

COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2020

[You can add an optional comment or delete here.]

College: College of Arts and Sciences

Contact: Mieko Yamada

Report Date: April 17, 2020

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY
FORT WAYNE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs _____ | 1 |
| Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments _____ | 5 |
| Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings _____ | 6 |
| Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions _____ | 7 |
| Attachments _____ | 8 |

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

In Fall 2019, departments and certificate programs in COAS were asked to complete assessment reports for 2018-2019 using protocols documented in SD 15-6. The Chair of the COAS Assessment Committee solicited assessment reports from chairs and directors through the COAS Connection Newsletter on October 1st with a deadline of November 8th. A reminder was sent out to all Department Chairs and Program Directors on November 7th. By the deadline, only two departments submitted the reports, five departments and four certificate programs requested extensions, and two departments and one graduate program requested waivers. The Chair contacted chairs and directors whose departments or programs had not yet submitted a report and notified those who requested extensions that the extended deadline was November 15th. As its meeting on November 21st, the Assessment Committee Chair reported the committee members that three departments, two certificate programs, and one graduate program had submitted the reports but that four departments and two programs had requested further extensions. The COAS Assessment Committee agreed to extend their deadlines to December 15th. Three departments and one program submitted reports in November and December 2019, and two programs submitted reports in January and February 2020 respectively.

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 COAS Assessment Committee sent letters to respective departments and programs during the period from January to March 2020. Copies of the letters are appended to the current document, and the scoring rubrics are on file in the Office of Assessment.

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

Summary of Results

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

| Department Program | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | Department Program | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| ANTH | R | W | R | MATH | R | R | R |
| BIOL | R | R | R | PHIL ¹ | --- | --- | --- |
| BIOL Grad | N | N | N | PHYS | W | W | R |
| CHEM | R | R | R | POLS | E | N | N |
| COM | R | R | R | PSY | E | R | R |
| COM Grad | W | N | R | SOC | R | W | R |
| CSD | E | R | N | GENST | R | R | R |
| ENGL | R | R | R | GERN | N | N | N |
| ENGL Grad | R | R | R | INTL | R | R | R |
| GEO ¹ | --- | --- | --- | LGBT | R | R | R |
| HIST | W | R | W | PACS | R | R | W |
| ILCS | E | N | N | WOST | R | R | R |

R= Report submitted; N= Report not submitted; E= Extension, working directly with Assessment Office; W= Waiver; ¹Department Eliminated

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

In Fall 2019, there was one vacancy of members in the COAS Assessment Committee. Thus, six committee members reviewed all submitted reports. In Spring 2020, reviews of assessment reports continued due to the late report submissions. Since two members out of six were on sabbatical in Spring 2020, four committee members completed the assessment reviews.

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.

A summary of scores for each of the seven rubric categories is presented for eight baccalaureate degree programs (Table 2). The COAS Assessment Committee received eight reports, but the eighth baccalaureate degree program submitted an assessment plan, not results, and therefore it was not evaluated.

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

| Table 2. Summary of scores of nine departments for each section of the rubric presented in SD 15-6, Appendix D | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------|----|----|----|----|---------|---|-------|
| Sections | Max Score | baccalaureate programs | | | | | | | Range |
| Clearly Stated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) | 9 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6-9 |
| Alignment of SLOs with (I)PFW Baccalaureate Framework | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Learning Experiences | 9 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 3 NA | 6 | 3-9 |
| Systematic Method for Measuring Progress of SLO | 15 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 1 NA | 5 | 1-15 |
| Reporting Results - Communication | 9 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 3 NA | 3 | 3-9 |
| Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement | 6 | 3 | 4 | NA | 6 | 6 | 2 NA | 2 | 2-6 |
| Use of Results for Programmatic Change | 6 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 5 | NA | 2 | 2-6 |
| NA= Not addressed/Not applicable | | | | | | | | | |

For Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), scores ranged from 6 to 9. Four of seven baccalaureate programs received the maximum score, and one received a score of 8 out of 9. For alignment with the baccalaureate framework, all the programs received the maximum score (3/3). For mapping SLOs to learning experiences, scores ranged from 3 to 9, and three baccalaureate programs received the maximum score. For measuring progress of SLO, scores ranged from 5 to 15, and two programs received the maximum score. In terms of reporting results, two programs received the maximum score for communicating results (9/9), and two received the maximum score for reporting to stakeholders (6/6). For use of results for programmatic change, scores ranged from 2 to 6, two programs received the maximum score, and one program received a score of 5 out of 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 the period between January and March 2020. Copies of the response letters are appended and scoring rubrics are on file on OneDrive.

SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS

Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

There is no change in the review process for 2018-2019. The process of having two reviewers (one new and one experienced) for each report worked well and will be continued.

Results from student learning assessments are reported in the individual reports appended. Two departments and one graduate program reported assessment results that changes in program curricula.

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

During Fall 2019 and Spring 2020, eight departments submitted assessment reports for baccalaureate degree programs, and one department submitted a report for a graduate program. Four certificate-granting programs submitted reports. Waivers were granted to two departments and one graduate program. Four departments were unable to submit reports on a timely manner and granted extensions (Fall 2020), working directly with the Office of Assessment.

Overall, the quality of reports submitted in 2018-2019 was good, providing solid evidence for a commitment to assessment by departments and programs. Most departments and programs presented SLOs using precise verbs and student-centered terms and providing rich descriptions of the knowledge and skills expected of students. Only a few departments were advised to write more effective SLOs and identify levels of expected learning relative to SLOs in the program's curricular map. In terms of systematic methods for measuring progress of SLOs, many departments clearly showed the relationship between assessment and SLOs. Several departments were advised to document how results of assessment have led (or are expected to lead) to changes in curriculum. A few departments were advised to describe employ standardized rubrics and assessment tools. For reporting results, a few departments were advised to utilize quantitative measures in addition to qualitative data and using direct and indirect metrics to assess student learning outcomes. About half of the departments did not have a process whereby assessment results are communicated with external stakeholders and also needed more formal ways to set up feedback loops with faculty as well. Several departments were advised to address how evaluated results are used for programmatic change in order to improve student learning outcomes.

The COAS Assessment Committee acknowledges that all the submitted reports were organized and formatted as per SD 15-6. Although the format and expectations have been in place for five years, the committee recommends providing an instructional meeting for the COAS Assessment Committee early next fall. It may also be of benefit to include Department Chairs and Program Directors at this meeting. The COAS Committee will work with the Office of Assessment to arrange such sessions.

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

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments

Response Letters

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Anthropology and Sociology
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for Anthropology Program
Date: February 3, 2020

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

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

The SLOs stated in the report generally contain precise verbs and descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students. However, those could be more accurately and clearly stated by using richer descriptions and student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do). The Committee recommends re-evaluating and revising outcomes for clarity and specificity so that all are precise and include expectations.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

In the report, the table (on page 3) appears to present the alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Degree Framework, but this table can be improved for clarity and specificity. The Committee recommends the program to elaborate the table by indicating how more specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program-Level SLOs are aligned to all foundation areas of the with PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

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

The Committee recognizes that SLOs are mapped to courses expected of students completing the program. However, the curricular map in the report does not clearly present levels of expected learning relative to SLOs at specific points in the curriculum. The Committee recommends the program to clearly identify where SLO's are introduced, explained, and reinforced in the program's curricular map.

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

In the current form, neither the Relationship between the assessments and the SLOs nor the Types of measures used is clearly present. Rubrics tied to grading or use of assessment needs to be clearly present. Also, it is unclear how direct assessments of the core courses are conducted. For example, how does the paper meet (or not meet) SLO in ANTH 10501? If the core courses are used as a barometer, those should be used for programmatic change. The Committee recommends stating what specific assessments are used to determine where SLOs are being met.

