

The Academic Program Assessment and Improvement Committee **APAIC**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Joyce Berry Natural Resources	George Jaramillo Libraries	Jim McCambridge Business
Lee Gray Agricultural Sciences	Lori Kogan Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences	Tom Siller Engineering
Ann Gill Liberal Arts	Antigone Kotsiopoulos Applied Human Sciences	George Thornton Natural Sciences

Guidelines for Programs to Develop New Assessment Plans

Introduction

Part of APAIC’s new charge includes: *“providing recommendations to establish systematic and comprehensive continuous improvement of general education and discipline-based programs. .”*

This Committee and the Provost request that all academic programs (undergraduate and graduate) report new Program Improvement Research Plans (assessment) during December 2002 using an on-line reporting site to be located on the Provost’s web page.

Every program is to develop and report at least **three** student learning outcomes, **one** faculty research or scholarly activity outcome and **one** faculty service outcome.

APAIC realizes that some programs will be developing assessment plans of this type for the first time. Programs should develop the best plans possible; however, achieving perfection on the first attempt is unlikely. In addition, the purpose of program improvement research at CSU rests in the desire to identify strengths and weaknesses or problems in a program’s approach to reaching established objectives for instruction, faculty research, and faculty service. Plans should not be developed solely to make the program appear perfect.

The Guidelines that follow present reporting forms that replicate the on-line system’s format. Programs can use the forms to develop their plan beforehand, then cut and paste the information into the on-line database in December. Also, the Word document can more easily be shared among faculty and staff for approval before the on-line reporting is accomplished. The completed Word forms should be kept on file in the relevant departments for viewing by the Higher Learning Commission evaluation team when it visits CSU in February 2004.

APAIC Guidelines to Develop a Program Improvement Research (Assessment) Plan

11-Step Process Listed Below

- Copy and use forms from the University Provost's Web Site at <http://www.provost.colostate.edu>
 - a) Select Faculty Resources
 - b) Select New Assessment Plan Format (Choose Word or Power Point)
- Review the Guidelines for the Cover Page.
- **Complete the Blank Cover Page** of Your Program Improvement Research Plan.
- See Example Program Objectives for CSU's Civil Engineering.
- **Develop or Review** the objectives of your program.
- Review Guideline for Page 2: Student Learning Outcomes showing
 - a) Outcomes, b) Strategies, c) Assessment Method, d) Criterion, e) Summary Results and Evaluation and f) Program Improvements.--Also Review Examples of Scoring Rubrics and the Example of BS Electrical Engineering at Other University as it shows formative program improvement research. Examples of other discipline plans also appear.
- **Complete the Blank Page 2 Student Learning Outcomes**, adding more rows and pages as needed to form **at least 3 student learning outcomes**.
- Review Examples of Research and Service Outcomes.
- **Complete the Blank Research and Service Outcomes Form, developing at least 1 outcome for research and 1 outcome for service**.
- **Report the program plan to APAIC** during December 2002 using an on-line reporting site located at <http://kiowa.colostate.edu/Assessment>. Passwords and access instructions have been distributed to assessment plan contact persons. A tutorial and demonstration model is available at the kiowa site mentioned above. Type demo for both the user name and password for accessing the demonstration.

Note: To schedule group / departmental workshops, contact the CSU Assessment Director Kim Bender by telephoning Patsy Harlan at 491-2043. If you have questions about the process or assessment contact Kim Bender at (970) 491-5388 or at kkbender@lamar.colostate.edu.

Guidelines for the Cover Page

This cover page precedes the listed student learning outcomes, faculty research & scholarly outcomes, and faculty service outcomes. The cover page contains introductory program information and will likely be stable from year to year with the program making minor editorial changes.

Program Title (e.g., BS Civil Engineering):
Program Improvement Research Plan, 2003-2004

Institutional Mission Linkages

Select a phrase or phrases from CSU's Mission Statement that apply to your programs' activity.

Mission Statement:

Colorado State University has a unique mission in the state of Colorado. The land-grant concept of a balanced program of teaching, research, extension, and public service provides the foundation for the University teaching and research programs, Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension, and Colorado State Forest Service. The University has long been a leader in recognizing the rapidly changing global environment, and has a commitment to excellence in international education in all its instructional, research, and outreach programs. The University continues to make education and training accessible to deserving applicants from all classes and groups, and maintains a wide range of research, extension, and public service programs in response to the needs of the people of Colorado, the nation, and the world.

Example: This program supports CSU's commitment to its land-grant heritage and responsibilities in the interrelated areas of education, research, and outreach. It also reinforces the university's emphasis on excellence in international education.

Institutional Strategic Planning Linkages

If possible, select Key Strategies that relate to the program's activity.

