

# COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2015-16

*College: College of Health and Human Services*

*Contact: Pat Eber*

*Report Date: February 2017*

**ASSESSMENT**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Contents

Tips and Hints _____	1
SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS _____	2
SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS _____	2
SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS _____	2
SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS _____	2
ATTACHMENTS _____	2

# Tips and Hints

When you **click here** on tip text, the whole tip is selected so that you can revise the placeholder instructional text. Enter text or cut and paste into the form field.

When you **click here and then click enter** on tip text, the whole tip is removed so that you can enter text and format it any way you want or cut and paste into the form field (including tables).

The table of contents updates automatically as you add pages to each section in your document. To see the updates, right-click anywhere in the table of contents and select *Update field*.

## **Report Expectations:**

The finished report should be about 4 -5 pages in length. Include as attachments:

1. Either letters to colleges describing your evaluation of their annual assessment report or the completed Appendix D Rubrics for all departments/programs in your college.
2. Attach all Departmental/Program Annual Assessment reports so that these can be published at <http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/assessment/reports/reports-program.html>.

## **Assistance:**

If at any point you have questions about completing or submitting this report, please contact the [Office of Assessment and Program Review](#).

## SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

<b>Please see attached for full rubrics. Findings summarized below. No data provided for DAST, DHYG, DLT, or HTM programs.</b>				
Criteria	MIRS	HSRV	NURS-UNDERGRAD	NURS-GRAD
SLOs: Clarity and specificity	3	2	3	2
SLOs: Student centered	3	3	3	3
SLOs: Expectation level	3	3	3	3
CURRICULAR MAP: Content alignment	3	3	3	3
CURRICULAR MAP: Student learning dev. of SLOs	3	3	3	2
CURRICULAR MAP: Student engagement	3	3	3	N/A
ALIGNMENT WITH BACCALAUREATE FRAMWORK	3	3	3	N/A
ASSESSMENT PLAN: Relationship between assessment and SLOs	3	3	3	1
ASSESSMENT PLAN: Types of measurements	2	3	2	3
ASSESSMENT PLAN: Established results	3	2	3	2
ASSESSMENT PLAN: Data collection and design integrity	3	3	3	1
ASSESSMENT PLAN: Measures reliability	3	3	3	1

## SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

### **Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):**

HSRV: Replace SLO verbs such as "think" and "understand" with more precise and measurable verbs.

NURS (GRAD): Several SLOs involve having/showing leadership, which is difficult to measure.

### **Programmatic Curricular Map:**

NURS(GRAD): No mastery of SLOs was documented; committee felt a graduate level program should indicate mastery of SLOs in each course.

\*N/A = Committee could not assess due to lack of examples provided

### **Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework:**

\*N/A = Was not included in the program's report

### **Assessment Plan Part 1:**

MIRS: Committee suggests incorporating indirect measures, such as self-assessments

NURS(UNDER): Assessment plan would benefit from including more indirect measures. A map of specific criterion/skills within the program would have also clarified the program's assessment of SLOs.

NURS(GRAD): The program's report did not provide enough information; descriptions of measures were too general and incomplete.

### **Assessment Plan Part 2:**

HSRV: Include benchmark goals, such as the expected class average, for each project/assignment.

NURS(GRAD): No indication of what "meets expectation" means - no criteria given. Not enough information was provided for committee to assess how data is collected and evaluated. No indication of methods for ensuring reliability of findings.

## SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS

This is the first year for this process, so this section is not relevant to the College of Health and Human Services.

## SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The College of Health and Human Services' experience for this year's assessment was mixed. Out of the total 8 programs, 4 opted not to participate for varying reasons, thus limiting our data and overall usefulness of the assessment. However, the quality of assessment for the participating programs was quite strong; the average overall score was 2.72.

The committee feels the assessment process in future years will be more efficient because the necessary templates have now been refined and will be available from process's beginning. The committee is hopeful the Office of Assessment will provide feedback on how to best utilize these assessment reports to improve student learning outcomes.

# ATTACHMENTS

(Program letters, completed assessment rubrics, and program reports all sent in separate emails)