

**Academic Programs Assessment Reports AY 2016-2017 Executive Summaries**

<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO2 (Theoretical & Conceptual Issues): Knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of behavior analysis as a science and as a discipline, as demonstrated through a simulated experiment and written lab report.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) graduate program conducted program assessment during the 1-year cycle. Within this cycle, Learning Objective 2 (Theoretical & Conceptual Issues) was assessed using assignment data from ABA503 Experimental Analysis of Behavior. This is foundational course in the program and all ABA students take during their first semester of year 1. The assessment data showed that 13 of the 16 students (81%) met all applicable rubric criteria at the acceptable level. While this did not meet our goal of 100%, we believe the course content and delivery of instruction are appropriate. Therefore, no changes are recommended at this time. Faculty will continue to work with the students who struggle to meet the learning objective criterion. We are awaiting indirect assessment results via course evaluations.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Clinical Mental Health Counseling
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO 1: Knowledge
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	LO2: Practitioner Skills
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student performance in knowledge content through the use of an examination (formative) and a nationally standardized exam (summative). Overall, 21 students were assessed in the formative phase, and all met criteria as established in the assessment plan. Nineteen students were assessed in the summative phase, and 18/19 met the criteria as established in the assessment plan. This pass rate exceeds the national average. Students who do not pass the national exam are given a chance to re-take the exam at a later date. They also have the opportunity to enroll in a class that specifically covers the knowledge content areas that are considered to comprise the field of counseling. Regarding LO2, students exceeded the criteria in the assessment plan in both formative and summative phases of the direct assessment. There was one student who did not meet the criteria in the formative phase of the indirect assessment. This student was counseled and modifications were made to the students placement which resulted in this student meeting criteria in the summative phase of the indirect assessment.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	MA in Criminal Justice and Human Rights
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Knowledge of the field (Goal 1): Students will demonstrate specialized knowledge in these disciplines (history of the fields, policy and legal dimensions, implications, social and political aspects, and relevant theoretical perspectives) through topical research papers in various courses, building to a capstone project and paper on a significant topic in the field chosen by the student. Papers are evaluated by social science standards, assessed by faculty according to established rubrics, with the capstone reviewed by a panel of at least two faculty members.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	

<i>Executive Summary</i>	The MA in Criminal Justice and Human Rights Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student capstone projects obtained from the HS590 Capstone course. The MA in Criminal Justice and Human Rights will launch in Fall 2017, so this year one evaluation is of an outgoing program. Both programs require a capstone at the conclusion of the program, and the capstone serves as a tool to determine whether more than one learning goal has been achieved. In year one we have only focused on LO1. The rationale for assessing the outgoing program is to learn from current practice to establish good practice for the incoming program and a baseline for Learning Outcome #1: Knowledge. Overall the capstone projects of 3 students were assessed for summative assessment related to the outcome of knowledge relevant to the discipline. The work of students who did not complete the capstone was not considered, but it was taken into consideration that students are often taking more than one semester to complete what should be a one-semester course. Although the sample size is small, the findings are that the summative assessment did not meet expectations for outgoing students. Coupled with students who do not finish the capstone in one semester, we believe that procedural changes are required for the course. (Because the content of the outgoing program is different than the incoming program, our findings are stronger in regard to procedure as compared to substance.) During 2016-17, we established a Research Design course, with the intent to guide students and ensure that they have completed a research proposal vetted by a professor prior to beginning the capstone course. In addition, the department plans to provide more structure for capstone students through a formal meeting at the start of each semester, a Blackboard organization page for resources, consistent resources used by each supervisor, and other forms of maintaining engagement with capstone students.