CSU's Annual Update of the University Strategic Plan FY03 is found at:

<http://www.research.colostate.edu/usp/fy03.pdf>

Example: For example, a program might cite Key Strategy One: Undergraduate Education and select one or more sub-elements, such as 1.1) the university core, or 1.9) program assessment.

College Planning Goals or Mission Statement Linkages

Example: CSU's BS in Civil Engineering links to its College's mission: "The mission of the College of Engineering is to provide high quality teaching, advising, research, outreach and service in a land-grant, Carnegie class I environment and to serve the people and industries of the state, nation and the world.

Program Purpose

Example: The program prepares our graduates to work independently or in a multidisciplinary team to assure full participation of individuals in our society. The program instills in our graduates inquisitiveness and assessment skills that foster a desire to continue life-long learning and sensitivity to socially and economically acceptable issues and makes them aware of the issues of diversity and of professional standards, ethics and responsibility.

Program Improvement Research Administration: OPTIONAL

Describe how your department administers the assessment process—meeting times, committee membership, information distribution, leadership, professional development experiences, research assignments, how assessment fits into the curriculum design process.

Example from a non-CSU University: Accounting: The Chair of the Curriculum Committee will collect data to implement the Assessment Plan for the BBA/Accounting by the end of the fall and spring semesters. Thirty days after the beginning of the fall semester, the Curriculum Committee will present a report evaluating the data from the spring semester.

Contact Reference (name / assessment role / e-mail and /or telephone)

Name of the individual responsible for maintaining/updating the plan—reporting results to APAIC.

Blank Cover Page

**Program Title:
Program Improvement Research Plan Sp-2003 to F-2004**

Institutional Mission Link

Institutional Strategic Goals Link

College Assessment Plan or Goals Link

Program Purpose

Program Improvement Research Administration: OPTIONAL

Contact Reference (name / assessment role / e-mail and /or telephone)

Example: Review/Develop Program Objectives

If possible, use student-centered language, e.g., "Students will understand the basic concepts of. . . ." or "Students will have the capability to design. . . ."

Program Objectives (e.g., CSU's BS Civil Engineering)

- To provide our graduates with a solid base in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering sciences, civil engineering and design processes, and management concepts, along with an ability to apply this knowledge to the broad area of civil engineering in a global and societal context.
- To develop student abilities to identify and assess engineering needs and requirements, formulate relevant design questions, and solve engineering problems through appropriate investigations, experiments, and acquisition and interpretation of design data and information.
- To help students develop their abilities to analyze and design basic system components and basic skills and techniques for modeling, designing, and managing civil engineering systems using both basic principles and modern engineering tools
- Through both technical and humanities/social sciences classes, provide students with knowledge of contemporary issues and to instill in them sensitivity to the increasing challenge of providing socially and economically acceptable facilities and services for human society within a global context, consistent with environmental concerns.
- To prepare our graduates to communicate well in the various modes (verbal, written, graphical/pictorial) used to convey ideas and information among both professionals and society at large.
- To prepare our graduates to work effectively in modes ranging from independent study to multi-disciplinary teams.
- To instill in our graduates an increased ability to learn, inquisitiveness and critical assessment skills, and appreciation for the need to continue development of their professional skills, and a desire to continue their education through life-long learning.
- To provide its graduates with an awareness and appreciation of professional standards, ethics and responsibilities.
- To prepare our graduates for either immediate employment in any primary branch of civil engineering or to continue into a graduate program for further study in a civil engineering specialty area.

Guideline for Page 2: Student Learning Outcomes

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Learning Outcome One:

1. The outcome should be crafted with enough detail so that it informs students on what faculty expect them to learn, and it guides a diverse faculty on effective curriculum design, and it helps faculty consistently score the assessment demonstration over time. **AVOID** making general statements such as “student will be able to write effectively.” The outcome should include the components that the program faculty believe comprise effective writing, such as 1) mechanics and grammar, 2) organization, 3) transitions and flow, 4) audience identification, 5) thesis development, 6) research skills, 7) documentation, 8) critical thinking (analysis or synthesis), and others. Programs should question the effectiveness of outcomes that no longer generate program improvements and consider adding outcomes more likely to identify program strengths and weaknesses.

Example of Writing an Outcome: Writing Proficiency: Students will attain a level of writing proficiency at which they should have ability to write critically and analytically, structure a persuasive argument, research thoroughly, document sources accurately, and write at a professional level in a given discipline.

Strategy (optional)

This section contains a description of **HOW the program will have the students develop the learning outcome**. The program’s approach may include such features as: 1) a pretest to evaluate entering students’ competency and identify remediation needs, 2) a brief, general description of curricular approach, 3) use of team teaching methods, 4) use of interdisciplinary courses, 5) student team learning, 6) community service learning techniques, 7) computer technology aids, 8) a capstone course approach, 9) use of internships, 10) hands-on learning projects, 11) case studies, and others.

