

COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2017-2018

College: College of Arts and Sciences

Contact: Abraham Schwab

Report Date: March 20, 2019

ASSESSMENT
INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs	1
Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments	1
Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings	2
Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions	3
Attachments	4

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

In fall, 2018, departments and certificate programs in COAS were asked to complete assessment reports for 2017-2018 using protocols documented in SD 15-6. The Chair of the COAS Assessment Committee solicited assessment reports from chairs and directors through the COAS Connection Newsletter on October 2nd with a deadline of November 9th. A reminder was sent out to all Department Chairs and Program Directors on November 6th.

Department Program	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	Department Program	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
ANTH	W	R	W	MATH	R	R	R
BIOL	R	R	R	PHIL ¹	---	---	R
BIOL Grad	N	N	N	PHYS	W	R	E
CHEM	R	R	R	POLS	N	N	E
COM	R	R	R	PSY	R	R	R
COM Grad	N	R	N	SOC	W	R	W
CSD	R	N	E	GENST	R	R	E
ENGL	R	R	R	GERN	N	N	W
ENGL Grad	R	R	R	INTL	R	R	R
GEO ¹	---	---	W	LGBT	R	R	R
HIST	R	W	R	PACS	R	W	N
ILCS	N	N	W	WOST	R	R	N

R= Report submitted; N= Report not submitted; E= Extension requested; W= Waiver approved;
¹Department Eliminated

Summary of Results

Nine departments submitted reports for baccalaureate degree programs and one department submitted a report for a graduate program. Four certificate-granting programs submitted reports (Table 1). The Director of Assessment, granted waivers to three departments. Two departments did not submit a report for baccalaureate degree programs, two departments did not submit a report for a graduate program and one certificate-granting program did not submit a report.

Two members of the COAS Assessment Committee reviewed each report. Reviewers used a scoring rubric presented in SD 15-6, Appendix D and each pair collaborated to create one rubric with scores and comments for each department/program report. The comments and recommendations were transcribed to a response letter that was sent to the chairs and directors.

Table 2. Summary of scores of nine departments for each section of the rubric presented in SD 15-6, Appendix D										
Sections	Max Score	Academic Departments								Range
Clearly Stated Student Learning Outcomes (a)	6	5	6	5	4	5	6	5	6	4-6
Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	1-3
Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Learning Experiences (b)	9	8	4/ NA	7	NA /1	4/ NA	4/ NA	9	9	1-6
Systematic Method for Measuring Progress of SLO	15	8	8	11	4/ NA	12	11/ NA	12	15	4-15
Reporting Results - Communication	9	3/ NA	5/ NA	8	2/ NA	NA	6/ NA	8	8	2-8
Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement	6	2	3	4	2/ NA	6	6	2/ NA	2	2-6
Use of Results for Programmatic Change	6	NA	NA /3	4	NA	5	NA /3	6	5	3-6
(a) "Expectation Level" not included; (b) "Student Engagement" not included; NA= Not addressed/Not applicable										

A summary of scores for each of the seven rubric categories is presented for eight baccalaureate degree programs (Table 2). The ninth baccalaureate degree program submitted a non-standard report that, in the words of the reviewers, “could not be evaluated in a meaningful way” using the rubric. Three of eight departments received the maximum score for student learning outcomes, while six programs received maximum scores for alignment with the baccalaureate framework. Only two departments received maximum scores for mapping SLOs to learning experiences. Total scores for systematic method (Assessment Plan) ranged from 4-15 (max), with only one department receiving the maximum score. Of seven departments that reported communicating results in their assessment reports, three received scores of 8 out of 9. Only four departments reported communicating results to stakeholders and

scores ranged from 2-6 (max). Six departments addressed using results for programmatic change, and, of these, three received a score of 5 or 6 (out of 6).

Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments

The COAS Assessment Committee provided formative feedback and recommendations to each academic department and certificate program in the form of a response letter. Content in the letter came from comments that were made on the scoring rubric. The Chair of the Assessment Committee sent letters to respective departments and programs during April 2019. Copies of the response letters are appended and scoring rubrics are on file on OneDrive.

Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

Changes in the review process for 2017-2018 included updating the rubric to more accurately identify the section to which each part of the Rubric should be applied. Additionally, the process of having two reviewers (one new and one experienced) for each report has worked well and will be continued.

Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

In general, the quality of reports submitted in 2017-2018 was good, providing solid evidence for a commitment to assessment by departments and programs. That said, there were a far larger number of reviewers that determined some part of the rubric was N/A to a particular department. This was due to a number of factors: one department gathered no new information this year, another department submitted a non-standard report, and one program submitted an assessment plan for the very first time.

As seems relatively routine, a few departments were advised to write more effective SLOs. The use of the word “demonstrate” without clarification about what that entails remains a consistent pattern. Several departments were advised to document how results of assessment have led (or are expected to lead) to changes in curriculum. Most departments did not have a process whereby assessment results are communicated with “external” stakeholders. Many departments also need more formal ways to set up feedback loops with faculty as well. Only a few departments reported results from activities that were recommended from previous assessment results.

Although the new format and expectations have been in place for four years, the committee recommends providing an instructional meeting for the COAS Assessment Committee early next fall. It may also be of benefit to include Department Chairs and Program Directors at this meeting. There are categories with expectations that are difficult to discern. For example, the “University expectation level” for SLOs and “Student Engagement” for the curriculum map were particularly problematic for those writing assessment reports and for the COAS committee. The COAS Committee will work with the Office of Assessment to arrange such sessions.