<i>School</i>	AS
<i>Program Name</i>	MA in Theology
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO 1 - Knowledge of the principal methods used in theological study, and an in-depth study of the Catholic Theological Tradition within the areas of biblical, theological, and pastoral studies.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	Theology: Our Program had one person graduate May 2017. The data amassed from one person is not sufficient to assess the Program. Several students will be completing the Program in summer of 2017 and their material will be added to the 2018 assessment.  In terms of this assessment, we will develop and implement a pre-test / post-test for students beginning and completing our program.  It should be noted that our Program completed its Program Review in spring 2017 and we will be moving on those objectives beginning fall 2017.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Master of Arts in Holistic Health
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Goal 1. Advanced knowledge of the Holistic/Integrative Health Discipline. Outcome: Learners will demonstrate advanced knowledge of the Holistic/Integrative Health discipline through research-based class assignments and capstone paper based on a cumulative final project.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	N/A
<i>Executive Summary</i>	Master of Arts in Holistic Health Studies program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student research paper obtained from HH501 and HH599 capstone final project course. Overall, the research paper of 4 students were assessed for formative assessment related to the outcome of attainment of advanced knowledge in Holistic/Integrative Health discipline and the final project writing and oral presentation of 4 students for summative assessment of the same outcome. Our results show that the formative assessment met the expected level and the summative assessment also met the satisfactory level. We believe that the offering of one information literacy session by the GCU librarian in HH501 positively contributing the students' ability to conduct search and discern the sources in their research process. We plan to continue this practice and continue assessment of skills that contribute in the attainment of this outcome. Furthermore, indirect assessment through surveys in hh599 revealed the students' confidence in their attainment of this outcome. We will continue to improve the survey implementation timing and method for better response rate in future.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Biology
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	The student will understand and apply key concepts and theories in the areas of Biology (molecular / cell biology and / or environmental and organismal biology) as evidenced through in class testing and course assignments.

<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Biology program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating scores on targeted comprehensive exam question in two 100 level cores courses (formative) and in one core and a number of upper level elective courses (summative). We also used SIR scores in sections D,F,G,I and overall score as indirect learning measures, and MFAT scores as a direct summative learning measure.</p> <p>Overall the results from the 31 students in BI120 and 13 students assessed in BI121 suggest that student learning meets or exceeds departmental expectations at the formative level. In class testing and SIR data indicate that students were meeting or exceeding department targets in the upper level elective courses. However, serious problems were encountered in student learning in the core BI305 course. We attribute this to the fact that both sections of this course this year were taught by adjunct faculty, and both of these faculty members were teaching the class for the first time. The department will endeavor to avoid using adjunct faculty to instruct this very time consuming and challenging course in the future, but because we continue to be somewhat understaffed for the size of our program, we recognize that this may not always be possible. In the case that this course needs to be adjuncted out again in the future, the chair will work with the faculty member hired to provide a greater degree of clarity about expectations up front, as well as additional support throughout the semester whenever possible.</p> <p>The poor performance of this year's seniors on the Biology MFAT is concerning. The department will explore options including changing the timing of the test, increasing the stakes for the test so that students have greater motivation to try their hardest on the test, as well as providing more opportunities to build test taking strategies for standardized tests such as this earlier in the curriculum.</p>
<i>School</i>	AS
<i>Program Name</i>	Chemistry and Biochemistry
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Knowledge of Foundations of the Chemical Sciences. Students will demonstrate knowledge and application of fundamental concepts and the theories of chemistry in five key areas of chemistry, including physical, organic, inorganic, analytical, and biochemistry chemistry through course exams, American Chemical Society standardized subject exams, and Major Field Test in Chemistry. The graduates will be expected to demonstrate foundational knowledge at a nationally competitive level.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Chemistry and Biochemistry Program conducted assessment for year one of the objective "Knowledge of Foundations of the Chemical Sciences" by evaluating results of nationally standardized American Chemical Society test and Major Field Achievement Test in Chemistry. Overall, data for 118 students collected in 2015-2017 were assessed for formative assessment, 12 of these students were declared chemistry or biochemistry majors at the time they took the test, and data for 2 graduating students collected in 2017 were assessed for summative assessment. Our findings were that the formative assessment fell short of expectations with achievement at the expected level for majors, while the summative assessment was nearly consistent with a stated evaluation metric. Based on the results, our graduating seniors performed competitively at national level. Most majors from years 2015-2016 who did not meet expectations in the formative assessment changed their academic major while attempting their sophomore level coursework.</p>
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Criminal Justice