Assessment Method(s)

Describe how students will demonstrate the learning outcome (e.g., capstone exams, internship evaluation forms, theses, juried performances, simulated exercises, design or writing projects, portfolio submission, peer-reviewed articles, etc.). Include how many assessments will be collected (the sample size), who or how many faculty will score the assessment, what the scoring guidelines are (e.g., use of an evaluation rubric or Likert scale), and if results are shared with faculty, students, or external advisory boards. **AVOID** using only surveys to measure a student learning outcome unless it is a post-graduate outcome. The method should include **faculty evaluation of a student demonstration**. Other supporting methods can include surveys, exit interviews, focus groups, advisory board feedback, and others. Scoring Rubrics, intern evaluation forms or surveys can be submitted with the plan.

Criterion

Describe the **faculty expectations for student performance**, such as the percent of students expected to score above average on the assessment. Include expected percentages for individual learning components (e.g., 1. writing mechanics, 2. organization, 3. transitions, 4. audience, 5. documentation, and others.). If unsure of a threshold, establish a baseline measure the first year with intent to increase a stated percent the following year.

Data Summary & Evaluation

Report and summarize the assessment data results, keeping the details of data on record at the department. Include the total number of assessment pieces collected and the total number possible (20 out of 100 students) with a breakdown of scores for each learning component (e.g., 1. writing mechanics, 2. organization, 3. transitions, 4. audience, 5. documentation, and others). Provide a brief analysis and evaluation of the results, **commenting on what the faculty believe the results mean for the program**. Describe possible problems and solutions. Enter historical discussion for context.

Program Improvements

Describe the **program improvements faculty want to implement as a result of the assessment summary**. Improvements can include 1) modification of the outcome, 2) changes in delivery strategy, such as changes in curriculum design or teaching methods, 3) alteration of the assessment method, 4) adjustment of the criterion, 5) changes in the departmental administration of assessment, and 6) better ways to collect and evaluate data.. Indicate if the improvement is 1) intended, or 2) to be carried over into the next planning cycle, or 3) has been implemented. AVOID listing improvements that are in no way related to the assessment process.

Example of a Scoring Rubric for an Engineering Assessment

Department of Electrical Engineering

--Evaluation Instrument for Electrical Engineering

Instructors:

Student Name:

Team Members:

Project Title:

Evaluator's Name and Affiliation:

Please use the following scale for evaluation:

Poor **Average** **Excellent**
 1 -----3 -----5

I. Ability to plan and execute an engineering design to meet an identified need

Item	Score
1. Shows knowledge and understanding of the design process	4
2. Displays knowledge of engineering fundamentals, techniques, and tools	4
3. Shows understanding of engineering codes and standards	5
4. Shows ability to formulate problems	5
5. Shows ability to deal with realistic constraints	4
6. Shows project planning abilities	2
7. Shows ability to manage projects	2
Subtotal	26
Average Subtotal	3.71

II. Knowledge of experimental methods and field study

Item	Score
1. Ability to set-up and conduct laboratory experiments	
2. Knowledge of dimensional similitude for conducting model-scale experiments	

EXAMPLE: BS Electrical Engineering at Other University: Formative Process

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Student Learning Outcome One

Graduates shall possess skill in the design of electrical subsystems and in the interface of those subsystems to other systems in order to meet desired specification through the use of appropriate engineering tools and techniques.

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

C. Evaluations of Cooperative Education program students actively involved in design.

D. EBI Engineering Student Survey on questions indicating the degree to which abilities have been enhanced by the undergraduate education.. Relevant EBI Engineering Student Survey questions include questions 41, 47, 50, and 51

Criterion

D. EBI: Mean scores of 5.25 on the 7-point scale.
80% of the responses shall show scores of 3 or above in this category, with 30% of the responses indicating minimum scores of 4.

Data Summary & Evaluation

C. During this period, 24 Electrical Engineering students participated in the Cooperative Program. Industries included Siemens, Cingular Wireless, United Space Alliance, Motorola, Datacore Software, Florida Department of Transportation, and others. Direct supervisors rated students on Job Performance Skills (from high (5) to low (1). Students are very strong in most elements that make up these categories, including problem solving and accuracy, but are weaker (still quite strong) in decision making and leadership.

D. The EBI Engineering Survey is conducted for all engineering disciplines. For the 2001 survey, N=135 for the College of Engineering and N=29 for the Department of Electrical Engineering,
The EBI Engineering Survey resulted in an average of 5.08 on a 7-point scale. This result was lower than the specified criterion of 5.25. Program weaknesses were noted in the enhancement of students' ability to use modern engineering tools and to pilot test a component prior to implementation.

Program Improvements

C. Deficiencies in the evaluation form used have been noted and recommendations have been transmitted to the Director of the Cooperative Program for consideration.