As the current documents and reporting formats presented in SD 15-6 were designed for traditional baccalaureate programs, the COAS Committee recommends that different requirements and report formats be created specifically for General Studies, certificate-granting programs, and the three graduate programs in COAS.

Attachments

Response Letters



TO: Robert Gillespie, Department of Biology
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for Department of Biology
Date: January 31, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Biology. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

We note “Clarity and Specificity” would be enhanced if there was a match to the Assessment report for the standard sections that are laid out in the general document, and that we are following in our rubrics.

For the second section, we wondered if the SLO could be phrased in a more "student-centered" way than simply prefacing the list with, "Students will demonstrate... ." Consider “we shall challenge students to engage in the following activities with robust tools of assessment ... to demonstrate ... to locate ... to design ... etc.

We are unclear why SLOs do not exist from biological or natural science societies as this would augment expectation level. BioMaps are said to survey an inventory of knowledge (not skills) are somewhat therefore deficient in assessing some SLO e.g. #3, but other tools such as guided/independent study (paper co-authorship, presentations, etc.) would help fill the gaps.

We suggest that you consider some other sources to help further validate your program:

- Thomas L. Fleischner, Robert E. Espinoza, Gretchen A. Gerrish, Harry W. Greene, Robin Wall Kimmerer, Eileen A. Lacey, Steven Pace, Julia K. Parrish, Hilary M. Swain, Stephen C. Trombulak, Saul Weisberg, David W. Winkler, Lisa Zander; Teaching Biology in the Field: Importance, Challenges, and Solutions, BioScience, Volume 67, Issue 6, 1 June 2017, Pages 558–567. <http://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix036>
- White, H. B., Benore, M. A., Sumter, T. F., Caldwell, B. D. and Bell, E. (2013), What skills should students of undergraduate biochemistry and molecular biology programs have upon graduation? Biochem. Mol. Biol. Educ., 41: 297-301. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.20729>

BioMaps is but one standard assessment tool and appears to be weighted less on Molecular Biology concepts. Our comments should be regarded as both prescriptive and positively constructive in this area.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

We find the associations as useful and well-done. Note that it appears that outcomes #4 and #6 are switched between this list and the SLOs on p. 5.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

We note that SLOs are mapped to one or two classes within the major, but that we did not note any associated activities.

An explanation of what each of the listed classes was and what activities demonstrated the various levels of proficiency could possibly help but more clarity is needed. The term “mastered” was not defined.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

How measures relate to SLO is clear enough.

One helpful part would be to explain when the BioMaps survey is administered. Is it to freshmen or to seniors? Are the measures counted to demonstrate knowledge at the beginning, middle, or end of a student's college career? While these measures demonstrate assessment for senior level classes, it is less clear how the department is assessing the success of learning outcomes in lower level courses.

More than one measure would augment the report for all SLO.

BioMaps was used to detect improvements in SLO #1 in the implementation going forward. There is some discussion of how the "information flow" (Biomolecular) is lagging as a perceived standard. It may be helpful to consult other sources here (see above).

Two faculty rating SLO #3 (paper & poster) is also problematic because of rater variation. More information has been suggested using in-class data and that would be helpful but not yet implemented. We also commiserate with the problem of a less than robust cohort.

When assessing communication - how is this best captured? Is a course available that teaches bio-science information? Working with the library or other experts may help develop such a course. The complexity of searching digital world is beyond a piecemeal approach. This is but one form of competency, yet it encompasses all of SLO #2-#6.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The report states, "We hope to better assess skills and abilities, rather than knowledge of core principles in our 300+ electives. This will allow us to modify course requirements, if necessary, to better develop writing, communication and critical-thinking skills."

Should one wait until senior level to attain a "mastery" or more accurately a "proficiency" level in all areas? Is it feasible to ask at what stage students represent: novice, competent, or proficient in laboratory, for example? This would help expand the number of evaluators in all courses. BioMaps is acceptable but captures not skills as you profess but knowledge.

More classes listed coverage of associated knowledge-base & skills would enhance the report (p. 7).

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Storing information on the O: drive but it is not mentioned the time allotted to review. When does the report reside on the O: drive? Early spring?

There is no mention of providing evidence to other stakeholders, e.g. advisory board etc., but this appears to be a viable option.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The department has boasted the achievement of more in way of SLO but also recognized that changes are needed to be made in assessment to fully assert that the process is working as intended. The Committee would like to see these changes implemented in upcoming years.

Overall Recommendations:

Progress has been achieved in assessment; however, improvements are being implemented, most notably:

- Implementation of knowledge inventory at the senior level needs to be expanded throughout the curriculum to understand where learning gains are improving and/or lacking
- Use of multiple outcomes including post-testing, and guided/independent study projects including senior paper/poster capstone experiences.
- Further in class assessment may be sought to measure the knowledge/skills in specific areas

We agree that the complexity and exponential growth in the scientific literature merits adding an information science (perhaps 1 cr.) course to encompass the digital bio-science library (BIOSIS, MEDLINE, BLAST, GENBANK, WEB OF SCIENCE, SCOPUS, SCIFINDER, etc.).