ATTACHMENTS

The Committee acknowledges the program's work on the following areas: C. Established results, D. Data Collection and Design Integrity, and E. Evidence of Reliability of measures. However, drawing conclusions based on student passing rates is not a viable assessment measure. Direct standardized quantitative measures could be used to enhance validity and reliability of measures and analyses. The Committee notes that future use of ePortfolios will produce a direct measure for majors, but the evaluation of portfolios should be standardized with using rubrics.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

In the current report, results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLOs. For example, "our ability to meet Learning Objectives 2-4 (familiarity with other cultures, holistic understanding, and writing) does not seem to be deficient" (p.8). Since there is a lack of direct measures of assessment, it is unclear how this conclusion is drawn. Moreover, it appears that there may have been some confusion on the assessment review versus the program review as much information provided is a better fit for the annual program review. The Committee expects to see data for this section in the 2019-2020 report.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It would be helpful to show specific ways curriculum has been shaped or changed as the result of direct assessment measures shared among faculty and other stakeholders. Given the current report, it is not clear whether there are external stakeholders. For example, internships are mentioned in the current report. Do these sites serve as external stakeholders, and do they need to be aware of the SLO and outcomes?

The Committee recommends including stakeholders (such as faculty and instructors who teach and internship site-supervisors) and also suggests to clearly indicate how information is shared with them (O drive, etc) in the next report.

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

The Committee acknowledges the program's next steps for curricular and assessment changes. We strongly recommend using the ePortfolios and having a standardized method of evaluation. Also, we recommend finding a way to directly measure the core set of courses for major and have those assessment be in addressed in a direct manner for help in programmatic change.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Biology
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for English B.A.
Date: January 31, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the goals are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

The SLOs are clearly presented and aligned with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

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

All the SLOs mapped to the curriculum clearly presents benchmarks. The curricular map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to the SLOs at specific points in the curriculum where contents are introduced, expanded, emphasized, reinforced, and mastered. The committee also acknowledges that the curricular map is well developed by indicating assessment tools.

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

The relationship between assessment and SLOs is clearly and thoroughly explained. The Committee recognizes that the SLOs are assessed using three measures: BioMaps surveys, evaluation of artifacts, and enrollments in directed research credits.

The Committee commends the work on the following areas: C. Established results, D. Data collection and design integrity, and E. Evidence of reliability of measures. We find that the use of two faculty members evaluating student papers is a good methodology. We acknowledge that using standardized rubrics and assessment measures such as BioMaps with external standardizations and national means help ensure reliability of findings and evaluated outcomes.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on the following areas: A. Presentation of Results, B. Historical Results, and C. Interpretations of Results. Those are scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee understands that the “reports are posted to the department O drive for access to all faculty, ...and posted on the college website.” We rank 2 out of 3 because it is unclear how the information is discussed and utilized by the department for building future plans. Is there any opportunity for discussion of results among the faculty? Is the information presented at any departmental meeting? Are there any advisory board or external stakeholders for which the assessment results would need to be shared? The Committee encourages the department to consider addressing how documents are shared and discussed among the faculty and other stakeholders.

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

The Committee commends the use of BioMaps to determine areas of growth related to the SLO's and then used for possible programmatic change. The areas of Programmatic and curricular improvement and Improvement of assessment process are scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Chemistry
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for
Date: February 6, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the goals are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

The current report clearly presents that the SLOs are aligned with the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and mapped to the curriculum.

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

In the current report, "Curriculum map" is stated as Section 2 (p.2-3). The Committee commends the work on the following areas: Content Alignment and Student Learning Development of SLOs. While the curricular map indicates the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs using three levels (i.e., "introductory," "developmental," and "mastering"), it does not provide specific information about student engagement. The Committee recommends addressing specific classes and/or activities where students are engaged in the work outlined in the SLOs.