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Learning Outcome(s) Assessed: LO4: Effective communication and presentation skills. Students will demonstrate an ability to communicate and present relevant information in regards to criminological or legal questions in course oral/poster presentations and debates that will be assessed by peers and professors according to established rubrics. (ACJS standards, B.8)
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	

<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Criminal Justice Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work presented in CJ213 Criminal Law (intended for sophomores) and CJ335 Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice. Overall the presentations of 31 students were assessed for formative assessment related to the outcome of effective communication and presentation skills, and the debate presentations of 18 students for summative assessment of this same outcome. Our findings were that the formative assessment met expectations with achievement at the expected level, while the summative assessment was above expectations for the presentations. We found that overall rubrics used to evaluate student presentation language, organization, delivery, strength of supporting material and central message need to be more rigorous. Recommendations were made for focusing more exclusively in the presentation assignments on just this learning outcome, and for elevating the level of learning required for each benchmark. Though courses are intended to be taken at certain phases of the program, outcomes did not differentiate along class lines. This is most likely due to variation in incoming class skill levels that persists.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	English Program
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	<p>LO1: [Aligned with Goal 1 -- "Competency in critical and/or creative written work"] <input type="checkbox"/> Students will regularly submit critical literary analysis and/or creative essays in required English Program courses. These assignments will be assessed with the program's rubrics and the student will upload final edits of selected signature assignments in their English Program Portfolio.</p> <p>LO4: [Aligned with Goal 4 --- "Competency in Research/MLA skills"] <input type="checkbox"/> Students will develop research and MLA skills for all research based-work. All research based-work will be evaluated for adherence to MLA standards.</p>
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The English Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating 17 senior portfolios using a rubric developed by the department for this purpose. Students were required to submit a paper from our introductory English course, EN 300, for formative assessment. And students were to submit a paper from one of our capstone courses, EN 429 or EN 430, for summative assessment. Formative and summative papers were each evaluated according to the following learning outcomes: 1) LO 1, Criterion 1: "Competency in critical and/or creative work;" 2) LO 4, Criterion 4: "Competency in Research/MLA skills." We found that out of a scale of 4 in the summative assessment area, the student gain was .5 in terms of critical thinking/creativity and .687 in terms of research/MLA skills. These gains represent marked improvement in both critical analysis and higher research skills in the obtainment of peer reviewed sources for our students. The department will continue to improve its assessment program by revising student directives for portfolio paper submissions and by improving scoring for discrepancies by enlisting the opinion of a third reader for scoring. In the fall and spring (2017/2018) department meetings we will discuss ways to further improve our assessment program.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Exercise Science, Wellness, and Sports
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO3: Students will communicate effectively in both written and oral formats, alone and in teams, and demonstrate academic research skills as applied to exercise science through assigned writing and research-based assignments and in class presentations.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	LO4: Students will reflect upon and apply professional standards and ethics in exercise science professions through personal integration, case studies, and internship opportunities.
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Department of Exercise Science, Wellness, &amp; Sports conducted an assessment for year one by evaluating writing assignments and oral presentations from ES220 (Introduction to Nutrition) and ES470 (Research Methods in Exercise Science.) Overall, the written communications of the formative group were found to be satisfactory in all areas except sources and evidence, and the oral communications of the formative group were satisfactory in all areas except organization. The summative group, however, only met expectations in one of our nine aspects of written and oral communication that were evaluated. The department plans to address this by more carefully scaffolding written and oral communication course goals into the core exercise science curriculum to make sure these skills are consistently emphasized, and by periodically inviting members of the writing center staff to department meetings to discuss how best to address these goals in class.</p> <p>The department also assessed our students understanding of professional standards and ethics. Twenty-three students in ES100 (Careers in Exercise Science) were given a five-question multiple choice test on professional standards and ethics in exercise science, which 78% of students answered at least 4 questions correctly, which suggests that our freshmen students do have an understanding of these issues. Summative assessment was attempted by analyzing the final internship evaluations of 15 students, but it was found that the items on the evaluation form were not defined sufficiently to allow meaningful comparison to the formative assessment. This will be addressed by developing a new internship evaluation form to be deployed during the 2018-19 academic year.</p>

<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	History
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Goal 1: Use historical knowledge and evidence to craft and sustain an historical argument LO1: Through coursework in all History courses, students will use historical evidence to craft and sustain a persuasive historical argument.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	Goal 3: Research and write research assignments LO3: Students will submit research assignments that demonstrate the ability to research, write, and document a research assignment based on primary and secondary sources with the following components: research question, argument, conclusion, endnotes, and bibliography, all in Chicago Manual of Style.
