

# COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2016-2017

*College: College of Arts and Sciences*

*Contact: Bob Gillespie, Chair*

*Report Date: January 26, 2018*

**ASSESSMENT**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Contents

Tips and Hints _____	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs _____	2
Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments _____	4
Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings _____	5
Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions _____	6
Attachments _____	7

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

In fall, 2017, departments and certificate programs in COAS were asked to complete assessment reports for 2016-2017 using protocols documented in SD 15-6. The Chair of the COAS Assessment Committee solicited assessment reports from chairs and directors on October 3<sup>rd</sup> with a deadline of November 10<sup>th</sup>. At its meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup> the COAS Assessment Committee agreed to extend the deadline to November 15<sup>th</sup> and notified department chairs and program directors.

Table 1. Submission of reports to COAS Assessment Committee during 2016-2017

Department Program	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	Department Program	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
ANTH	R	W	R	MATH	R	R	R
BIOL	R	R	W	PHIL <sup>2</sup>	---	R	W
BIOL Grad	N	N	W	PHYS	R	E	R
CHEM	R	R	R	POLS	N	E	R
COM	R	R	R	PSY	R	R	R
COM Grad	R	N	R	SOC	R	W	R
CSD	N	E	R	GENST <sup>1</sup>	R	E	---
ENGL	R	R	R	GERN	N	W	W
ENGL Grad	R	R	R	INTL	R	R	R
GEO <sup>2</sup>	---	W	R	LGBT	R	R	W
HIST	W	R	W	PACS	W	N	W
ILCS	N	W	W	WOST	R	N	W

R= Report submitted; N= Report not submitted; E= Extension requested; W= Waiver approved;  
<sup>1</sup>Joined COAS in 2015; <sup>2</sup>Department Eliminated

## Summary of Results

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

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

## Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

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	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4-6
Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	1-3
Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Learning Experiences (b)	6	4	6	6	4	5	4	4	6	6	6	4-6
Systematic Method for Measuring Progress of SLO	15	13	14	15	13	15	13	13	14	11	11	11-15
Reporting Results - Communication	9	7	7	9	9	7	NA	8	NA	7	7	7-9
Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement	6	NA	6	NA	6	5	NA	NA	NA	4	4	4-6
Use of Results for Programmatic Change	6	6	NA	6	6	6	NA	6	6	6	6	6
(a) Expectation Level" not included; (b) "Student Engagement" not included; NA= Not addressed/Not applicable												

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

A summary of scores for each of the seven rubric categories is presented for nine baccalaureate degree programs (Table 2). Eight of nine departments received the maximum score for student learning outcomes, seven programs received maximum scores for alignment with the baccalaureate framework, and only five departments received maximum scores for mapping SLOs to learning experiences. Although total scores for systematic method (Assessment Plan) ranged from 11-15 (max), eight of nine departments received scores of 13-15. Of seven departments that reported communicating results in their assessment reports, two received maximum scores (9), while other programs ranged from 7-8. Only four departments reported communicating results to stakeholders and scores ranged from 4-6 (max). All seven departments that addressed using results for programmatic change received the maximum scores (6).

## SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

### 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 February 2018. Copies of the response letters are appended and scoring rubrics are on file in the Office of Assessment.

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

### Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

Changes in the review process for 2017 included, 1) aligning the call letter, response letter, and rubric category headings with those in Appendix D in SD 15-6. Now that departments and programs in COAS have experience with the format, and the language and format are now consistent among documents, review of assessment reports was made easier. 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

### Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

In general, the quality of reports submitted in 2017 was good, providing solid evidence for a commitment to assessment by departments. A few departments were advised to write more effective SLOs and accurately map them to courses in the program. Several departments were advised to document how results of assessment have led (or expected to lead) to changes in curriculum. Most departments did not have a process whereby assessment results are communicated with “external” stakeholders. Only a few departments reported results from activities that were recommended from previous assessment results.

Although the new format and expectations has been in place for three years, the committee recommends providing an instructional meeting to explain the process for chairs and directors, either late in spring or early in fall. 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 these 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. Until then, the committee recommends permitting these programs to submit reports without the constraint of the current format.