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

The relationship between assessment and SLOs is clearly stated, and types of measures are explained. In terms of data collection process and design integrity, we acknowledge that enough information is provided in the current report. However, limited methodological concerns still remain for drawing meaningful conclusions. The Committee recommends including specific methods of data collection and highlighting how these methods are used to ensure reliability of findings.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

Overall, the results presented in the report demonstrate student achievement relative to the SLOs and give historical analysis to provide context for the current results. However, the current report does not clearly state how interpretations of the results are made. The Committee recommends describing how the results are directly related of each SLO in the 2019-2020 report.

ATTACHMENTS

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The current report does not state that results are shared with faculty or other stakeholders. The Committee recommends including stakeholder involvement and addressing how the results are provided to and discussed by all faculty and other stakeholders to build future plans.

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

The current report does not address continual improvement. The Committee recommends including specific statements on how the department critically evaluates the assessment process (i.e., mechanics).

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Communication
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for Communication Undergraduate Program
Date: February 3, 2020

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

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

The SLOs are well described, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The Committee commends the program's work in Section II and III. The tables in Section II and III clearly present that the SLOs are aligned with the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and mapped to the curriculum. The Committee acknowledges that the program addresses the previous committee's feedback in the current report by stating that the program is in progress for developing ways to show student progression through the curriculum for each SLO and that the development of student learning will be marked as I (introduced), D (developed), and M (mastered).

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

The program's methods of assessment for SLOs are very good. The relationship between assessments and SLOs is clearly indicated in the report. The Committee commends the work on the following areas: C. Established Results and E. Evidence of Reliability of Measures.

In terms of D. Data collection and Design Integrity, the Committee recommends using more than one portfolio from a different concentration for assessment. By assessing one portfolio for RPAD concentration, the result may be biased due to small sample size. The program may want to consider assessing a higher percentage of portfolios for concentrations of smaller size, such as RPAD, rather than 25% for each concentration, equally, in order to increase the accuracy of the assessment procedures.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on A. Presentation of Results and B. Historical Results. In terms of the area of C. Interpretations of Results, interpretations of results seem overall reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. However, it could

ATTACHMENTS

provide more details by describing how results are discussed by multiple faculty. The Committee acknowledges the program's work on this area but expects to see more complete result interpretations, including Alumni surveys and Employer surveys, in the 2019-2020 report.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee commends the work for this section and acknowledges that documents and results are shared with faculty and other stakeholders.

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

The Committee commends the work on the use of results for Programmatic change to improve student learning outcomes and achievements. It is scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of English
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for English Graduate degree
Date: March 25, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the goals are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 is given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

N/A. The baccalaureate framework is not applicable to the graduate program.

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

All the SLOs mapped to the curriculum clearly presents benchmarks. The curricular map identifies the progression of student learning relative to the SLOs at specific points in the listed 4 courses (i.e., 2 CORE and 2 SEMINAR courses).

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

In the current report, description of how SLOs relate to assessment is not clearly presented. The committee recommends providing description of SLOs-to-measure match, i.e., how specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. We acknowledge that two measures (direct and indirect) are provided.

In the section of C. Established Results, desired results are stated. While the results/data are provided in Section V. B (pp.7-9) as stated in the report, no specific description of comparisons and detailed timelines for completion is provided. The Committee recommends providing statements of comparisons and timelines for completion in the future report.

The Committee commends the work on the areas of D. Data collection and design integrity and E. Evidence of reliability of measures.

ATTACHMENTS

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on the areas of A. Presentation of Results, B. Historical Results, and C. Interpretations of Results.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee commends the work on the areas of A. Documents and results are shared with faculty, and B. Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders. We acknowledge the program's effort for expanding stakeholders.