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The History Program conducted assessment in year one using data from two required courses. Faculty assessed signature assignments in Historian's Craft (formative) and History Seminar (summative) related to students' use of evidence in support of an argument (LO1). We assessed the same assignments for evidence of the ability to research and write research assignments (LO3). In assessment rubric categories related to LO1 and LO3, the 14 signature research assignments for the formative program course met expectations with achievement at the expected level, as did the 12 signature research assignments for the summative program course. The corresponding indirect evidence was the grades for the research papers. The Spring 2017 grades satisfied the distribution we articulated in the assessment plan. Based on these results, we know that students are meeting the requirements of the research assignments at the formative and summative levels. Faculty will meet in AY 2017-18 to review the rubric we implemented this year and will then will rotate teaching Historian's Craft. Once we can compare data from multiple faculty teaching this course, as well as a record of student achievement, we will be able to further validate our shared rubric.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Mathematics and Computer Science
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO2: Students will produce solutions of real-world and theoretical problems in a precise and logical fashion and identify key mathematical structures through assignments, presentations, and testing in the program's core coursework.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Mathematics and Computer Science department conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work obtained from a signature assignment and item analysis of a question on final exam. Overall, the signature assignment for 6 students in MA116 were assessed for formative assessment related to the goal and outcome of analysis and application of appropriate mathematical procedures to develop critical and logical thinking. the same outcome was assessed for 6 students in MA331 using item analysis of a question from final exam for summative assessment. The formative assessment met our level of expectation, but summative assessment was above our expectation. The students who did not meet our expectation for formative assessment were non-math major students. Indirect assessment using student surveys showed that they are satisfied with their level of learning.
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Psychology
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO4: Upon successful completion of the B.A. in Psychology students will exhibit effective written and oral communication skills in their academic coursework.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Psychology and Counseling Undergraduate Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work obtained from our 400-level senior seminar course. We evaluated the capstone paper and oral presentations from PS455: Senior Seminar using a rubric with a 4-point rating scale (0=needs improvement, 1=developing, 2=proficient, 3=exemplary). Overall the papers and presentations of 22 students were assessed for a summative assessment related to learning objective #4: Upon successful completion of the B.A. in Psychology students will exhibit effective written and oral communication skills in their academic coursework.</p> <p>Our direct evidence findings indicate that 86.36% of the students (n=19) sampled achieved our benchmark of being rated “proficient” or higher in all evaluation areas of the capstone paper and presentation. Additionally, our indirect evidence findings indicate that 90.9% of the students (n=20) received a grade of B- or better for the course, which exceeded our goal of 80% of students achieving a grade of “B-” or better for the course. We expect motivation for this course to be high as it is a graduation requirement and all students enrolled were psychology majors.</p> <p>The rubric for evaluating the capstone paper is currently undergoing revisions and is expected to be completed by August 2017 and implemented for the Fall 2017 semester. Several faculty pointed out that some criteria on the rubric overlap and cause confusion when evaluating student work. Additionally, rubrics for evaluating student work in PS214 will be developed by the end of the Fall 2017 semester in order to provide formative data for learning objective #4.</p>
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Social Work
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Students will integrate the history, purpose, and philosophy of social work in the study of the profession and its practice through course exams, student led class discussions, and assigned research.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>Social Work Program: The 80% benchmark was not obtained for the topic of values and how values are implemented in the social work agency. This could have occurred for two major reasons: students failed to attend to values and ethics, the agency chosen to visit and observe failed to demonstrate the presence of values and ethics. This area needs clarification for the future. A separate lesson is needed regarding values and ethics and how to look for them in the agency setting. Although the course does teach NASW’s Code of ethics, greater attention will be paid, perhaps with a reflective assignment.</p> <p>All rubric criteria will be met at or above the satisfactory level by at least 80% of students. Those criteria not meeting this standard will be analyzed further.</p> <p>These results for LO1 are satisfactory since the goal of at least 80% of students meeting rubric criteria were met for both the formative, and summative assessment pieces.