# ATTACHMENTS

## Attachments

1. Response letters to departments and programs.

TO: Dr. Lawrence Kuznar, Chair, Department of Anthropology  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report  
Date: January 2018

---

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Anthropology. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 98-22. Appendix D.](#)

The Department of Anthropology has done laudable work in assessing student learning. While the Assessment Committee found many parts of the report to do a good job of describing the department's goals and progress towards those goals, we also noted areas where further specificity is needed. In particular, greater clarity of SLOs and additional means of measuring student progress would aid both the department and the Assessment Committee in future years.

There are areas that need to be addressed as described in Sections I, II, III, IV and V.

If a section is left blank, this indicates that at the very least, the department satisfied if not exceeded the requirements of the assessment report.

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

The department's goals and learning objectives should be listed as student learning outcomes (SLOs). The Senate rubric requires SLOs to meet conditions of "clarity and specificity," as well as being "student-centered." It seemed to the Assessment Committee that your SLOs should be worked to meet these requirements better, being both more specific, and more student-centered. For what you list as goals (SLOs), is it possible to provide sub areas assuming that these are sufficiently differentiated from the core areas? Under Student-Centered SLO's for example, besides competence in writing, are there discipline specific styles for journal articles? What sort of quantitative skills should students acquire? Also, it would be surprising that anthropology students wouldn't demonstrate evaluation and synthesis in Bloom's taxonomy. Can these be addressed in the SLOs? In Goal (SLO) 7, how is "willingness to engage learning and scholarship as a life-long endeavor" measured beyond attending graduate school? Are there any other measures?

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

This was partially given a score of 2 because there appeared to be no alignment to Baccalaureate Goal 4: Sense of Community. How are the professional ethics communicated to students? Can they be aligned to anything in the curriculum? Is there anything else that can be aligned to BG 4 besides lifelong learning and scholarship, or can you explain how this commitment to lifelong learning is viewed as a "Sense of Community" by your department?

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

In the curricular map, the column above Anthropology Learning Objective 6 is blank; is this a place that should be BG5? The Assessment Committee would like to see some rating of the level that students are

expected to achieve in a goal (SLO). For example, some departments list a course as introductory, proficiency, or mastery in terms of meeting the SLO. There would be a progression from introductory in the low level courses to mastery in the upper level courses. To indicate progression or development of student learning in the matrix, the course is marked as introductory (I), proficient (P), or advanced (A) to indicate the level of mastery the students are expected to achieve. Other descriptors can be used.

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

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

The Assessment Committee found that the means by which assessment relates to SLOs is insufficient based on your suggested method of measurement. Grades should not be used for assessment; instead, students should be scored on whether they have demonstrated achievement in some specific manner. For example, note that 70% of the students demonstrated that they could properly apply a skill to a problem. For simple acquisition of knowledge, it could be stated what percentage of students correctly answered a specific set of questions. Alternatively, student papers in selected courses could be judged by how well they achieved SLOs using a set of rubrics judged by multiple faculty members. Another possibility would be to create student portfolios for selected papers and projects. These could be judged by subsets of faculty using department rubrics.

Other than the recommendation that grades not be used for assessment, the Committee finds that the department accomplished this part of the assessment plan.

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The conclusions contained a heavy focus on some of the SLOs (methodology, quantitative skills), while others (SLOs 1-4) seemed missing. Similarly, historical results did not get a good focus in this description. There was discussion of the introduction of some new methods courses, in particular one introduced Fall 2016, but no follow up on how that went. Past iterations of results should be provided.

Is it possible to provide comparisons for the percent of students attending graduate school to peer institutions or national averages?

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It appears that faculty are involved and engaged in assessment and the results. As for outside stakeholders, it is not clear who these are, and if extant, if they would require access to these results. For the time being, this is scored as currently N/A.

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

The Assessment Committee finds that the department has successfully met the benchmarks in using past results to improve the learning and achievement process.

#### Overall Recommendations:

The main recommendation is to improve the clarity of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), as spelled out in Section I above.

In addition, continue to work on the curricular map so that it clearly demonstrates student progress and learning. This applies both to specifying that all of the SLOs are being met, and the progression of student learning, including the level of mastery, through the various courses offered by the department.

Another important area of improvement for the department will be in the area of measuring accomplishment towards goal. As described in Section IV above, the Assessment Committee strongly recommends finding measurements other than grades to establish student progress.