D. The 2001 EBI Engineering Survey results have been acted on in two ways: (1) upgrading of laboratory equipment through use of Department funds (25K) and Industry donations (40K) and (2) the implementation of an Engineering Design Center where students of all engineering disciplines can work on team projects.

Blank Page 2: Program Name, SP 2003 to F 2004

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Student Learning Outcome One

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Student Learning Outcome Two

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Student Learning Outcome Three

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Example of a Non-CSU General Education Outcome 2003-04

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

General Education Learning Outcome One

1. Read Critically:

Student can compose a research paper that demonstrates a) effective integration of materials from multiple sources with appropriate and consistent citation, b) analysis of information, and c) synthesis of conclusions based on sources and analysis.

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

A committee of 5 instructors/faculty (including at least one but no more than two English composition faculty) will evaluate research papers written in ENC 1102 by students who have completed ENC 1101 at the university with a C grade or better (students will be asked to self-identify). Papers meeting this criterion will be photocopied at the Copy Center and originals returned to the instructor within a day for normal grading. Student names will be eliminated from the copies, though the ID number will remain. We will sample 15% of the papers received that meet the criterion (approximately 150 papers will be selected at random per semester [300 per year], based on a freshman population of 2000). The committee will assess outcome one by evaluating the number of sources, how well they are cited, and the quality of the analysis and conclusion. The committee will assess papers on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the critical reading skills shown: 1) **excellent** critical reading skills because the number of sources cited is sufficient, the citations are clear and consistent, and an insightful analysis leads to a supportable conclusion; 2) **very good** critical reading skills because the number of sources cited is sufficient, the citations are clear and consistent with only minor flaws, and a careful analysis leads to a reasonable conclusion; 3) **acceptable** (moderate) critical reading skills because the number of sources cited is not quiet sufficient, the citations are often unclear or inconsistent, and a superficial analysis leads to a superficial conclusion; 4) **poor critical** reading skills because the number of sources cited is insufficient, the citations, if given, are unclear and inconsistent, and there is no meaningful analysis or conclusion.

Criterion

75% of students will rate 1 or 2; 90%of students will rate 1,2, or 3 in assessment.

Data Summary & Evaluation

300 student papers were evaluated. 50% rated a 1 or 2. 94% rated a 1, 2 or 3.

Program Improvements

The assessment team's finding indicate that student writing displays critical reading abilities significantly below the criterion set by the GEAC, and this reflects research that is inadequate and/or engaged at a level of analysis that is not sophisticated enough. We are therefore planning to use a new text with longer and more difficult essays and assignments that force students to be analytical and critical.

May be appropriate for a program's:

- 1) First-Year Seminar Course(s),
- 2) Core Competency Courses,
- 3) Foundation and Perspectives Courses,
- 4) Depth and Integration Courses.

Blank Page General Education Page # Program Name: 2003-04

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES (OPTIONAL—NOT REQUIRED)

General Education Learning Outcome One

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

FACULTY RESEARCH & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Research Outcome One:

Programs can develop unit-specific outcomes or can collaborate with other programs within a larger unit-size and report common outcomes established at the department or college level. Programs can also collaborate with other programs in interdisciplinary efforts. The outcome can be structured to emphasize a unit's priority research objectives. While faculty research is a highly individualized activity, these outcomes should **focus on broader more general objectives that a program or department establishes based on the needs of its constituents and mutual desires of faculty.**

Examples of Research Outcomes

1) Expand research space, 2) Increase equipment, 3) Improve community needs assessment, 4) Add or drop research areas, 5) Expand student learning research, 6) Involve more students in research, 7) Strengthen research impact, e.g., citations), and 8) Increase number of grant/contract proposals submitted,

Strategy (optional)

This section contains a description of **HOW the program/department plans to achieve the outcome.**

Examples

1) Collaborate with private industry to leverage funding for more equipment or space and to inform firms of research output, 2) Develop or improve a community needs survey, 3) Develop library resources to expand into new research area, 4) Increase the number of faculty attending grant workshops or professional conferences.

Assessment Method(s)

This section describes the method used for **measuring the progress of outcome success.**

Examples

1) Focus groups, interviews, or surveys of industrial advisory boards on effective research responsiveness to needs, 2) Records or databases that monitor research outcome activity, 3) Feedback on grant proposals or peer review reports, 4) Trend comparison of library resources over time, 5) Patent citations or citation index review.

Criterion

This section describes **faculty expectations for performance of the research outcome activity.**

Examples

1) A baseline rate with commitment to increase by 5% the following year, 2) Completion date of a project or phase development of a unit's ability or functional capacity, 3) A money threshold figure for expenditures.

