TO: Gordon Schmidt, Chair of Organizational Leadership
FROM: ETCS Assessment Committee
SUBJ: 2019-2020 Assessment Report for OL
DATE: February 5, 2020

The ETCS Assessment Committee has received and reviewed the OL program 2019-2020 Assessment report. Our comments below follow the rubrics derived from the revised Senate Document 98-22 Appendix D.

Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

- Clarity and specificity can be improved from acceptable to exemplary. The detailed descriptions of the knowledge, skills, and value domains expected of students are not clearly stated.
- The SLOs are clearly given as student-centric, and their expectation levels seem to exceed that established by the University.

Programmatic Curricular Map

- The content alignment is done using common classes taken by the students. There does not seem to be electives used in mapping with the SLOs.
- It is not clear from the 2019-2020 report that the curricular map identifies the progression of SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.
- Classes and activities appear to engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.

Alignment with PFW Baccalaureate Framework

- The mapping of SLOs with the PFW Baccalaureate Framework is not provided in the OL report. It may have been done in their assessment plan given separately earlier. But the achievement of the PFW Baccalaureate Framework using the scores obtained this year are not shown.

Assessment Plan

- The relationship between assessments and SLOs is not clearly established to let instructors properly assess the outcomes separately. More details in the section of Assessment Plan - Part 2.
- Indirect measures were not used by the time this report was written.
- Statements of desired results do not provide valid comparisons between outcomes. For example, in Goal 3, outcomes 1 and 2 are measured collectively using the same activities in various courses. It is not possible to evaluate data for these two outcomes separately. Also, some courses given in the introduction of the report that has assessed these outcomes are not included in the data collection or elsewhere. A different course has been added to collect data that was not given in the report's introduction.
- A success %s of some sections over several semesters are used to show the results. It is not clear how and from where these percentages were generated or what specific measures were used to come up with these percentages.
- It appears the reliability of measures is questionable as no evidence is given to authenticate the achievement of outcomes.

Reporting Results

- The presentation of results covers multiple sections over multiple years. It will better to give the year, semester, and the section that gave the %s as indicated in the report.
- Historical comparison of the percentages is not shown from the last time these goals were assessed, which may be about three years back.
- Interpretation of results is straight-forward based on percentages given, but these numbers' reliability is not apparent.

Report Dissemination and Collaboration

- The report is shared with the faculty.
- It is not clear from the report if other stakeholders have been shown the report.

Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement, and Success:

- The program has to work on its assessment process and procedures as given in this report
    - (1) to assess each outcome separately, providing the measures used in assessment, and
    - (2) to be consistent in following the process from year to year, and (3) to show the assessment's historical progression, evaluation, and improvements made in the program.
- Just indicating "No suggestions for improvement" is not expected from the OL department.
- The OL program is recommended to give up on the template used for writing the annual assessment report. Develop a more reader-friendly report giving data in tabular format, showing the results in the sequence of semesters and sections.

Please contact us if you have any questions.