Finally, in terms of reporting results, it is preferable that the department report on all of the progress, or lack thereof, of goals being met, rather than focusing on some goals and processes at the expense of others.

## COAS Assessment Committee Report: Biology 2016-2017

TO: Department of Biology  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: Assessment Report 2016-2017  
Date: January 19, 2018

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the Department of Biology's 2016-2017 Assessment Report. Your Department's Assessment Report of Student Learning Outcomes is very strong and continues to be a leader among COAS Departments. The comments below only hope to strength your exemplary work. The comments follow a rubric derived from the revised Senate Document 98-22. Appendix D.

### Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

As clearly explained in the department's *Responses to Comments and Recommendations from COAS Assessment Committee for 2015-2016 Report*, the Biology Department lacks "Expectation Level of SLOs" by other approving organizations. But it isn't clear to me why the department cite the coverage of core biology principles as identified by the NSF-AAAS report (2011) & by Brownwell, et al. (2014) and measured by the department using the BioMaps Surveys as "Expectation Level of SLOs"? This surely covers SLO 1 and most likely others as well (for instance, SLO 6).

### Section II: Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Very nicely done. A small recommendation may be to include the SLO numbers found on page 4 in front of each SLO listed on the right side of the *IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Table* to ease in the readability of the table and to help facilitate a greater understanding of which biology SLO corresponds to which IPFW Framework item.

### Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Learning Experiences in the Academic Program

It would be helpful if the SLOs in the first row of the *Curricular Map* on page 6 were presented in the same order as they originally appear on page 4. Note, that they are currently in the order: 1, 2, 3a, 5, 4, 3b, & 6 (with SLO 3 being split into 2 parts - a & b).

When reviewing the *Curricular Map* the reader immediately notices that SLO 3b and 6 are not assessed. Through my reading of your report, I believe that SLO 3b is assessed through the Capstone Research Paper. Is this correct? If so, I would note that in the table.

It would be helpful to note in the table how each SLO is assessed by using either words or and acronym. For example, For SLO 1 "assessed" could be changed to "assessed – BioMap". For SLO 4 "assessed" could be changed to "assessed – Art" for Artifacts. This would really add to both the clarity and depth of information provided in the table.

In response to a recommendation from the COAS Assessment Committee last year, who suggested listing the numbers of all of the upper level biology electives within their concentrations to your *Curricular Map*, you instead decided to add a footnote about electives and concentrations to the bottom of the table. Unfortunately, I do not find this footnote helpful. I actually find it confusing. While the wording of the footnote is clear, it makes the reader wonder why, of all the acronyms you list, (i.e., BIOL, MT, ECEV, MCIM, GCMB) only BIOL appears in the table. Where are the others? How do the others differ from

BIOL? What exactly is going on here? More explanation is needed or the footnote should be removed. One solution would be to construct a table just of electives by type of concentration. I am not saying that you *should* go to all of this work. I am just saying that the footnote, as it stands now, creates more questions than it answers.

**Student Engagement** is discussed on page 13, but only in regard to research. How are students engaged in other aspects of the curriculum and with respect to the other SLOs that do not directly involve research?

#### **Section IV: Systematic Method for Measuring Progress Toward Accomplishment of SLOs**

The Measurement of SLOs is both rigorous and appropriate. However, some SLOs are assessed using only one “measure”; albeit with 2 different faculty doing the measurement.

My only suggestion is to add a table and discussion of the BioMap Assessment overtime and across the curriculum. It would be very convincing to present data showing your students’ BioMap scores dramatically improving as they advance through the Biology curriculum, etc.

#### **Section V. Reporting Results – Communication/ Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning**

The report states that, “The department assessment plan needs in-course assessment tools across the core and upper-level curriculum” (page 14). While this is a worthwhile long-term goal, couldn’t the department report BioMap scores until then?

#### **Minor Typos:**

Page 1: Either add period to end of SLOs 2, 3, 4, & 6 or remove from SLO 1 & 5 to be consistent in presentation.

Page 6, bottom of Table in footnote: There should be a semicolon following (BIOL).

Page 7, bottom: Remove extra space between SLO 2 and 4 to be consistent with presentation throughout report.

Page 7, bottom: Add a period to the end of SLO 2 and 4 to be consistent with presentation throughout report.

Page 8, middle: Add a period to the end of SLO 3 to be consistent with presentation throughout report.