Data Summary & Evaluation

This section is used to report and summarize the assessment data results, **commenting on what the faculty believe the results mean for the program or department**. Provide a data summary, keeping the details of data on record at the department. The data summary should effectively support conclusions. Use this section to identify strengths and weaknesses and to describe problems and potential solutions. Enter historical discussion for context.

Program Improvements

Describe the **program improvements faculty want to implement as a result of the assessment data summary**. Improvements can include 1) modification of the outcome, 2) changes in strategy—how to better approach private industry or acquire exposure in better journals, 3) alteration of the assessment method, 4) adjustment of the criterion, 5) changes in the departmental administration of assessment, and 6) better ways to collect and evaluate data.. Indicate if the improvement is 1) intended, or 2) to be carried over into the next planning cycle, or 3) has been implemented. **AVOID** listing improvements that are in no way related to the assessment process.

Service/Outreach Outcome One

Programs can develop unit-specific outcomes or can collaborate with other programs within a larger unit-size and report common outcomes established at the department or college level. Programs can also collaborate with other programs in interdisciplinary efforts. The outcome can be structured to emphasize a unit's priority service objectives. While service/outreach can be highly individualized among some faculty, these outcomes should **focus on broader more general objectives that a program or department establishes based on the needs of its constituents and mutual desires of faculty.**

Example of a Service Outcomes

1) Expand student experiential learning opportunities in community impact projects, 2) Increase the community impact of workforce or extension training efforts, 3) Expand housing options for lower income groups, 4) Contribute to resolution of environmental problems (drought, insects, others), 5) Participate in partner school efforts, 6) Increase faculty involvement in community service or professional service commitments,

Strategy (optional)

This section contains a description of **HOW the program/department plans to achieve the outcome.**

Examples

1) Collaborate with private industry, non-profit agencies or CBOs to leverage funding for expanded service impact, 2) Develop or improve a community needs survey, 3) Increase grant funding for neighborhood empowerment projects, 4) Expand workshop training, 5) Work with academic departments to integrate service learning and academic learning outcomes.

Assessment Method(s)

This section describes the method used for **measuring the progress of outcome success.**

Examples

1) Community focus groups, interviews, or surveys on effectiveness of outreach responsiveness to needs, 2) Records or databases that monitor activity, 3) Community impact data on employment, housing, and money savings resulting from extension service (e.g., eradication of pests or weeds), 5) share assessment method with a student learning outcome to show positive relationship between service learning and academic outcomes.

Criterion

This section describes **faculty expectations for performance of the service/outreach outcome activity.**

Examples

1) A baseline rate with commitment to increase by 5% the following year (e.g., number of students involved in service learning or committees faculty serve on), 2) Completion date of a project or phase development of a unit's ability or functional capacity, 3) A money threshold figure for expenditures.

Data Summary & Evaluation

This section is used to report and summarize the assessment data results, **commenting on what the faculty believe the results mean for the program or department**. Provide a data summary, keeping the details of data on record at the department. The data summary should effectively support conclusions. Use this section to identify strengths and weaknesses and to describe problems and potential solutions. Enter historical discussion for context.

Program Improvements

Describe the **program improvements faculty want to implement as a result of the assessment data summary**. Improvements can include 1) modification of the outcome, 2) changes in strategy—how to better collaborate with private business or non-profit agencies to expand impact or how to better survey community needs, 3) alteration of the assessment method, 4) adjustment of the criterion, 5) changes in the departmental administration of assessment, and 6) better ways to collect and evaluate data. Indicate if the improvement is 1) intended, or 2) to be carried over into the next planning cycle, or 3) has been implemented. **AVOID** listing improvements that are in no way related to the assessment process.

FACULTY RESEARCH & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Research Outcome One

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

**FACULTY SERVICE / OUTREACH
(includes University or Professional or Community)**

Service Outcome One

Strategy (optional)

Assessment Method(s)

Criterion

Data Summary & Evaluation
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

Program Improvements
(TO BE COMPLETED IN MAY-JUNE 2003)

The assessment plans that follow are taken from other universities and are presented here as examples in various disciplines.