TO: Chemistry Department
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for
Date: January 4, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Chemistry. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs use descriptive verbs to show clear action and understanding from the student. The SLO's are well integrated with the curriculum map and outcomes which help explain assessment goals.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Nicely stated, particularly with the use of IDM language to explain the increasing complexity of the assessment model.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

Evaluations are both consistent and a clear timeline was followed. In particular, it was gratifying to see that students were reassured their class grade would not be affected by testing results. It is likely beneficial to ameliorate anxiety and establish a pattern for students who continue through the program.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The plan was particularly comprehensive, given its measurement of students at different points in the program. More background or information explaining the identification of appropriate benchmarks would improve reporting.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Reporting is limited since class performance is only impacted by significant gains or unmet benchmarks. The brief nature of this section lacked some historical analysis from the previous year and could include a little more description.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Documents are anticipated to be shared with the advisory board (but not yet an integrated part of the assessment timeline). What stakeholders are represented on the advisory board? None were identified.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The assessment plan is detailed, but may experience change with the introduction of a new major.

Overall Recommendations:

With the addition of the Biochemistry major, is the Chemistry department planning to modify any SLO's?
Change is unnecessary for this first year of the program but may be a consideration for future planning.

TO: Department of Communication
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for Communication Undergraduate Degrees
Date: January 30, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Communications. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Overall the SLO's are well written. However, in the MMNR concentration, Section I, pp. 12-13, Student Learning Outcomes 8 through 14 are stated as Methods of Assessment instead of SLO's, notwithstanding the note added on the report and highlighted in green on page 11. The same is true for SLO's 8 through 13, p. 15, in the RPAD concentration. SLO's 8-14, pp. 12-13 and SLO's 8-13, p. 15 are centered on the Method of Assessment instead of on the student learning objectives.

It is not currently clear to the committee how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The tables combining the alignment of SLO's with the baccalaureate framework and curricular map are complete and helpful to anyone reviewing what the students should achieve for their degrees and what the curriculum provides. The only deficiency concerns progression of student learning which is stated in the next section.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The committee understands what an undertaking it has been for the Communications department to develop assessment procedures for new concentrations while continuing to report on the assessment of the previous concentrations. The Communications Undergraduate Assessment Committee has considered how they plan to include student progression through the curriculum by designating courses as I(ntroductory), P(roficient), and A(dvanced). Hopefully these will be provided in the next assessment report.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The department's methods of assessment for SLO's are very good overall.

Regarding "Established Results", the Communication Assessment Undergraduate Committee has considered the COAS Assessment Committee's recommendations in 2017 regarding a) the provision of detailed time lines for completion of Portfolios and b) proportional numbers of portfolios according to each one of the concentrations within the Communication major. This information will be reported in 2019, given that the portfolios are assessed every other year. Given that exit interviews are also due to be assessed in 2019 and alumni and employer interviews are only due to be assessed in 2020, there is no report about these. Nonetheless, goals for student achievement of the SLO's should be stated even if they must be amended later. In Section VII, some of the proposals relate to reliability measures. However, they should appear here and in greater detail.

Note to Communication Assessment Undergraduate Committee: in Appendix B, pp. 39, 45, 50, 68, 76 your sentence "The student has been assessed ... learning outcomes" is there twice. Please delete once. In Appendix C, p. 83, question 6, add "free" after "feel". Why does the numbering start again from 1 on p. 84, given that these are still questions for all students?

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

No results are included in this year's report. Assessment will only be due in 2019 (Portfolios and exit interviews) and 2020 (alumni and employer interviews).

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

On page 34, exit surveys, for the second bullet point referring to 2017 assessment report, you might want to say "is available" instead of "will be available" - if it is in fact available.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The Communications department has clearly considered how to address results expected in 2019 and 2020. They have proposed mechanisms by which data will be collected, analyzed, and changes implemented, if warranted. The score given is 2 since only proposals have been provided, but this will probably become 3 in the future 2019 and 2020 assessment reports when action is taken.

Overall Recommendations:

The committee recognizes the effort required to develop assessments for the new concentrations while continuing the collection of assessment data for the previous concentrations. It is understandable that data for the new assessments will not become available until 2019 and 2020. The SLO's for the MMNR and RPAD concentrations still need to be included. The progression of student learning through the curriculum map still needs to be added. Goals for student achievement of SLO's should be established and included in the report. Measures of reliability should be described in Section IV and in further detail.

TO: Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for Department of Communication Science Disorders
Date: March 15, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Communications Sciences and Disorders. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

We note "Clarity and Specificity" would be enhanced if there was a match to the Assessment report for the standard sections that are laid out in the general document, and that we are following in our rubrics (i.e. Table on page 1 needs numbering).

We wondered if the SLOs could be phrased in a more "student-centered" way than simply prefacing the list with, "Students will demonstrate."

Regarding the section "Expectation Level," the committee has determined that it is not clear how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports and for the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

SLO #3 & 4 aligns with critical thinking.

SLO #4 less aligned with personal values etc., but also is critical thinking by demonstrating correct use of language tools?

Measures via Bb not clear as how approving organizations have vetted the assessments & metrics.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

As we note on the rubric, it appears mapping in some cases inappropriate for SLO #3, #4 and #5.