Page 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph, last sentence: Delete the word “by” or “from” – one needs to be eliminated.

Page 9, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph, last sentence: The word “posters” needs an apostrophe “poster’s”.

Page 13, Top: Add a period to the end of SLO 3 to be consistent with presentation throughout report.

TO: Department of Chemistry  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 6, 2017

---

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 clearly articulated and explain what is required of the students. Furthermore, the SLOs consider the American Chemical Society.

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

SLOs are aligned to the foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework (acquisition of knowledge, application of knowledge, critical thinking, communication, sense of community, and personal/professional values). Please note: The foundation "personal and professional values" in the university's Baccalaureate Framework is labeled as "personal ethics" in the department's report. The department might consider updating its language to align with the university's language.

#### 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, developed, mastered).

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

The assessment model clearly and directly articulates the assessment process. Detail is provided regarding the match between SLOs and measures. All SLOs are assessed using several measures and desired results are provided. The assessment rubric was clearly explained.

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The data collection process is clearly explained. The report presented the results from the current and previous academic years, and provided comparisons of the data.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is clear that department is working to include multiple perspectives (i.e. faculty, advisors, a community advisory board, etc.) in the assessment process.

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

The process is analyzed, and "findings...did not indicate that any curricular changes were needed" (p. 7).

#### Overall Recommendations:

The department has a clearly established assessment plan, has several measures in place, and continues to take a proactive approach towards assessment. These efforts are admired. Please contact the COAS Assessment Committee if we can provide any assistance as you move forward with your assessment process.

TO: Dr. Steven Carr, Chair, Department of Communication  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report  
Date: January 2018

---

The COAS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the assessment report submitted by the Department of Communication. Our comments below follow a rubric derived from the revised [Senate Document 98-22. Appendix D.](#)

The Communications Department is to be commended on the amount of time and effort made to provide a detailed assessment report. With the exception of a few problems that need to be addressed, much of the report is exemplary. We do note that the assessment process for Communications is still in transition, as you continue to adapt your curriculum from three concentrations to four, while assessing all seven.

It is understandable that some aspects of the assessment report are incomplete because they are being updated to reflect that the undergraduate program is still working through this transitional period.

There are areas that need to be addressed as described in Sections I, III and IV.

If a section is left blank, this indicates that at the very least, the department satisfied if not exceeded the requirements of the assessment report.

#### Section I: Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

For all but one of the majors, the SLOs provide descriptive, yet succinct outcomes. In each case, there is a general heading followed by a description of what students should be able to do. Under MMNR, there is a general heading, but then the methods of assessment are described instead of outcomes. This needs to be changed to provide SLOs in the manner provided for the other majors and concentrations.

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 with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The Communications Department's SLOs are clearly defined and do align with all of the areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.

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

Although SLOs 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 is marked as introductory (I), proficient (P), or advanced (A) to indicate the level of mastery the students are expected to achieve. Other descriptors can be used.

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



The Communications Department has shown improvement in its assessment plan and has successfully demonstrated a sound choice of measurements to align with the SLOs being assessed.

We noted a few areas where additional change is warranted. Firstly, desired results should be framed around a specific timeline. Second, it appears that simple means were used to obtain the mean for all majors/concentrations. Since there were different numbers of portfolios between majors/concentrations, weighted averages should be used for entire populations.

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Assessment Committee found that results were present, clear, and showed student achievement in regards to the SLOs.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Dissemination and Collaboration

The Communications Department has done a good job of sharing its results both with faculty and with relevant stakeholders. We recognize that some data is not yet available given the new concentrations and that alumni and employer surveys will be next conducted at a later date.

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

During this time of transition, it is understandable that specific details cannot be provided. Hopefully it will be possible to give greater specificity as to how recommendations will impact the SLOs and meeting goals in future years.

#### Overall Recommendations:

The COAS Assessment Committee suggests the following changes and additions.

Be sure to provide full descriptions of SLOs for the MMNR concentration, similar to those included for the other concentrations.

Continue to work on the curricular map so that it clearly demonstrates the progression of student learning, including the level of mastery, through the various courses offered by the department.

When improving the Assessment Plan, work to include a specific timeline, and to use weighted averages for the entire population.