</p> <p>Interestingly, although the 80% meeting of the rubric criteria in SW 310 Methods of Social Work Research was met for the final paper grades, the 80% mark was not met for each individual section of the final paper.</p> <p>The 80% mark was met in the Introduction, Literature Review and Conceptual Framework. Social Work students are used to writing term papers and this section of the research paper is something with which they are familiar. Additionally, they must write a first draft of this paper, (which I comment on) and submit the revised paper in their final work. The same process occurs with the Methodology section of their papers.</p> <p>Three students out of 17 failed to meet the 80% benchmark for the Methodology section. The terms and concepts in Methodology are new to social work students and many have difficulty grasping concepts of sample, random versus non-random and its impact on the generalizability of results, design and approach of a study as well as the development of an instrument for the purposes of collecting data. Concepts of reliability and validity are also difficult for some. In future, I must take more time in the classroom for teaching Methodology and give more examples. I am going to see if a video exists on teaching this content. I will also construct a power point for this material, although a power point from the text does exist and is on BBL. Perhaps a separate test on methodology concepts will enable students to study and see where their knowledge is lacking.</p> <p>The final section of the paper requires students to make sense of their findings and indicate their impact upon the profession of social work. Students are also required to brainstorm on future studies needed given the current findings. Six students did not reach the benchmark in this section of the paper, although their over-all grade in the course did meet the benchmark. It is particularly difficult to make sense of the limitations of one’s study if concepts of methodology (instrument design and sampling) are not fully understood since these areas account for most study limitations. Once again, I believe that changes in instruction will increase the % reaching the benchmark in the future. I will implement</p>
<i>School</i>	Arts and Sciences
<i>Program Name</i>	Spanish
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Literary Criticism
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	

<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Spanish Program used the protocol for Writing Intensive (WI) Courses for the major paper due in SP426 during the Fall 2016 semester. There were five students enrolled in the course. The overall results, in the area of literary criticism, found results of 2 exemplary, 2 evident, and 1 not evident. The program will incorporate literary criticism, with a focus on thesis statements, in the formative courses of SP 221 & 222 as a result of evaluation of these results. Also, the WI rubric will be reviewed and adapted for the Spanish program. The inclusion of the formative introduction of literary criticism will begin in Fall 2017.
<i>School</i>	Business and Digital Media
<i>Program Name</i>	MBA
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Effective oral, written, and technological business communication skills for managerial and executive settings
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The MBA Program in the School of Business conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating Learning Objective 1 which was: effective oral, written, and technological business communication skills for managerial and executive settings. This goal was assessed in the BU691 Capstone MBA course by a written paper and presentation assessed with rubric. 90% of the students presented their capstone projects in a manner that shows preparation and practice (scores of 90+) using the Group Strategic Planning Presentation Rubric. Over the last academic year, this Learning Objective was assessed 3 semesters: Summer 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017. This learning objective was achieved 100% for each of the semesters.</p> <p>Additionally, the SIR was used to assess this communication learning objective. The results of the SIR revealed that 60% of students reported their course met learning objective 1 at levels 4 or 5 in Spring 2017. The SIR was only conducted in the Spring of 2017. The SIR also revealed that 90% of BU691 capstone blind evaluations exceed 3.0 for aspects related to organization and content: Summer 2016: 83%, Fall 2016: 81%, and Spring 2017: 100%.</p> <p>The data gathered was from summative assessment. This assessment met expectations with achievement at the expected level. The department had a department meeting in the Fall 2017 to discuss:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rubric choice (investigating a better option)</li> <li>2) SIR scores</li> <li>3) Evaluating more courses with SIR</li> <li>4) Using teamwork rubric in BU609 (in assessment plan but was not completed)</li> </ol> <p>As MBA Director, I am satisfied with the assessment results but understand that room for improvement exists.</p>
<i>School</i>	Business and Digital Media
<i>Program Name</i>	Bus. All undergrad Majors
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO4 : Ability to articulate ethical business behavior
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	LO5 – Career goals through internship and reflection
<i>Executive Summary</i>	Students are successfully achieving the assessed goals of the School of Business and Digital Media in the undergraduate business majors, including Accounting, Bus. Admin., Marketing, Management, and Finance. Assessment criteria will be reviewed to look for methods of refining the assessment to look for particular weaknesses potentially not apparent using the current criteria.