One of the foundation areas (Communication) is not included as aligned.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

A useful curriculum map is provided but the use of Bb (Blackboard etc.) to assess each SLO and to detect how progression is not clear. The number of CSD 549 students is needed to determine the extent of clinical based experience. We assumed a clinic-based experience is initiated on small scale using the "case study" mode or perhaps this is done using Bb - it is difficult to determine without more detail. It appears however that more direct measures are needed.

We were not clear how these measures relate to the achievement of different levels of proficiency in SLO per peer organizations.

We note that there was nothing indicating progression of learning or benchmarks to be met, nor was there any distinction between introductory courses, core courses, upper level, etc. We also did not find evidence of student engagement.

We question the reliability of Bb and how the assessment tool devised? Where external sources consulted, e.g. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)?

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The report seems to recognize the need for more direct assessment. The newness of the program appears to make it impossible to draw any real conclusions - this is developing.

The report states "Because this was the first year this assessment was used, the overall data meet departmental expectations; however, as described below *in* chances (changes) to this measure are planned that will allow for a more complete evaluation of learning throughout the curriculum." Here it is not clear what expectations were and how they were met.

Rather than give this "current knowledge" tool in every class it is suggested it be given no more than two to three times and in the same class to capture the proficiency level. The use of 5 questions per course might appear adequate but very high stakes in question selection - again it would be useful to have normed exam materials from peer and/or accrediting organization.

We did find sufficient description of how CSD felt their assessments met the learning objectives but more direct evidence is warranted. We have a few additional comments on the rubrics page concerning Bb exams, numbering SLO, client surveys and grad surveys.

Acceptance rates, exit interview, and client survey need to be augmented with more direct measures, e.g. ideally an external standardized metric if one exists (see ASHA perhaps). We were concerned that no national society data is available.

The way clinical performance is assessed seems arbitrary. We see "case studies" at varying degrees of sophistication could be used to assess performance of students in diagnosing prospective clients with communication disorders.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The newness of the program appears to make it impossible to draw any real conclusions - this is developing.

Historical results scored a 1, because prior results were not offered in this report (newness of program, etc).

Results were presented, but they were not matched to SLOs.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The newness of the program appears to make it impossible to draw any real conclusions - this is developing.

The discussion of the report on 11/7/2018 was late as a target date to get meaningful feedback particularly for a new program. The spring 2019 review date appears appropriate. It is suggested that the report appear on the drive (O drive, etc) for faculty comment and review by April 2019 and discussed by the department.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The newness of the program appears to make it impossible to draw any real conclusions - this is developing.

The "high rates of acceptance" in graduate study is regarded as a measure of preparation. Further evidence could be obtained concerning the reputation of the programs accepting these students (please include).

The alumni survey may help identify deficiencies, if any and identify perceived meritorious elements. Other community stakeholders should be consulted.

Overall Recommendations:

We note that the program is newer and developing but going forward we can make some recommendations:

- The elucidation of the aim of the program would be most helpful. We suggest that you clarify who the prospective audience is and how this program targets their needs.
- We believe a more "student-centered" SLO would be useful to again help understand the programmatic goals.
- We note that the omission of "communication" in the IPFW framework was surprising but should be easily addressed by a namesake department.
- We believe the SLO would be strengthened by comparing result to peer institutions and adoption national society standards.
- We also note that assessment of clinical performance could be augmented and amplified by using "case studies" that could help assess the students' performance.

TO: Department of English
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for English Graduate degree
Date: January 22, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of English. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The committee finds that the SLOs are rather general. Would it be possible to write them with some more detail?

Regarding expectation levels, currently, it is not clear to the committee how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The baccalaureate framework is not applicable to the graduate program.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

We see that the curriculum map is provided in appendix B and that the map has descriptions that include both activities to engage the students and progression of learning. While only 4 courses are listed, it is stated that some courses had to be cancelled causing changes in the normal procedure.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The assessments of the SLOs in the essays provide no detail of how they were scored. The scores appear to be essentially grades since there is no indication of what the students achieved or failed to achieve. Would it be possible to include further explanation of the assessment of the SLOs so that it becomes clear what the scores correspond to?

Regarding the survey applied, understandably it is of limited value since there was only one respondent.

With respect to Established results, Data collection and design reliability, and Evidence of reliability of measures, it is difficult to rate these categories above 2 given the lack of detail about the assessment method. Specifically, no established results are stated. Moreover, regarding the sample, how was the size of the sample decided? How many total M.A. essays were there available and why 10 was chosen as the sample size? How are the measures reliable?

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Presentation is given a score of 2 for the same reasons the scores were 2 under "Systematic Method for Measuring Progress ...", that is, a lack of detail.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Neither of these were addressed for Reporting Results. From what we can see in the report, there was no sharing of document or results with stakeholders.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The English Graduate Gen Ed Assessment committee is to be commended for their self-recommendations toward Programmatic and Curricular Improvement and for their critical evaluation of their assessment process, as well as for the detail with which they suggest specific changes to the assessment process.

Overall Recommendations:

Regarding the statement of SLOs, we recommend that more detail is added. With respect to the assessment of SLOs, further explanation of how this was conducted seems necessary – the scores are not self-explanatory. Moreover, we recommend that further detail is added to the sections Data collection and design reliability, and Evidence of reliability of measures.

Lack of detail is also impacting how the committee can score the reporting of results. We recommend that results are shared with stakeholders at different levels.

