray

Name of Program: Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

This is the first cycle utilizing the new assessment plan initiated in the summer of 2017. 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.

For the 2017 /2018 Academic year, the focus was on three of the ten outcomes: *Research and Evaluation, Assessment and Diagnosis*. There are 13 designated assignments. In the majority of assignments, students are meeting the criteria. We have 18 pending actions in five courses: COUN 510 (3) COUN 580 (5) COUN 665 (4) COUN 590 (3) and COUN 550 (3). In COUN 510, 665, and 550 we are working on clarification of exam items and learning modules. In COUN 580 and 590, we are refining the research papers and case studies and will monitor results in the upcoming year. We also have several external methods including site supervisor evaluation for COUN 690, 695, and 696. The ratings for all areas assessed is well above average. There was a slight decline in the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) less than 1 point, this is likely an anomaly, due to a variety of factors, and we will closely monitor future scores. Graduates of the program continue to pass the national exam on the first attempt.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, 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 Steps and Open Loops in all domains. The Core Faculty will continue to utilize at least six faculty meetings at the conclusion and beginning of fall, spring and summer semesters, for assessment efforts.

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



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Liza Ware

Name of Program: Psychology

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

In 2017-2018, we focused on four of our outcomes (1, 3, 4, 5), either continuing to assess methods for which the criterion was not met the year before, or assessing new methods. Psychology majors demonstrated strengths in several areas, meeting criteria for understanding ethical principles and standards (outcome 3), and oral and written communication (outcome 4). Students in our introductory course, PSYC 171: General Psychology, continue to have difficulty meeting the criteria for knowledge of psychology (outcome 1) and career assessment (outcome 5). Overall, we are finding that students more readily meet our learning outcomes at the baccalaureate (upper

division) assessment point compared to the foundational (lower division) point, demonstrating a need for refinement of our teaching and learning strategies at the lower level as well as growth and improvement as students' progress in our major.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2018, we will focus on working towards closing the loop on several outcomes for which our students have yet to meet the criterion. This includes refining assessment methods and teaching and learning strategies for the foundational level of outcome 1 (knowledge of psychology), outcome 2 (research skills), outcome 3 (ethical principles and standards in psychological science), and outcome 5 (career assessment); and the baccalaureate level of outcome 3 (ethical principles and standards in psychological practice). We will also develop and pilot assessment methods for components of outcomes 1, 3, and 4, that we have not yet assessed. As a department, we also need to strengthen our assessment culture so that all instructors are continually reminded of our annual assessment goals and work towards carrying out our stated action plans and gathering follow-up results.



Name of Assessment Coordinator: Jennifer Anderson-Meger

Name of Program: Social Work

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Field Learning Contract Data

Our benchmark for the Learning Contract is a 3.5/5.0. All students in spring 2018 met the benchmark. See Learning Contract spreadsheet in related documents in TracDat for details.

Course Embedded Measures (Explicit Curriculum)

This is the first year of a new assessment framework based on the 2015 Educational Policy and Assessment Standards from the Council on Social Work Education (EPAS/CSWE). Consequently we are not completing any follow up on the previous assessment framework or measures under the 2008 standards.

The following summary highlights competencies (outcomes) that did not meet benchmark during 2017/2018.

Competency 4 Engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research and Competency 9 Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities: Overall competency at 60.00 % for both competencies.

EP 2.1.6b Research informed practice. Assignment: Research paper. Literature review 63.63 (2016/17) fell to 60% in 2018-2019. There were just 5 students to determine the benchmark. Two out of the 5 students got scores below 80%. This competency routinely falls below benchmark.

2. Identify the program's primary focus for assessment work for 2018-2019.

There will need to be concerted efforts in SOWK 340 to increase competencies in research. Faculty discussed whether the issue reflects faculty expectations for undergraduate research outcomes being too high, a potential rubric that is inaccurate for assessing the competency, or the assignment design. We agreed that the issue is a mix of all.

Plan for 2018/2019: We will create a rubric for assessment purposes that places less emphasis on writing mechanics and more emphasis on research outcomes. The rubric will stress the students' ability to find

relevant evidence based articles, draw conclusions from the articles, and apply the findings to practice situations. The two competencies that use the rubric for assessing research outcomes have very similar components so the rubric can be used for both competency 4 and competency 9.



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

1. Assessment Results from 2017-2018

Our substance abuse counseling majors are meeting many of our assessment criteria and we are closing the loop on several outcomes, including the critical thinking in practice component of outcome 2 (research and practice skills), outcome 3 (ethical principles and standards), and the oral and written communication components of outcome 4 (communication skills). Overall, changes to both teaching strategies (e.g., additional in-class discussion, examples, and practice) and evaluation methods (e.g., more refined rubrics that precisely measure learning outcomes) have increased the rigor of our assessment methods while also helping our students meet our learning outcomes. We have also been able to make clearer conclusions about the specific skills that our students are developing and those that are potential areas of needed improvement.

2. Plan for 2018-2019

In 2018-2019, we will refine and evaluate assessment methods and results in courses that were not taught last year but will be this year, including the multicultural component of outcome 1 (knowledge of SAC concepts, principles, and theories), the critical thinking in research component of outcome 2 (research and practice skills). Because this major was recently discontinued and the remaining students will complete the program by Spring 2020, we do not plan to develop additional program-level assessment methods. However, we will continue to make sure that students are meeting course-level outcomes, as well as any core content requirements for courses that also count towards state licensure as a substance abuse counselor.