<i>School</i>	Business and Digital Media
<i>Program Name</i>	Digital Communication
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	L04: Conduct academic research and develop skills to critique media content.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	L05: Communicate effectively and use collaboration to be a contributing member of the profession and teams.

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Digital Communication Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work from CM465 Digital Communication Professional Practices. This capstone course is required for all majors. Six students were evaluated and participated in the evaluation of L04 (Conduct academic research and develop skills to critique media content) and L05 (Communicate effectively and use collaboration to be a contributing member of the profession and teams).</p> <p>My findings indicate summative assessments met expectations with students achieving 80% or higher for LO4 (conducting academic research) and 90% or higher for LO5 (communicate effectively).</p> <p>LO4 was evaluated using a information literacy rubric. Students conducted a SWOT analysis of an assigned community partner/client and their analyses were assessed. While the standard was met improvement is needed. In order to strengthen this outcome formative work will be integrated into CM113 Digital &amp; Visual Literacy including how to conduct effective internet and library searches.</p> <p>Summative assessments for LO5 (Communicate effectively and use collaboration to be a contributing member of the profession and teams) indicate 90% of students met or exceeded the expectation. This was evaluated based on student peer and self assessments. While students performed well, improvement is needed. This will be addressed in CM105 Presentations Skills. Formative coursework will address this learning objective and encourage students to develop effective team and collaboration skills earlier in the coursework.</p> <p>The Digital Communication Program was redesigned in 2017 to accommodate the changing needs of the student body, changes in technology, and lack of resources. This redesign was in response to a complete overhaul of the program in 2014 where the Communication program was redesigned to more closely aligned with Graphic Design &amp; Multimedia.</p> <p>The current structure of the major is highly interdisciplinary with English, Art and Graphic Design. Core course work was aligned with the program's learning objectives to ensure students are introduced to foundational communication, research, and production skills earlier in the curriculum. While ninety percent of students met or exceeded program expectations, the year one curriculum evaluation does reveal areas for improvement. Dr. Gina Marsello will incorporate changes into</p>
<i>School</i>	Business and Digital Media
<i>Program Name</i>	Graphic Design & Multimedia
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate Major
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Demonstrate a global view of design theory and history.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	Demonstrate a personal style through the application of theory and practice.
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The first year assessment for the Graphic design &amp; Multimedia Program has been performed based on the evaluation of the GD11 and GD422 courses. The first is an introductory course introducing students to the basics computer graphics and the second is an advanced technical course in web design. Overall, the outcome of 12 students' final exam in GD113 and 8 students' final grades in GD422 were assessed. The formative assessment was satisfactory, since the majority of students reached the level of expectation of the program. In the summative assessment, the majority of students exceeded the level of expectation of the program.</p> <p>Although the majority of students started the program with no technical or design background, by the end of their studies they achieved a good level of technical skills and theoretical knowledge. Despite these achievements, a deficiency in research methodology has been observed throughout their studies. This issue will be addressed during the next two years by requesting students to provide written statements about their research methodology for each project.</p>
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	Teacher of Students with Disabilities
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Certificate Only
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Students will present research on identified disabilities and have content knowledge testing exams.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	TSWD Certificate Program: A total of 46 students were assessed for summative results using a 5 point scale rubric. Of the 46 students, 42% achieved a score of 3; 43% got a score of 4; 7% got a score of 5. A score of 3 indicates meeting expectations. All students met expectations.
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	Administration and Leadership Program
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's



<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	ALP candidates will demonstrate the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions of an educational leader who (a) creates a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; (b) manages the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, (c) collaborates with families and community members; (d) understands the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; and (e) acts with integrity and in an ethical manner.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Administration and Leadership Program conducted its annual assessment using multiple measures including: signature assignments and rubrics, rating scales (Cooperating Administrators and Faculty Supervisors), and Exit Surveys (Student Candidates). Our findings indicate that candidates met expectations and were proficient in all areas assessed. Our plans include strengthening the validity and reliability of signature assignments, rubrics, and rating scales by providing annual calibration training with ALP faculty and adjuncts.