TO: Department of English and Linguistics, Undergraduate Studies Committee  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 6, 2017

---

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)

Department-wide (not concentration-specific) SLOs are provided, and they are clear and specific. They are written in student-centered terms. The following was stated on page 3 of the report, "These SLOs apply to all concentrations." Is this suggesting that there are not concentration-specific SLOs? If so, please consider directly articulating that in future reports. Or if there are concentration-specific SLOs, please consider including the SLOs for each concentration in future reports, even if these are not being assessed in a given year. The expectation level of the "university and other necessary approving organizations" is unknown at this time.

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

As indicated by the COAS Assessment Committee in the 2015-2016 feedback: While the report contains the section "General ENG SLOs mapped to the Baccalaureate Framework numbers above" (bottom of page 1 and top of page 2), it is unclear how these six items directly relate to the three SLOs (identified in section 1). Furthermore, it is unclear how the three SLOs (identified in section 1) align with the Baccalaureate Framework. In future reports, please consider clearly/directly aligning the SLOs (identified in section 1) with the Baccalaureate Framework. Furthermore, as previously recommended by the COAS Assessment Committee in the 2014-2015 feedback and 2015-2016 feedback, in future reports, please consider including a discussion of how all SLOs, including those in the concentrations, align with the Baccalaureate Framework. For example, what foundations of the Baccalaureate Framework align with SLO #1? Etc.

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

All SLOs are mapped to specific courses. However, the progression of learning was unclear. For example, at what point in the curriculum are the SLOs introduced? When are they developed? When are they mastered? Etc.

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

The assessment model clearly and directly articulates the assessment process. Detail is provided regarding the match between SLOs and measures. All SLOs are assessed using different measures. The assessment rubric was clearly explained.

#### Section V. Reporting Results – Communication

Results suggest students are achieving the established benchmarks for the SLOs, and the interpretation of the results appear sound. The following was stated on page 6 of the report, "This will allow meaningful longitudinal study over multiple years." In future reports, please include previous results to provide context for the current results.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is clear that multiple faculty participate in the assessment process. The following is stated on page 5 of the report, "In addition, the ENG Undergraduate Assessment Report will be provided to the ENG chair for further distribution and discussion among the department as a whole, as well as with other relevant stakeholders". In addition to English faculty, who specifically are the "relevant stakeholders"? How are the "relevant stakeholders" directly involved in the assessment process? In future reports, please consider addressing the "documents and results are shared with other stakeholders" section with more depth.

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

The process is analyzed, and "no changes have been proposed at this point" (p. 5). The report also indicates that the "responses does not reflect a significant sample size. And, due to an error, these new responses were collected with old responses from two years ago..." (p. 5). In future reports, please consider explaining what the department is doing/has done/will do to increase future response rates.

#### Overall Recommendations:

The department has a clearly established assessment plan, and is working towards fine-tuning the process. These efforts are admired. For next year's report the COAS Assessment Committee suggests focusing on the specific recommendations provided in sections I through VII in this letter. The committee asks the department to respond directly to the recommendations listed above, in next year's report. Please contact us if we can provide any assistance as you move forward with your assessment process.

TO: Department of English and Linguistics, Graduate Studies Committee  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 6, 2017

---

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 SLOs are clearly articulated and explain what is required of the students. The expectation level of the "university and other necessary approving organizations" is unknown at this time.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

n/a

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 (i.e. "explore", "demonstrate", "produce", etc.).

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

The assessment model clearly and directly articulates the assessment process. Detail is provided regarding the match between SLOs and measures. All SLOs are assessed using two measures.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The data collection process is clearly explained. The report presented the results from the current and three previous academic years, and provided side-by-side comparisons of the data.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is clear that faculty members and stakeholders outside of the department are actively involved in the assessment process.

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

While the report did not identify any changes to the assessment process itself, the report did identify specific strategies that the department will undertake in an effort to improve future alumni survey response rates.

Overall Recommendations:

The department has a clearly established assessment plan, has several measures in place, and continues to take a proactive approach towards assessment. These efforts are admired. Please contact the COAS Assessment Committee if we can provide any assistance as you move forward with your assessment process.

TO: Julie Hook, Director of General Studies  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 20, 2017

---

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 for the General Studies Degree appear to be SLOs that could easily be expected of any student with a college degree, no matter what that degree happens to be. Is it possible to identify any program-specific SLOs.