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

The Committee commends the work on the areas of A Programmatic and curricular improvement and B. Improvement of assessment process. Those are scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of English
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for English B.A.
Date: January 21, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the goals are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and Section III: Student Learning Outcomes Mapped to Planned Learning Experiences in the Academic Program (Curricular Map)

The SLOs are aligned with the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and mapped to the curriculum. The Committee finds that the English undergraduate program in its future plan clearly presents benchmarks by indicating the different points along the curricular map where contents are introduced, developed, and mastered.

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

The relationship between assessment and SLOs is clearly explained. The Committee understands that the second measure, the exit survey of graduating seniors, is still problematic because it depends on whether students submit surveys.

The Committee commends the work on the areas of: C. Established results, D. Data collection and design integrity, and E. Evidence of reliability of measures.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on the areas of A. Presentation of Results, B. Historical Results, and C. Interpretations of Results.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee commends the work on the areas of A. Documents and results are shared with faculty, and B. Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders. Very good involvement of stakeholders.

ATTACHMENTS

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

The Committee understands the reasons why “As of early November 2019, none of the proposed changes to” the broader curriculum and department have yet begun and thus, the need you had to revise the goals proposed in 2018, regarding the next direction of the department. We acknowledge that this program wish to

- Propose updated SLOs;
- Create a rubric for scoring those SLOs;
- Revise the exit survey to reflect the two changes above.

The Committee supports your future work on them.

Overall Recommendations:

While the Committee acknowledges that the department’s assessment procedures are currently being updated, we make the following minor suggestions and recommendations for the program’s consideration.

- Section I: The committee commends your work in providing clear, specific and student-centered learning outcomes. One detail is that the goals under each concentration all start with “Graduates will demonstrate particular strengths in:” and then list the SLOs, while the general undergraduate goals all repeat “Students will demonstrate” and then refer to “students”. Unless it is intentionally used, we recommend to use “students”, instead of “graduates”.
- Sections II and III: The Committee suggests to add “aligned” between “Learning Outcomes” and “with the PFW Baccalaureate”, on p. 2, paragraph 1.
- Section IV (Current Progress): The Committee encourages the English undergraduate program to continue making progress toward the fulfillment of the goals stated in their 2017-2018 academic year report of assessment – specifically goals 1, 2 and 4. Moreover, we commend the program for the successful creation of the new entry-level “Introduction to the major” course for freshmen.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: La Tishia Horrell, Director of General Studies
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for General Studies
Date: January 26, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the goals are stated clearly and specifically and are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

As minor suggestions, the Committee recommends to add “Students will” once, above the numbered SLOs. To be consistent throughout the report, the Committee suggests that the program may want to change numbering to “SLO-1, SLO-2, ...” from “1, 2, ...”, in Section I unless the program has a specific reason to have chosen different types of number.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The Committee commends the work on the Alignment with the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework in the rubric. To clearly present, the Committee suggests that the program may want to add one more category to indicate specific courses where students would learn in the table in addition to “Baccalaureate Framework Outcomes” and “SLOs” (on page 1).

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

The Committee commends the work on “Content alignment” in the rubric. To be consistent, again, the program may want to have the same numbered list in Section I, II, and III.

The Committee was not clear about both “EDU 40000” and “Required General Education Capstone Course”, questioning whether those are same or different courses in the following outcomes: “Understand the nature and diversity...”, “Demonstrate understanding of scholarly work...”, and “Apply the knowledge...”. To avoid confusion, it would be helpful if the program could use course numbers and titles clearly and consistently.

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

In the current form, neither the Relationship between the assessments and the SLOs nor the Types of measures used is clearly present. The Committee understands that no direct assessment of the SLOs

ATTACHMENTS

has been conducted up to now. While acknowledging the program's careful analysis of the past situation and that there is the lack of information to report, the Committee commends the program for proposing the assessment plan stated in your report and further encourages the program to implement it.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee understands that lack of results to report in this section. For the time being it is scored as currently N/A. The Committee expects to see data for the 2019-2020 report.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee acknowledges that the program shared the information with the General Studies Policy Board. We encourage the program to consider expanding stakeholders (such as faculty and instructors who teach) and clearly indicate how information is shared with them (O drive, etc).