Page 2: BA Theatre

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Data Summary & Evaluation	Program Improvement
<p>1. Graduates will work effectively as collaborative artists, applying traditional vocabulary, communication skills and protocols needed to demonstrate maturity in the exercise of their discipline.</p>	<p>Each semester, an evaluation committee composed of the production directors and designers will appraise the “collaborative process leading to the creative work” completed by a representative sample of graduating students involved in the department’s production program. This appraisal will occur during the production process of a main-stage production, beginning with the first production meeting through the completion of the production. (Evaluation Definition Instrument is attached to plan)</p>	<p>At least 70% of students will score at least 80 of 100 points on the attached rubric code #2.</p>	<p>82% (14/17) of graduating seniors scored at least 80 of 100 points. --Average score 88.6%.--Score range 38-100.</p>	<p>Department recently instituted a required baseline course, Theatre Forum, whose principle goal of the course is to facilitate communication in the collaborative process. It has also proposed a new required course in state stage management, which directly addresses issues of collaboration. The faculty also has been discussing ways of improving the practical use of the new department handbook, which outlines in detail the production development process[w1]. <i>Given these recent improvements, the department anticipates that Spring results will reconfirm our success in these outcomes. Once we have this data, we will decide whether further action is warranted.</i></p>
	<p>Spring 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis 71% (12/17) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 82.8; score range 70-90. Our data show that we are in the low range of acceptable outcomes in this assessment, and so the faculty has discussed the following improvements.</p>		<p>Improvements 2001 --We are in the process of implementing a stage management course, to help students have roles in coordinating collaboration within the department.- -We are working on a more comprehensive structure for the Studio I and II production program, and are expanding Studio II outlet possibilities, to give students more support and opportunity to practice these skills.--Faculty also suggested exploring the possibility of implementing a course called “the Collaborative Process.”</p>	

	<p>Fall 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis 100% (6/6) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 92.5; score range 88-100. Our data shows considerable improvement; this could, however, be partially attributed to the size of our sample in this iteration.</p>	<p>Improvements 2002 Our plans to implement a stage management course have become more ambitious: we have now designed and are in the process of implementing a degree track devoted to this art.</p>
--	---	--

BA Theatre Continued

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Data Summary -Analysis -Evaluation	Program Improvement
<p>2. Graduates will demonstrate fundamental knowledge and mastery of skills in the art and crafts necessary in the pursuit of a career or further education in Theatre Arts. The knowledge and skills under evaluation will be identified according to the sub-areas of acting, design, and technology, depending upon the students' specialization</p>	<p>A) A departmental committee composed of performance faculty will appraise a representative sample of senior level performance projects of graduating students in the performance classes once in the semester. B) A departmental faculty committee will observe and evaluate the prepared auditions or portfolio presentations of a representative sample of graduating students on at least two occasions during the academic year.</p>	<p>A) At least 70% of students will be proficient in text based analysis and creation of character in performance, as evidenced by scores of at least 80 of 100 points on the rubric #4. B) At least 70% of students will present themselves and/or their work in a manner accepted by the profession, as evidenced by scores of at least 80 of 100 points on the rubric #1.</p>	<p>A. 61% (11/18) of graduating students scored at least 89 80 of 100 points. --Average score 77.2% --Score range 31-94. B. For Rimers Auditions 4/2000: <u>Fall assessment</u> 9/2000--60% (12/20 of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points. --Average Score 81%. --Score range 64-97.5. For Corpus/Alba Auditions 12/2000: <u>Spring Assessment</u> 2/2001--85% (22/26) graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points. --Average score 88.1%. --Score range 72-99</p>	<p>A. <i>Our Fall assessments show our program to be relatively weak in this area. Pending the results of our Spring assessments, the faculty has made the following adjustments in relation to this outcome:</i> Over the past semester, faculty has designed a five level actor-training process to address different skill levels more effectively. Courses in stage combat, stage management, script analysis, acting for the camera, and dramatic literature have been added to the required curriculum. Career counseling has been integrated into several acting classes. B. <i>Our Fall assessments show our program to be relatively weak in this area. Pending the results of our Spring assessments, the faculty has made the following adjustments in relation to this outcome:</i> Faculty has discussed the feasibility of individual coaching of student auditions. Audition guidelines published by the University/Resident Theatre Association and the National Association of Schools of Theatre have been integrated into the preparation process. Greater emphasis has been placed on the development of audition materials within the acting curriculum[w1].</p>

	<p>Spring 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis A 93% (13/14) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 81%; score range 75-94 B 85% (22/26) graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 88.1%; score range 72-99 We notice a marked improvement from first to second semester, and intend to continue improving our work in this area.</p>	<p>Improvements 2001 --Involvement of other faculty members in the performance projects and portfolio presentations will improve student engagement in the process and, again, help to communicate our value system.--A segment on “professional self-presentation” will be built into acting courses, and a required outcome of portfolio building will be built into design and technology courses.</p>
	<p>Fall 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis A. 81% (13/16) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 87.2%; score range 65-97 B. 69% (11/16) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 82; score range 69-91. The scores for this assessment continue to show a pattern of improvement from first to second semester, and from last year to this year. Spring 2002 Data Summary B 90% (9/10) of graduating students scored at least 80 of 100 points; average score 89; score range 77-96.</p>	<p>Improvements 2002 Due to budget constraints, we have more and more limited faculty resources, so we are unable to implement the first improvement listed above. The second improvement has been implemented; we continue to monitor its success.</p>