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	Autism Spectrum Disorders
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: In-depth study of the pervasive developmental disorders of autism, evaluated through research assignments and in class testing. LO2: Teaching strategies and interventions for students with autism and related developmental disorders, including collaborative models of teaching, as evidenced by observation reports and research studies. LO3: Assessment of students with autism and related developmental disorders, using case studies to apply the appropriate approaches to instruction. LO4: Implementation of techniques to support social communication development of students with autism and related developmental disorders, through direct observation and practicum experiences. LO5: (Master's Degree) Advanced professional leadership within the area of services to support students with autism and related developmental disorders, through academic research and program evaluation.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Autism Program conducted the assessment for year one by evaluating student Keystone assignments submitted to Taskstream. Overall the Taskstream report of 3 students was assessed for formative assessment. The results were that the formative assessment met expectations with 100% of students' achieved level 3 or better on rubrics for each Keystone assignment for the core courses (EDC 5301-5305) and thesis (EDC 6095 & EDC 6099).
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	ESL/Bilingual Education graduate program
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Students will research and evaluate the current theories of second language acquisition and culture competence to evaluate different ESL and bilingual instructions and assessments.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The ESL/Bilingual Education Program conducted assessment for Year One by evaluating student work obtained from one graduate course with a PowerPoint presentation using a rubric. The keystone assignment from two students was evaluated for formative assessment related to the outcome of preparation for the profession. The results indicated that the formative assessment met expectations with achievement at the expected level. The course used to assess student outcome may discontinue in the future provided the newly designed curriculum is approved by the state DOE.
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	MA, Education: Literacy/Reading Specialization
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	LO1: Knowledge and application of the theories and concepts of literacy acquisition and development as evidenced through assigned projects, and discussions.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	LO2: Identification and evaluation of a variety of instructional methods and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners evidenced through assigned projects and discussions.

<i>Executive Summary</i>	The MA, Education: Literacy/Reading Specialization Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work obtained from an introductory course, a mid-level course, and a capstone/practicum course. Formative and summative assessments were conducted related to two outcomes aligned with the International Literacy Association's Standards for Reading Professionals: (1) Knowledge and application of the theories and concepts of literacy acquisition and development and (2) Identification and evaluation of a variety of instructional methods and materials to meet the needs of diverse learners. For both outcomes, the Keystone Assignments for 56 students were reviewed as direct formative assessments for both outcomes, and the Practicum Reports written by 5 students were reviewed as direct summative assessments. Our findings were that the formative assessments exceeded expectations regarding knowledge and application of theories and concepts and met expectations regarding instructional materials and methods. The summative assessment results were above expectations in both areas. The department is aware of the newly revised standards from the International Literacy Association and is adjusting the program accordingly.
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	School Counselor
<i>Level of Program</i>	Graduate - Master's
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	In-depth knowledge of the area of school counseling applicable to the school age child, their families and caregivers, school faculty and administration, and school and community support services, as evidenced by research-based course assignments evaluated by rubric scoring.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	N/A
<i>Executive Summary</i>	School Counselor Program: For Learning Outcome 1 from June 2016 to May 2017 the following Taskstream signature assignments were utilized for the formative assessment component: EDC5001A, EDC5001B, EDC5040, EDC6301 and EDC6304. For the summative component of this learning outcome the following Taskstream signature assignments were utilized: EDC5014, EDC5158, EDC6302, and EDC6303. The total number of individual student rubrics scored for the stated time period for each of the reported courses ranged from 15 for EDC5014 and EDC6304 to 21 for EDC6302. With the exception of selective dimensions from two courses reviewed in the full program report, overall program effectiveness was evidenced as reflected in tallied rubric ratings at or above the 80% success criteria for both formative and summative components. Overall, student satisfaction was represented by multiple areas rated at least at the 90th percentile on the SIR School of Education summary data.