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

The Committee understands the lack of information to report on these sections, given the lack of assessment conducted so far. We commend the program on the steps taken to conduct regular assessment soon.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Lachlan Whalen
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for the International Studies Certificate Program
Date: February 4, 2020

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

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

All the SLOs are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

In the current report, the SLOs are clearly aligned with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework and mapped to the curriculum.

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

The Committee commends the work on the areas of Content Alignment and Student Engagement. In terms of Student Learning Development of SLOs, the Committee acknowledges the program's benchmarks by using two levels: "introduced" and "emphasized and expanded on". However, the curricular map could present more detailed progression of student learning by adding a mastery level. Are there any courses or contents where SLOs are marked as "mastered"? The Committee recommends re-evaluating levels of student learning development in the program.

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

The relationship between assessments and SLOs is clearly stated. However, types of measures used for assessment can be improved. In the current report, formal papers for both INTL 20000 and WOST30100 are stated as two direct measures. However, the papers from INTL 20000 and WOST30100 are in fact counted as two sources, and only one direct measure (i.e., formal paper assessment) is used for assessment. In addition to the qualitative data, quantitative measures as well as direct/indirect metrics could be utilized for assessment. The Committee encourages the program to consider using an additional measure for assessment.

The Committee commends the work on the following areas: C. Established results, D. Data collection and design integrity, and E. Evidence of reliability of measures.

ATTACHMENTS

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on the following areas: A. Presentation of Results, B. Historical Results, and C. Interpretations of Results. It is scored as 3/3.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The current report includes sharing documents and describes how the results are shared and distributed to faculty and stakeholders. However, it does not clearly articulate how “information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.”

The Committee recommends addressing how the faculty and stakeholders can or play a role in building meaningful future plans.

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

The Committee commends the work on the use of results for programmatic change to improve student learning. The areas of Programmatic/curricular improvement and Improvement of assessment process are scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: LGBT Certificate Advisory Committee
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for LGBT Studies Certificate
Date: February 6, 2020

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

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

The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

The Committee acknowledges that the SLOs are aligned with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

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

The current report includes specific courses which are most likely used by students to achieve the SLOs in the program's curricular map. We appreciate this inclusion requested by the committee in the prior year's review. Further clarity can be made in the future report by specifically addressing "student engagement" in the work outlines in the SLOs. The Committee recommends addressing specific classes and/or activities where students are engaged in the work outlined in the SLOs.

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

The Committee acknowledges that the current report adds greater detail on the methods used to assess SLOs, but it could further delineate the connection between the SLOs to the details of the assessment so it can be used to determine future progress.

In the current report, only one direct measure (i.e., portfolio) is used. The Committee appreciates the explanation of why a second measure could not be added in this report.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

With no students pursuing the certificate, no data are provided in this report. For this reason, the current ratings can only be N/A.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

Because no data are provided in the current report, the ratings can only be N/A.

ATTACHMENTS

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

Because no data are provided in the current report, the ratings can only be N/A. The Committee recognizes that the program continues to have difficulty to find “assessment instruments, reports, or policy statements for LGBT programs that would provide guidelines for the assessment of knowledge and competence regarding LGBT issues or scholarship”.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Mathematics
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for Department of Mathematics
Date: January 27, 2020

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

The Committee acknowledges that the report included an assessment plan but not assessment results.

The assessment results are to be reviewed in Fall 2020 as stated in the report: “Results from an academic year will be reviewed by the department’s Assessment Committee, who will write a report summarizing its findings. The entire department will discuss the report during a special departmental meeting early in the Fall semester, with the intention of implementing changes for the following academic year.”