We commend the English Graduate Gen Ed Assessment committee for their self-recommendations toward Programmatic and Curricular Improvement, for their critical evaluation of their assessment process, and for the detail with which they suggest specific changes to the assessment process.

TO: Department of English
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for English B.A.
Date: January 21, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of English. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The Committee understands that the department's assessment procedures are currently a work in progress. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity. Nevertheless, we find that the SLO's are rather broad. Given that you mention that AACU rubrics are being used, your report would be strengthened if the rubrics in detail could be outlined and referenced in this section.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

This is sufficient as it is currently written and aligned. Nevertheless, on p. 2, Gen SLO 3 for all English majors, we think Application of Knowledge should be included among the Baccalaureate Framework Goals in the middle column, given that the students will be able to use tools of research.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The Committee commends the department for the process of updating its assessment procedures. It is understandable that this is a work in progress. Nevertheless, we would like to point out that, although SLO's have been mapped to specific courses, there are no indications of the progression of student learning through the curriculum. Normally departments indicate this by producing a matrix of SLOs vs. course numbers. For each SLO, a course is marked as either addressing it or left blank if it does not. To indicate progression or development of student learning in the matrix, the course can be marked as introductory (I), proficient (P), or advanced (A) to specify the level of mastery the students are expected to achieve. Alternatively, the course could be designated as Introduced, Emphasized, or Reinforced in each of the courses. Other descriptors can be used.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The relationship between assessment and SLO's is rated 2 merely because SLO 2 is being developed at this point and is not present. As stated earlier, the broad SLO's would benefit with a description of the AACU rubrics. Once this is accomplished, this rubric will be easily rated as 3. Since multiple papers and projects will be assessed, it is possible that the portfolio will contain more than 1 direct measure for the SLO's.

The problem cited concerning the alignment of SLO's and exit survey questions is a common one seen in the assessment reports of other departments. English is to be commended for recognizing the problem and considering how to address it.

Later in the report, the problems observed with only two raters per portfolio are stated. Adding a third person to review a given portfolio and making comparisons to a normed portfolio have been suggested by the department as solutions. Regarding the Evidence of Reliability of Measures, the score of 3

responds to the fact that a solution was suggested for the problem that was identified. Please make sure that you do find a solution (either norming, as you suggested or something else) for the problem mentioned on p. 10, under Discussion of individual student averages, paragraph 2.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

We commend the change from 2.0 to 3.0 as the average for success.

We understand that historical results cannot be produced at this time because the department started now assessing portfolios and these cannot be compared with the single assessments used in the past.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Very good involvement of stakeholders.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The first part of this section has been rated N/A because new assessment procedures are still being developed. The current development of new assessment procedures is the result of the improvement of the assessment process.

Overall Recommendations:

While the Committee understands that the department's assessment procedures are currently being updated, we recommend that

- The AACU rubrics that you are using be outlined and referenced in section I
- You consider the convenience of adding Application of Knowledge among the Baccalaureate Framework Goals for Gen SLO 3 in section II
- You add indications of the progression of student learning through the curriculum in section III
- Either norming or a third rater – or both procedures – are added to the rating process described in section IV

TO: Julie Hook, Director of General Studies
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for General Studies
Date: February 2, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Women's Studies Program. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs for the General Studies Degree are, by nature, very "general." Is it possible to identify any program-specific SLOs? SLOs should also be composed in a manner that was more "student-centric," laying out precisely what students are expected to know and do. It would be very helpful to number the items in this section.

Regarding expectation levels, currently, it is not clear to the committee how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

While it seems that the SLOs align with the Baccalaureate Framework, there is no explicit attempt to align them.

It is not clear how the statement "assess arguments and compare and evaluate them with arguments" (SLO 3) aligns with personal ethics. Ethics deals with personal responsibility and fairness whereas above phrase aligns only with critical thinking. The Committee also found SLO 5 overly vague and problematic in its ontological references. This SLO should be clarified or eliminated.

The Committee recommends that this program have a look at an assessment that has done this well in order to see how to improve for next year.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The Committee offered a score of NA for the content alignment, given that GEN does not have core classes. The report clearly, and most rightly, states that the diversity of courses allowed to complete the General Studies degree program preclude a curriculum map. The listing of course numbers is still needed.

A capstone (EDUC 400) was added. This is good but high stakes to cover many SLO and late career - ca. 50 students out total not given.

The assessment report should give an indication or at least an example of how progression is envisioned through the program. Along these lines, the Committee was not clear what course(s) represent(s) engagement.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The relationships between the SLOs and the assessment strategies remain largely unarticulated.

Descriptions of outcomes need to more precisely match the SLOs. We recommend a newly created three outcome assessment tool which covers all eight SLOs. As stands, one high stakes assessment in the senior year is not ideal for measuring progress in the various outcomes.

There also need to be indirect measures in addition to the direct measure of assessing the Capstone course. A suggestion of an indirect measure is a survey of graduates, as many other departments are currently undertaking.

There are questions concerning in the number of raters and how ratings from novice to highly proficient are made. Metrics and rubrics are needed to draw any meaningful conclusions at this point.

The Committee recognizes the unusual character of this B.A. which poses difficulty in measuring outcomes for all of the different courses accepted.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Since this is the first iteration of any type of assessment and so it is not possible to make any meaningful connections. Again it is notable that there is no discussion of rating process within the department. We would like to see numbers of faculty who have an interest in the program and in helping to evaluate results.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee would like to see specifics on how information is shared (O drive, etc), and also would like an explanation as to who the program's stakeholders are.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

Since this a first time effort there is nothing to report.