#### 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.

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

The report clearly, and likely rightly, states that the diversity of courses allowed to complete the General Studies degree program preclude a curriculum map. This would not seem to preclude mapping the SLOs onto courses that will or are likely to meet that SLO. This would provide some indication of how the courses that count toward the degree connect in meaningful ways to the SLOs of the degree.

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

The relationships between the SLOs and the assessment strategies remain largely unarticulated. We recommend including details of how the various methods of assessment will be carried out and used to measure achievement of the SLOs. Until the assessment tools are more fully developed, meaningful data points will remain out of reach.

#### 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:

As the assessment plan nears implementation, the most significant improvements will be to the mapping of SLOs to courses within program and a clearer mapping of how the assessment tools will be carried out and used measure achievement of the SLOs.

TO: Lachlan Whalen, Director of International Studies  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 21, 2017

---

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 could be improved through richer and/or more detailed descriptions of the skills developed, perspectives attained, and knowledge gained.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Aside from a formatting problem on page 2, the SLOs were connected to the Baccalaureate Framework.

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

SLOs were clearly connected to course content and curriculum map.

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

SLO C (Critical thinking) is not included in the description of assessments related to either INTL-1200 or WOST W301.

Section V. Reporting Results – Communication

Results, both current and past, were presented clearly and interpreted in light of SLOs.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Reports of results were shared with faculty. Other stakeholders with which the results might be shared are unidentified.

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

Report indicates consistent attention to opportunities to improve curricular and pedagogical strategies aimed at increasing attainment of SLOs.

Overall Recommendations:

Maintain current effort and make the adjustments identified in the previous sections.

TO: Craig Hill, Director LGBT Program  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 21, 2017

---

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)

Very ambitious SLOs; clarity and specificity limited by the interdisciplinary nature of the certificate curriculum and the breadth of application of analysis associated with certificate skills.

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

SLOs were defined in light of Baccalaureate Framework.

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

Course Content and curriculum map are connected explicitly to SLOs. Clarity of student learning development limited by flexibility of course offerings within the certificate program.

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

The goals according to which the results of the assessment artifact will be measured should be more clearly articulated. This is less significant at this stage because no students have completed the certificate since the assessment plan has been constructed. It will be important to address this before implementation of the assessment plan.

#### 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 Assessment Plan will be improved most significantly by identifying the goals according to which the results of the assessment artifact will be measured. Additionally, any additional clarity and specificity connecting SLOs to the curriculum map would be beneficial even though this is obviously limited by the flexibility of the course offerings within the certificate program.



TO: Peter Dragnev, Chair, Department of Mathematical Sciences  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date:

---

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](#).

Overall the department has developed a commendable assessment program particularly in light of the limited amount of information that can be gathered in any given year. The COAS Assessment Committee recognizes the work the department has done to analyze the data and make sense of it. In some cases, categories are scored as N/A because of the difficulty in interpreting the results. Although the assessment program is sound, some suggestions for improvement are provided.

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

It would be helpful to make clear in the "goals for all majors" section that the individual specialties will also possess a Goal 4 that relates to that specific topic.

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

Three out of the six areas of the Baccalaureate Framework (Personal and Professional Values, Sense of Community, and Communication) appear not to be met by the SLOs. For Personal and Professional Values, isn't the code of ethics for your field presented to the students at some point?

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

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 is marked as introductory (I), proficient (P), or advanced (A) to indicate the level of mastery the students are expected to achieve. Other descriptors can be used.

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

While Section 3 A & B note that instructors are asked to measure performance as it relates to an SLO, detail is not provided as to how those assessments are linked. Perhaps an appendix including the request letter and the "selected questions to specifically assess designated outcomes" would help the Assessment Committee in understanding how the particular SLOs are being measured. We are told that instructors measure students' performance, but were not given details on what kinds of activities provide for the measurement. Are these tests, homework assignments, or other assessments?

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The results are clear, but appear to only target some SLO's, but not all. It also might be useful to break reporting results down for each of the concentrations. There was lack of clarity for graphs denoting Goal 4, as this is a goal that changes for each specific concentration. Although the department has carefully considered how to approach the small amount of data available, the Interpretation of Results will be scored N/A until more results can be added.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

“Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders” has been scored N/A. However, if the department has an active community advisory board, perhaps your assessment results can be shared with them.