The Committee requests that the report be forwarded to Kent Johnson (johnsodk@pfw.edu) for review by October 31st. Kent will append the department’s annual report for this year with his comments.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Craig Ortsey, PACS
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for
Date: March 27, 2020

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

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

Overall, the goals are clearly stated, and they are also student-centered. A rating of 3 was given for clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The SLOs are aligned with the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework and mapped to the curriculum.

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

The current report presents benchmarks by indicating the different points along the curricular map where contents are introduced and expanded/emphasized. However, the curricular map could show more detailed progression of student learning by adding a mastery level. Are there any courses or contents (such as 40000s courses) where SLOs are marked as “mastered”? The Committee recommends re-evaluating levels of student learning development in the program.

It is unclear what “others” indicates in the curricular map. Does it refer to 40000s courses or elective courses? The Committee recommends listing and describing “others” in the next report.

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

The Committee recognizes the work on the areas of A through E. In the area of A. Relationship between assessments and SLOs, two sources of measure (i.e., community volunteer work papers in PACS 20000 and internship papers in PACS 49900) are mentioned. However, it seems that these are counted as one measure. In the current report, how SLOs relate to assessment is not clearly stated. For the next report, the Committee recommends providing descriptions of SLOs-to-measure match, i.e., how specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs.

The use of one indicator for assessment limits the conclusions that may be drawn overall for meeting the learning objectives. The current report clearly notes this point as a weakness and indicates that it is

ATTACHMENTS

a starting point. The Committee suggest that the program continue to develop the assessment of additional learning objectives as it appears to be the plan for PACS.

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

In the current report, results are present and related to the suggested SLO (i.e., LO 1), and interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO. The Committee encourages the program to incorporate results from the assessment of additional learning objectives. The Committee recognizes that no historical data are available for comparison in this report.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The Committee acknowledges that while results have not been shared with faculty or other stakeholders, the program has planned to do so in the near future.

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

In this report, A. Programmatic and curricular improvement and B. Improvement of assessment process are clearly stated. These areas are scored as 3/3.

Overall Recommendations:

While the Committee acknowledges the program's assessment procedures, results, and plans, we make the following suggestions and recommendations for the program's consideration.

- The development of inter-rater reliability would further enhance the confidence of the results. The committee suggests that an inter-rater reliability be further explained in the appendix. The committee acknowledges the use of the third rater as a means to handle conflicting ratings among reviewers.
- In the current report, two effective means of sharing the results with stakeholders are stated. For next year, the Committee suggests that the sharing of the results with stakeholders be completed before the submission of the report, and that the sharing process also include means for stakeholders to give feedback on ways to improve student learning and/or assessment procedures and methods.
- The committee recommends multiple methods of evaluation – not just student course work. The plan to use portfolios should aid in the assessment process.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Department of Anthropology and Sociology
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for Sociology Program
Date: February 3, 2020

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

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

The SLOs stated in the report generally contain precise verbs and descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students. However, those could be more accurately and clearly stated by using student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do). The Committee suggests the program use student-centered terms so that all SLOs would be more accurately stated with clarity and specificity.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

The Committee commends the work on the Alignment with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework in the rubric. A ranking of 3 was given for this section.

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

In the current report, most SLOs are mapped to common courses expected of students completing the program. However, the curricular map could more accurately and clearly indicate levels of expected learning relative to the SLOs. For example, “LO-12 Write a research paper” is only reinforced and never introduced. All SLOs should be introduced in some fashion. The Committee recommends re-evaluating the SLO table on page 2.

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

In the current form, neither the Relationship between the assessments and the SLOs nor the Types of measures used is clearly present. It is unclear how assessment is conducted. It would be helpful to have standardized rubrics and standardized assessment tools. Exit interviews and survey of alumni provided feedback on student satisfaction in the report but does not correlate to measurement of SLOs.