There are no prospective changes noted.

Overall Recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the GEN program meet with Kent Johnson or with leaders of the assessment process for other departments to get a sense of what a strong assessment looks like. Simple things such as numbering SLOs would help to start, but there also needs to be more concerted effort in evaluating the program at an earlier stage than the final 400-level capstone. We also recommend greater effort put into explaining how data is collected and evaluated, and who the program's stakeholders are.

TO: David Shuster, History
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for
Date: December 27, 2018

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of History. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs are generally defined. They could be clearer (and so easier to assess) if they included more specificity. For example, a definition of “evidence based analytical arguments” or perhaps a contrast with arguments that are not “analytical” would be clearer and easier to assess the demonstration of. Further, the qualities for which students will be able to assess sources for would further clarify the SLO.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Well explained.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

SLO and Student Learning development would be more clearly linked by a clearer articulation of the progression of students across courses. For example, the progression of students through the various levels of assessment seems to be distinguished primarily by the length of the paper that they write. Should the quality of analysis and arguments also improve? Additionally, there is some ambiguity about the nomenclature of the assessment progression: the term "tackling" is used to describe the 2nd tier, but is then used to describe student activities in all three tiers. A definition of "tackling" would improve the description and a clearer demarcation of the progression in student skills would improve the link between the SLOs and student development.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

The methods of measurement would be improved through addition of second measure. Additional improvement could be achieved through clearer distinction between 1st and 2nd tier development. Finally, no desired results are identified, no other method for evaluating progression between the tiers of development are described, and no methods of data collection are described. Regarding the latter point, is the assessment of all the papers in each of the courses, the papers of only history majors, or some other set?

Also, consider replacing "comprehension" of the SLO with "demonstrates achievement" of the SLO. It's plausible that students will comprehend the SLO but fail to demonstrate the skills described in the SLO.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The results are reported clearly, but the method of finding the results is not articulated in the report.

Additionally, no interpretation of the results is included in the report.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The only plan for dissemination included in the report is to send the report to the Department Chair. Given that the various stakeholders (departmental faculty and others) may have feedback on the assessment plan, assessment report, and future directions, this responsibility should be tackled by the Department's Assessment Committee.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

All the discussions of programmatic changes in this section are prospective, using language that suggests that no assessment has been done. This suggestion is obviously belied by the rest of the report.

Overall Recommendations:

The report has the foundations of a good report in future years, but in its present form there are gaps in the information included, it lacks any interpretation of the results of the assessment exercise, and the discussion of programmatic changes seems to be from a plan to assess more than from a report on the assessment exercise.

TO: Lachlan Whalen
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for the International Studies Certificate
Date: January 4, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of XXXX. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs are adaptable to each elective to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the program. They could be made more active, by rewording the verb in each SLO to focus on the outcome.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

While it is was a bold and aggressive claim that all SLOs match up with all sections of the Baccalaureate Framework, the accompanying rationale was convincing.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

We appreciated the argument to assess only original work. There is a concern to continue the work begun by using excerpts from INTL 200 into upper level courses. Although it is understood that this would be difficult to accomplish and require a significant curriculum change, perhaps a portfolio or some capstone project for the certificate would indicate another core sampling for developed growth.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

Do we know that students who have taken WOST 301, during years it was assessed, had previously taken INTL 200? It is understood that much effort was given to try and recruit original artifacts from an advanced course. Perhaps a contingency could be implemented as a survey or request to students directly for programmatic feedback?

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Appreciating the plight and threats to existence that plague smaller programs, communication between departments remains vital. The assessment analysis indicates that more resources are needed to support student learning.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Please specify how results are shared with faculty who teach INTL. The recent changes have undoubtedly hurt small departments. Could new partnerships be developed with Purdue's main campus and the women's studies department and other interdisciplinary programs there?

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

Strong analysis of the department's changes, recent adaptations and outlook. Although additional adaptation may be necessary, specificity in identifying what other courses or partnerships INTL can use to continue furthering the assessment cycle would be helpful.

Overall Recommendations:

The current assessment plan is detailed, unique, and allows a lot of freedom for individual students to display learning. The concerns brought with completing the assessment process this cycle given recent challenges and changes to the INTL program are telling. If you would like assistance in preparing for next year's assessment, you may contact the COAS Assessment committee.

TO: LGBT Certificate Advisory Committee
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for LGBT Studies Certificate
Date: January 18, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of LGBT Certificate Advisory Committee. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

We have found that the Student Learning Outcomes are clear and specific and that they are student-centered. However, we recommend that they be stated in section I as you have them in section II. Moreover, while a rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity, it would be helpful to elaborate what is included under citizenship skills.

Currently, it is not clear to the committee how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

We have found that the SLOs are aligned with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

We have found that the SLOs have not been mapped to any planned learning experiences in the Academic Program Curricular Map. We understand that this is so because of the nature of an interdisciplinary program such as this one. We recognize that different students can fulfill the requirements through different sets of courses and that it would be impractical to list every possible option. Nevertheless, we think that some examples could be added so that the link between SLOs and learning experiences in specific offered courses becomes clear. It would be helpful if some of the most likely courses to be used by students to achieve the SLO's were listed in the curriculum map. If that is not possible, perhaps some examples could be included. Then it could be noted that other courses are possible.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

We have found that there is no systematic method for measuring progress toward the accomplishment of the SLOs and we understand that this is due to the low number of students and the fact that they, due to the interdisciplinary nature of the program, took different paths towards completion. Thus, only one direct measure is used so far (assessment of a reflection on the portfolio).