<i>School</i>	Education
<i>Program Name</i>	Teacher Education
<i>Level of Program</i>	Other (please specify)
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Students will demonstrate proficiency in planning, implementing, and assessing instruction.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	The Teacher Education Program conducted its annual assessment using multiple measures including: signature assignments and rubrics, standardized exams (Praxis), rating scales (Clinical Supervisors and Cooperating Administrators), and Exit Surveys (Student Candidates). Our findings indicate that candidates met expectations and were proficient in planning, implementing and assessing instruction for diverse learners. Our plans include strengthening the validity and reliability of signature assignments, rubrics, and rating scales by providing annual calibration training with TE faculty and adjuncts.
<i>School</i>	University-Wide
<i>Program Name</i>	Bridge General Education Program
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate - University Wide
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Bridge General Education Outcome 1a: Students will demonstrate the ability to apply foundational knowledge in the arts, humanities, languages, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences.
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>99 courses (276 sections) were offered in the Bridge General Education Program over the 2016-2017 academic year. This included Online, Hybrid, Lakewood, and Offsite offerings. A total of 2,513 students enrolled in Bridge courses in the fall, and 2,314 students were enrolled in Bridge courses in the spring. These offerings included two new Bridge GE requirements, GEN199 (12 sections) and GEN400 (2 sections).</p> <p>The General Education Program conducted its formative direct assessment of GE Learning Outcome 1a for year one by evaluating student work obtained from 100 and 200 level courses that reflect application of learning in the following categories: English (Humanities), Art History / Music History (Art), Mathematics, World Languages, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. A request for two volunteers from each of these categories was sent to faculty. Volunteers were asked to assess one GE course in either the Fall or Spring semesters and to submit an outline of the assignment and its alignment with criteria for Bridge Learning Outcome 1a. This form was reviewed by the Director of General Education and the Director of Assessment. If necessary, feedback was provided to volunteers about the assignment or rubric alignment. These submission forms were posted on the General Education Curriculum Committee Blackboard Organization for review by committee members. At the conclusion of the semester, faculty were asked to complete the assessment rubric indicating student performance at either the exemplary, evident, developing, or not evident levels. Completed rubrics were reviewed by the GECC during a May 9, 2017 meeting.</p> <p>A total of 11 different courses (22 sections) were assessed. Two different courses were assessed in 5 of the 6 categories (with MU109--Music History not submitting in Arts). Our findings demonstrate that students generally meet the formative expectation with achievement at the expected level.</p> <p>The one noticeable criteria where students did not consistently achieve the expectation was criteria 2 (student applies foundational knowledge in a new or related situation). 6 of 22 sections reported student performance below the 90% expected level with only one section below 80%. While several of these courses were close to the 90% expectation, it suggests that work is still needed to clarify the expectations that we have for students applying their foundational knowledge in these different disciplines. It also reflects a continued need for faculty discussions about these expectations, their assignments, and reporting assessment results. Such discussions will be critical as we continue with the continued</p> <p>When made available, NSSE results will be used for summative assessment results.</p>
<i>School</i>	University-Wide
<i>Program Name</i>	Writing Intensive
<i>Level of Program</i>	Undergraduate - University Wide
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (1)</i>	Use informal/low stakes writing as a gateway to critical thinking and learning
<i>Learning Outcomes Assessed (2)</i>	
<i>Executive Summary</i>	<p>The Writing Intensive Program conducted its assessment for year 1 by evaluating “informal” writing assignments from 25 students in GEN199 (formative) and 9 students in GEN400 (summative). All artifacts assessed related to the learning outcome of using low stakes or informal writing as a “gateway to critical thinking and learning.” Our findings were that both the summative and the formative assessment slightly exceeded expectations. There were some difficulties in assessing the assignments because we did not have the prompt. We will consider addressing this through a modification in process or rubric going forward, but need to discuss this with faculty. We also noted that GEN400 assignments were more polished than is typical for low stakes assignment. We will bring this up at faculty planning meetings for GEN400 and consider assessing another assignment or perhaps modifying. We plan to address this by Spring. Our approved assessment plan calls for indirect assessment to be based on SIRs. This is not included in this report since we do not have access to this data. The Assessment Director has said she can compile this information.</p>