Page 2: Honors College: BA Liberal Arts and Sciences

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Data Summary Evaluation	Program Improvement
<p>1. Writing Proficiency: Students will reach a level of writing proficiency at which they should have ability to write critically and analytically, structure a persuasive argument, research thoroughly, document sources accurately, and write at a professional level in a given discipline.</p>	<p>Each term, students submit a writing sample from their assigned coursework to be included in their Writing Portfolio. At the end of each spring term, a faculty committee will evaluate the portfolios of 30-50% of students (a representative sample) who have completed their sophomore year to assess how well the Honors core writing requirement prepares them for upper-division and thesis writing. We anticipate that each year, at least 70% of our students will have reached the level of writing proficiency indicated by our proposed outcomes, and the remaining 30% will need supplementary tutorials (e.g., working with a tutor in the writing center) to reach our target proficiency level. Each summer, a faculty writing committee will conduct a Mid-Career Portfolio Assessment for all students entering their junior year. This assessment is conducted to determine whether a student needs to strengthen a particular area such as grammar, research skills, argumentation structure, etc. At the end of the senior year, a faculty committee evaluates the student's honors thesis[iea1]. <i>Faculty discussions will continue on this issue.</i></p>	<p>We anticipate that each year, at least 70% of our students will have reached the level of writing proficiency indicated by our proposed outcomes.</p>	<p>The Honors College will conduct its first iteration during the summer of 2001.</p>	

<p>Spring 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis 4 faculty members read 19 portfolios (37% of eligible portfolios). 46% of the portfolios met the passing criteria. The result was below the projected 70%. A rubric defining these outcome expectations is on file in the Honors College</p>	<p>Improvements 2001</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ask faculty to encourage revision and proofreading by students. 2) Increase the number of upper-division writing hours. 3) Establish a writing center 4) Additional 3 credit course beyond ENC 1123 5) Explore a Summer Bridge Program to address writing issues before students begin regular coursework. 6) Create a writing intensive Freshman Seminar program. 7) Focus on documentation and writing conventions across the curriculum. 8) Develop more writing in the fields of math and sciences. 9) Compensate and support teaching of writing. 10) Establish a writing center professional who may oversee the various aspects of the process. <p>The improvements have been prioritized as long-term and are in process.</p>
--	---

Honors College: BA Liberal Arts and Sciences Continued

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Summary Evaluation	Program Improvement
<p>2. Foreign Language Proficiency: Students will reach a level of Spanish language proficiency at which they should be able to satisfy most routine travel and survival conversational needs, write short compositions on familiar topics, and read uncomplicated authentic prose.</p>	<p>Each year students submit a writing portfolio in Spanish from their assigned coursework. At the end of each spring term, a faculty committee will evaluate the portfolios of a representative, <u>anonymous, and randomly-selected</u> sample of the students (30-50%) who have completed SPN 1121. In addition, the final oral quiz for SPN 1121 will be taped and reviewed by the faculty committee. <u>This group is also anonymous and randomly selected.</u> The portfolio and the oral exam will help the faculty committee assess how well the communicative approach fulfills the Honors core foreign language requirement[iea1]. <i>Yes, see underlined comments above.</i></p>	<p>We anticipate that each year, 70% of our students will place into the next level of Spanish (courses above core requirements).</p>	<p>The Honors College will conduct its first iteration during the summer of 2001.</p>	

Spring 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis	Improvements 2001
<p>Writing: 2 faculty members looked at 50% (6) anonymous writing portfolios. We used an adaptation of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines to assess the writing. 83 % (5 out of 6) reached the numerical bar (70 out of 100) that would place them into the next level of Spanish[iea1].</p> <p>Oral: 2 professors listened to 50% (6) of taped interviews. We used an adaptation of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines to assess the oral interview. 100% of the students scored attained the numerical bar (70 out of 100) that would place them into the next level of Spanish.</p>	<p>1)Faculty administering the proficiency exercises should be ACTFL trained.</p> <p>2)Better technical support. Listening to tapes with background noise was not optimal.</p> <p>3)Provide language tutors. Maintain low caps (16).</p>

Page 2: **BUSINESS: BBA Management Information Systems**

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Data Summary -Analysis	Program Improvement
1. Students completing the program will be well prepared for an entry-level position in information systems analysis, database management, network management, application development or systems support.	Upon graduation, students will be sent a "post-exit" e-mail survey by the department regarding their employment status. The survey will ask students to identify the area of their specialization and changes in the status of their employment.	Of the students who were employed while attending FAU, 75% will have received a promotion upon receipt of their degree. Of those students who were not employed while attending FAU, 75% will have been offered a position upon receipt of their degree.	[w1]	