Narrative clarity is needed to assist with assessment review as much of the information provided is a better fit for the annual program review. There is a lack of clarity in assessments used. If there are multiple sections of courses, standardized assessments should be used to develop reliability and

ATTACHMENTS

validity. For example, passing rates does not equate to a direct measurement of SLOs. External standardizations and national means would help ensure reliability of findings, i.e., evaluated student learning outcomes.

The Committee recognizes that information provided in the report is a good step starting towards an assessment plan, but specifics are needed. We recommend using standardized rubrics and assessment measures.

Section V. Reporting Results – Communication

The Committee recognizes that results are provided by using generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment. However, the results in the current report do not clearly relate to SLOs. Heavy reliance on qualitative data limits the program from gaining valuable information for curricular change. The Committee recommends incorporating quantitative measures in addition to qualitative data and using direct and indirect metrics to assess student learning outcomes.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

It is not clear whether and how information is presented to and discussed by all faculty and other stakeholders and how results are utilized by the program for building future plans. Is there any opportunity for discussion of results among the faculty? Is the information presented at program meeting? Are there any advisory board members or external stakeholders for which the assessment results would need to be shared? The Committee recommends including stakeholders (such as faculty and instructors who teach, internship site-supervisors, and community research partners) and clearly indicating how information is shared with them (O drive, etc). We also recommend addressing how documents are shared and discussed among the faculty and other stakeholders.

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

In the current report, no specific data and outcomes are provided to improve assessments. Narratives related to how assessments have created for curricular change need to be stated in this section. For the future report, the Committee recommends addressing how evaluated results are used for programmatic change in order to improve student learning outcomes.

ATTACHMENTS

TO: Janet Badia, Women's Studies
FROM: COAS Assessment Committee
SUBJECT: 2018-2019 Assessment Report for Women's Studies Certificate
Date: March 27, 2020

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

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

The Committee finds that the program's SLOs are clearly stated, and they are student-centered. Expectation levels are also clearly addressed in the current report. Those are scored as 3/3.

Section II: Alignment of SLOs with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

The SLOs are clearly presented and aligned with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

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

The Committee commends the work on the alignment of SLOs with PFW Baccalaureate framework. All the SLOs mapped to the curriculum clearly presents benchmarks. The curricular map identifies the progression of student learning relative to the SLOs at specific points in the curriculum where contents are introduced, emphasized, and reinforced.

In the current report, information on student engagement is not clearly provided. For example, SLO 1 (p.6) could be assessed via exams, class discussions, and/or written assignments. The Committee recommends providing specific information on student engagement and describing how classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.

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

The relationship between assessment and SLOs is clearly stated. The Committee recognizes that the SLOs are assessed using three measures: Interim assessment, Exit assessment, and Alumni survey.

The Committee commends the work on the following areas: C. Established results, D. Data collection and design integrity, and E. Evidence of reliability of measures. Those areas are scored as 3/3.

ATTACHMENTS

Section V. Reporting Results - Communication

The Committee commends the work on reporting results and interpretations of results. We also acknowledge that interim and exit assessments are not implemented every year due to the course-offering cycles. In the area of Historical Results, the Committee recognizes that past iterations of results are provided for the assessments of SLO 3 and SLO 7.

Section VI: Reporting Results – Stakeholder Involvement

The current report states that the program director shares results with part-time and full-time faculty and the board of the directors of Community Friends of Women’s Studies. Given the report, it is unclear how results are shared (e.g., sharing data on O-drive and frequency of meetings) and how they are discussed and utilized for building future plans. The Committee recommends addressing how results are discussed among the faculty and other stakeholders and utilized for building future assessment plans.

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

The Committee recognizes that improvement of process is stated in a general fashion. It would be much more convincing if specific improvement plans are identified and explained in the report, instead of stating “reviewing courses”, and “looking for opportunities to improve”. Acknowledging that the program plans to have opportunities to improve student learning, the Committee further encourages the program to continue to develop an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assess student learning and performance.