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

Once again, since data are still being collected and conclusions are currently difficult to draw, this has been scored N/A for this year.

#### Overall Recommendations:

The most significant issues that the department should address are the alignment of SLO's with the entire Baccalaureate Framework and more detail concerning how assessments from the instructors are measured with the results communicated for all SLO's.

TO: Mark Masters, Chair, Department of Physics  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date:

---

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](#).

Overall the assessment program is commendable, and the student SLO's are excellent. There are some other aspects that can be improved.

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

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. If any assessments relate to standards set by the American Physical Society, then it would be worth including.

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Although it is possible to imagine how "Thinking Like a Physicist" would apply to BF4 Sense of Community, it would be helpful if the department explained this in a footnote.

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

It is unclear what the numbers indicate in the table. Do they represent the number of raters or level of student proficiency? Although SLO's have been mapped to specific courses, there are no indications of the progression of student learning through the curriculum. To indicate progression or development of student learning in the matrix, the course is marked as introductory (I), proficient (P), or advanced (A) to specify the level of mastery the students are expected to achieve. Other descriptors can be used.

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

It is not clear which measurement is being used to assess which of the four specific SLO's.

It was very commendable to note that there is faculty discussion, but perhaps there could be a way to document this. Perhaps you could use minutes, or create some sort of checklist or rubric for times when the faculty comes together to assess student progress.

The FCI is a particularly useful choice for assessment.

#### Section V. Reporting Results – Communication

The results were present, but not tied specifically to the various SLO's outlined. In your results, try to make explicit references to how student achievement demonstrates outcomes such as thinking like a physicist and scientific ethics.

## Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

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

It appears that a great deal of thought has gone into how to improve the program for the students. In next year's assessment indicate which of the recommendations were implemented and document how they worked.

Considering some of the issues described in the report, the following suggestions are provided. If it is possible within the 120 credit limit, introduce a required 1-credit freshman seminar course for your majors that describes expectations, work load for the major, and other objectives. With the move to banded tuition, this should at least not be a financial burden for your majors. We recognize that this may not be possible. Consider collaborating with the English department (or other writing intensive departments such as HIST and COM) in developing ways to improve writing. The assessment committee looks forward to the creation and implementation of new rubrics.

### Overall Recommendations:

The most significant issues that the department should address are to provide an explanation of how “Thinking Like a Physicist” applies to BF4 Sense of Community, specifying which measurement is being used for which SLO, and reporting specifically the results for the individual SLO’s and how student achievement demonstrates outcomes.

TO: Department of Psychology  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 6, 2017

---

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 clearly articulated and explain what is required of the students. The expectation level of the "university and other necessary approving organizations" is unknown at this time.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

SLOs are aligned to the foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework (Acquisition of Knowledge, Application of Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Communication, Sense of Community, and Personal/Professional Values).

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, #4, #6, and #7 appear to only be assessed by one measure. However, Department of Psychology is taking a proactive approach to this. The following is stated on page 9, "...we have begun to look for additional assessment measures so that we will have two measures for each learning objective."

Section V: Reporting Results - Communication

The only results presented were for the psychological reasoning test. The survey of majors and survey of alumni are only conducted "at the time of departmental program review" (p. 6). However, it was unclear why the results for the other measures (major field test and evaluation of senior papers) were not provided. The following explanation was provided for historical results: "The current version of this measure has not been administered previously." Therefore, this section of the rubric was n/a.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is clear that multiple faculty members are involved in the assessment process. The following explanation was provided for other stakeholders: "Documents and results shared with stakeholders: not applicable" (p. 9). Therefore, this section of the rubric was marked accordingly.

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

The report indicates that the assessment results will be considered when making programmatic/curricular improvements. The report indicates that the department is in the process of developing additional assessment measures.

Overall Recommendations:

The department has a clearly established assessment plan, has measures in place, and continues to take a proactive approach towards assessment. These efforts are admired. For next year's report the COAS Assessment Committee suggests focusing on the specific recommendations provided in sections I through VII in this letter. The committee asks the department to respond directly to the recommendations listed above, in next year's report. Please contact us if we can provide any assistance as you move forward with your assessment process.