We recognize that with only two certificate graduates who took different paths towards completion, it would be difficult to assess the program. The WOST Certificate program has similar problems albeit not as severe. They have developed rubrics for assessing projects and papers within portfolios. They have matched SLO's to the content within portfolio projects. Perhaps their approach could be modified for assessment within your program. Regarding the desired results it should be possible to develop a set of

these. WOST's assessment rubrics could be a model for how this can be accomplished. By referring generically to the SLO's, it may be possible to avoid confidentiality issues. We trust that a sufficient number of papers and projects will be in the portfolio to provide more than one direct measure for each SLO.

It may be worthwhile to develop an exit survey for future students who will obtain the certificate. Numbers may be low, but individual responses may provide useful insights. Since some surveys are sent out every five years to all alumni, the previous graduates could be eventually contacted.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The assessment instrument was recently developed and no students have been assessed with it yet.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The assessment instrument was recently developed and no students have been assessed with it yet. With the lack of results currently available, the current ratings can only be N/A. However, a plan for reporting results to faculty and other stakeholders should be included in the report. Also, is it possible to share results beyond the committee of 3 faculty? Is it possible to identify other stakeholders within the community? Would it be possible to establish a community advisory board?

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

The assessment instrument was recently developed and no students have been assessed with it yet.

Overall Recommendations:

If possible, list in the curriculum map some of the most likely courses to be taken by students to achieve the SLOs.

In order to make available more direct measures for each SLO, the WOST Certificate program might serve as a source of ideas. They have developed rubrics for assessing projects and papers within portfolios and they haven't matched their SLOs to the content in the portfolio projects and papers.

We recommend that you develop a set of desired results. We also think that it may be worthwhile to develop an exit survey for future students who will obtain the certificate. Notwithstanding the low numbers, individual responses may provide useful insights.

Lastly, we think that a plan for reporting results to faculty – beyond the committee - and other stakeholders should be included in the report. We recommend identifying other stakeholders within the community and possibly establishing a community advisory board.

TO: Department of Mathematics
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for Department of Mathematics
Date: January 22, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Mathematics.

Mathematics is in the process of developing new programs mandated by factors external to the department and the result of institutional and student needs: the B.S. in Actuarial Science and the B.S. in Data Science and Applied Statistics. The “pure” math and teaching option were combined into one B.S. program where students interested in teaching mathematics will now double major in education. Understandably, this requires that new assessment plans be developed. Such plans are currently under discussion. The Mathematics department did not provide a standard assessment report. Instead it provided assessment activities up to 2017 and proposals for future assessment activities aligned with their new degrees.

Since it will not be possible to provide ratings based on the college assessment rubrics, we will comment on past and planned assessment. We suggest that the Mathematics department refer to the 2017 COAS Assessment Committee response letter and address the comments within it as they develop assessment plans for their new programs. Although this suggestion would generally apply, they are significant since the department indicated that a large portion of its SLO’s and assessment methods could carry over to the new degrees.

The Mathematics department acknowledges the ineffectiveness of its old assessment plan and cites that the Program Review process has set a high-priority, short-term Goal of developing a new assessment plan (page 2, section 2). A problem cited in previous assessment reports was the small sample sizes for assessments due the low number of majors in any given course or year. The department proposed that the learning of other STEM majors also be assessed with math majors in the core courses where both are present. Although it may not be ideal, it is probably the best possible solution to generate more meaningful assessment of learning outcomes for those courses.

The Mathematics department outlined proposals in its assessment report that have the potential to be quite effective. Insufficient details were provided to adequately judge them which may be due to the fact they are still under current discussion. The following comments were addressed by the report in some cases. They are included here as areas the reviewers considered salient. The use of online homework should be able to generate a relatively large amount of data without burdening faculty. There was no elaboration of number of questions to be used, how they would be aligned with SLO’s. Evaluation of high impact experiences is very good to assess but how will it be done in a systematic manner that can be related to learning outcomes? Maybe developing a survey containing material from the SLOs for students to fill in after each of their high impact experiences should be added. The use of professional exam results would be valuable to the program. Will only single overall scores be available, or will it be possible to obtain more granular data such as results in specific topics? The former may be the only data available but will nonetheless be valuable. The only area that appeared problematic was the assessment of the mathematics and education dual majors. First destination also could be valuable, but no details were given. Since the old mathematics teaching option will now be a dual mathematics and education major, it is perhaps best that the assessment of education courses be left to the School of Education. Nevertheless, we would like to point out that the idea of using student-teaching as one of the high-impact experiences to collect data for assessment is a very interesting one.

The sources of data identified in section 2.D. seem very promising, especially the idea that combines Gen Ed assessment goals with recruitment strategies and new lines of communication with external stakeholders.