TO: Department of Sociology  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 6, 2017

---

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 clearly articulated and explain what is required of the students. The expectation level of the "university and other necessary approving organizations" is unknown at this time. Also, the following is noted on page 1 of the department's report, "...the Sociology Program is in the middle of a finalizing process of new learning objectives/outcomes for all courses."

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

SLOs are aligned to the foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework (acquisition of knowledge, application of knowledge, critical thinking, communication, sense of community, and personal/professional values).

#### 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, and reinforced).

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

SLOs appear to be assessed by multiple measures (i.e. oral presentations, written papers, exit interviews, and alumni survey). However, the results from the alumni survey seem to focus on what motivated sociology students, employment, and graduate school/research (p. 7-8). It was unclear how the results from the alumni survey directly assessed any of the SLOs. Furthermore, page 5 of the report indicates the following about the alumni survey, "The approved survey will be conducted with all new alumni every two years.", and the following is stated on page 6 of the report, "A survey of graduates will be conducted on the third anniversary of their graduation." These two statements seem to disagree with one another.

The Department of Sociology is taking a proactive approach to revising their SLOs and the assessment process. The following is stated on page 1, "...the Sociology Program has reviewed and discussed learning objectives of all level courses. The adoption of new learning objectives for upper level courses still continues. Because our review of learning objectives for upper level courses is in progress, this year's report shows the data collected through the learning objectives that we currently use."

As the Department of Sociology revises its SLOs and assessment process, the COAS Assessment Committee recommends that the alumni survey is revised accordingly (or at least directly explain how/why the survey directly relates to the SLOs and/or the assessment process) in future reports.

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

While the desired results were clearly stated for S470, the desired results were unclear for the SLOs assessed in S340, S351, and S352.

The Department of Sociology is in the process of revising their SLOs. As a result, the desired results, data collection, and methods sections appear to need development also. More specifically, the following is stated on page 9 of the report, "In Spring 2017, the new learning objectives were adopted..." and "...the portfolio implementation needs to be further discussed... As an initial step, the portfolio will be implemented as a course requirement in Senior Seminar in Spring 2018.". As the Department of Sociology revises its SLOs and assessment process, the COAS Assessment Committee recommends that the desired results, data collection, and methods sections are developed accordingly in future reports.

The only results presented were the assignments completed in the required courses and alumni survey. However, it was unclear why the results for the other measure (the exit interviews) were not provided.

Results suggest students are achieving the established benchmarks for the SLOs in S470 (p. 7). In future reports, please include previous results to provide context for the current results.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is clear that multiple faculty members are involved in the assessment process. In addition to SOC faculty, who are other stakeholders who are involved in the assessment process (i.e. Alumni Office, professionals in the Fort Wayne business community, etc.)? In future reports, please consider clearly/directly explaining how information is provided to stakeholders (in addition to SOC faculty) and/or their role in the assessment process.

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

The report indicates that the Department of Sociology is in the process of implementing a course requirement/portfolio. However, the details are still being discussed by SOC faculty (p. 9). The report indicates that the department is in the process of developing additional assessment processes and measures (p. 9).

#### Overall Recommendations:

The department is working to revise their SLOs and fine-tuning their assessment process. These efforts are admired. For next year's report the COAS Assessment Committee suggests focusing on the specific recommendations provided in sections I through VII in this letter. The committee asks the department to respond directly to the recommendations listed above, in next year's report. Please contact us if we can provide any assistance as you move forward with your assessment process.



TO: Janet Badia, Director of Women's Studies  
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee  
SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Assessment Report for  
Date: December 21, 2017

---

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 are clearly and articulated stated.

#### Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

Some areas of the Baccalaureate Framework are only connected to the SLOs for the major. If possible, connected the other SLOs to the Baccalaureate Framework would be optimal, but the limited curriculum time for minors and certificates often precludes this.

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

SLOs are clearly connected to course offerings and curriculum map.

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

The methods defined in the assessment plan are detailed and clear.

#### Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The describing of assessment measures, reporting of results, and interpretation of those results are tightly integrated. There are no historical results to report.

#### Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Report indicates that results are shared with faculty and relevant stakeholders.

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

Report indicates consistent attention to opportunities to improve curricular and pedagogical strategies aimed at increasing attainment of SLOs.

#### Overall Recommendations:

Maintain current effort and attempts to continually improve assessment strategies, tools, and communication.