TO: Craig Ortsey, PACS
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for
Date: December 27, 2018

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Peace and Conflict Studies Certificate Program. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SLOs are clearly stated and seem comprehensive. Consider combining some of the SLOs. At present, it seems that there is some significant overlap between the SLOs and there are a comparatively large number in contrast to other departments and programs. As the assessment plan is executed, it may turn out that incorporating and evaluating all these SLOs will prove quite difficult.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

While it is possible that all of the SLOs match up with all sections of the Baccalaureate Framework, this seems implausible in some cases (e.g., that SLO 6: “Articulate how social change occurs” involves the “acquisition of knowledge”). The connection between each SLO and its match to various parts of the Baccalaureate Framework needs to be articulated more clearly.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

Similar to the concerns mentioned under Section I, the plan is very aggressive in terms of the number of SLOs represented in nearly every class. It may be more feasible to limit the number of SLOs claimed for an assessed in each course.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

Given the preliminary nature of the plan, we expect that as the plan is implemented the assignments (or range of assignments) that will be used to assess SLOs will become more clearly defined. Related, the desired results for the assessments will become more clearly defined as the assignments (and the related rubrics of evaluation) become more clearly defined.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

N/A

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

N/A

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

N/A

Overall Recommendations:

The PACS Assessment plan includes aggressive and comprehensive SLOs and endeavors to connect these to the Baccalaureate Framework. It includes the foundation for identifying classroom artifacts for assessment, which in turn will help set desired goals for assessment of these artifacts.

TO: Carol Lawton, Chair, Psychology Department
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for
Date: April 2, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of History. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

SLOs rely heavily on "demonstrations" but lack clarity and specificity of these demonstrations. The SLOs would be improved by clarifying the demonstrations (e.g., will these be demonstrations be memorization, application, integration, etc.)

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

SLOs are aligned to the foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

All SLOs are mapped to specific courses and within these courses the progression of learning was clear (introduced, emphasized, reinforced).

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

SLOs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 are assessed using only one measure. Providing an additional, even indirect, measure would be an improvement.

The Established Results section should include desired results.

It does not appear that any data was collected for 2017-2018, or, more likely, the year was not changed for the MFT in this section.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Interpretation of Results could be more robust, particularly for the few sections of the MFT in which scores or percentile ranks have been inconsistent.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The sharing of results with faculty appears to be provided "for information only". A more formal feedback loop would improve stakeholder involvement.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

In some ways, this cannot be assessed because of the ongoing success of students who achieve high scores on the MFT.

The report promises a search "of assessment measures maintained by the APA" for other useful measures. This provides an important opportunity for ongoing improvement of assessment tools.

Overall Recommendations:

The Psychology Department's assessments are solid, but still show room for improvement. Clarity about the "demonstrations" of the SLOs, multiple measures for each SLO and clearly defined benchmarks for those measures, and more formal feedback loops would set up the department to improve the quality of value of their assessments.

TO: Janet Badia, Women's Studies
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Assessment Report for Women's Studies Certificate
Date: January 14, 2019

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Women's Studies Program. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 15-6 Appendix D](#).

Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The Committee found the SLOS to be stated clearly, composed with specificity, and stated in a student-centered manner. Regarding expectation levels, currently, it is not clear to the committee how expectation levels should be properly addressed in assessment reports. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Overall, the committee was impressed with the alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate framework. However, we noted a few things that made the presentation of this alignment unclear and that could be improved for the next assessment.

First, we noted that the numbering system between SLOs for the BA and SLOs for the minor did not correspond entirely, and thus it was hard to tell which SLO was being referenced in matching the Baccalaureate framework. Similarly, the Committee requests clarification as to where the SLO refers to the BA, the certificate, and the minor in this section. Third, the committee suggests that perhaps SLO 8 might also be included with Baccalaureate Foundation 5.

Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The most significant problem is that there is no alignment in the curriculum map for SLO 5. The comments that follow are of lesser importance.

It would helpful to other readers of the assessment report if the SLO's had been numbered and placed in numerical order. Although it might have been preferable if there were courses that reinforced SLOs 7 and 10, it is understandable that it may not be possible. For SLO 10, it would be preferable if some example courses were listed for Other since there is apparently no WOST course that would apply.

Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLO

There is an interim assessment and assessments for the major and certificate. Are there assessments for the minor and associates' degree or would they be considered with the certificate? The SLOs are slightly different.

Since there are several projects or papers in the portfolio, perhaps more than one addresses an SLO so that it can be said that there is more than one direct measure for some or all of the SLO.

For Learning Goal 8 in the rubrics, a highly successful portfolio requires an "unusual level of sophistication." This is vague and further elaboration would be helpful.

Perhaps it would be helpful to assess assignments from lower level classes in addition to upper level courses.

The committee was not clear how many instructors are measuring the data and how those faculty are chosen. Is it every associated faculty member who teaches a WOST course or merely a selection?

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Most of this section was scored N/A since the WOST program was not at a stage to present results this year. However, the committee was curious why there are no historical results provided. Since Women's Studies has been around for a number of years, hasn't there been some previous assessment?

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Although there are no results this year, it would be preferable to state what would be done if there were.

Section VII: Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success

Nothing appeared in this section of the Assessment report.

Overall Recommendations:

The Committee found this assessment in good shape. We note some overall recommendations to make the report itself more clear by numbering various sections and being more explicit when referring to BA, minor, certificate, etc. We are hopeful that the appearance of results from the portfolio classes will allow the program to reflect on progress towards meeting goals, on what the program has done well, and what improvements need to be made.