<p>Spring 2001 Data Summary /Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>The "post exit" survey that had been developed earlier was administered before graduation rather than after graduation. We anticipated that contact information following graduation would be difficult to obtain. Moreover, we do not have the resources to devote to finding/tracking students after they graduate, although doing so would provide useful information. Instead, we administered the survey at the end of the Project course, the last course students majoring in MIS are required to take. The survey was administered to students in two sections of the Project course and also to students completing internships (N=46). Even though the number of students was relatively low, the N is close to the number of students that graduated as MIS majors after the spring term (N=44), as reported by the Office of Student Services. (Not all of the students who completed the Project course in the spring necessarily graduated in the spring.) The results of the survey provided us with interesting information that we did not previously have. Perhaps the most salient finding, is that the respondents who are employed part-time or full-time in IT jobs, spend a majority of their time in programming and application development. Moreover, respondents anticipated that after graduation they would retain or obtain jobs in which their</p>	<p>Improvements 2001</p> <p>The first IEO is too broad and needs to be focused on the specific skill set of application development. The third IEO focuses on one aspect of application development (and the measurement of complexity represented in the projects produced by students at the end of their MIS career as students). The focus of the first IEO should be on measuring and assessing the programming skill development at the beginning of the student's MIS career. The course requirements for MIS majors are highly structured, in that students must take required courses in their proper sequence. The objective here is to raise the educational outcome earlier in the sequence so that at the latter part of the sequence students will be more productive. There are two steps we will take to achieve this objective. First, the department undergraduate curriculum committee will consider a</p>
--	--

responsibilities would involve programming and application development (36%), database (28%), networking (22%), and systems analysis and design (16%). Although these data do not represent what, in fact, students will do after graduation, they do provide useful information. We will continue to administer this survey at the end of each semester to students in the Project course and to students completing internships. The database we will develop will allow us to monitor and respond to long-term trends that emerge. After reflecting on these findings, in particular the preponderance of application development, reviewing the open-ended comments written by students who responded to the survey, and discussing programming skill development of our students, we would like to move in the directions specified in the following section. The means of assessment for the first and second IEOs included surveys to be answered by individuals outside of the university. It is difficult to obtain information from outside sources. Moreover, we were counseled, after the prior Assessment Report was filed, to reduce our dependence on survey data. We were also instructed to focus more on the assessment of specific skills. The next section indicates our effort to respond to these concerns.

proposal to add a 2000-level programming course as a pre-requisite for ISM 3232, Intermediate Business Programming. This is the first required course for MIS majors. Second, all of the faculty teaching ISM 3232 will agree on a set of topics that need to be covered in that course. The topics will be included in a syllabus that contains common elements and used by all faculty teaching ISM 3232. In addition, a common comprehensive and final exam will be developed by all of the faculty teaching ISM 3232 and administered to students at the end of the fall 2001 term. 60% of the students taking the exam will score with a grade of C or better. This initiative is already underway.

BBA INFORMATION SYSTEMS CONTINUED

Fall 2001 Data Summary/Evaluation/Analysis

At the end of the fall term of 2001, we administered the same survey we conducted at the end of the spring term of 2001. Again the survey was distributed to students in ISM 4332 and ISM 4243, the two projects courses from which students can select to complete the final requirements of the MIS program. The results of the survey from the 29 respondents were consistent with the results of the spring survey, namely that a greater percentage of students both in their current (part time or full time) or anticipated (after graduation) employment work in the area of programming compared to the other MIS work categories. In the fall survey, respondents anticipated that after graduation they would retain or obtain jobs in which their responsibilities would involve programming and application development (29%), database (22%), networking (18%), and systems analysis and design (19%). Compared to the previous semester, a higher percentage of students (19%) in the fall term indicated they would be working in "other" areas (e.g., testing and IS auditing). These results provided further support for focusing on improvements in programming, as indicated in the report submitted for the spring term. During the fall term, the faculty teaching ISM 3232, Intermediate Business Programming (currently the first upper division programming course required of MIS majors), agreed on a common set of 15 general topics to be taught in all sections of the course (e.g., Boolean Expressions, Selection Statement, if Statements, Nested and Extended if Statements). Under certain general topics, certain subtopics were identified (e.g., under Problem Solving Fundamentals, subtopics include Data Types, C++ Arithmetic, I/O Statements, and so on). To further develop consistency across sections and to ensure high standards, the faculty initiated the first step in establishing a common final exam for the course. Each professor submitted five questions that became part of a pool of questions. Each then selected from the pool in constructing his particular final exam. Each exam included five questions from the pool, representing a subset of roughly 50% of the exam questions in each exam. The proportion of students who received a C or better on the final exam were as follows:

Improvements 2002

The faculty teaching ISM 3232 will establish the common final exam during the spring term and use the common questions in the final exam for the spring term. 75% of the students enrolled in ISM 3232 will successfully answer 90% of the common portion of the exam. (For example, if the common portion comprised 60 points, 75% of the students would earn credit for 54 points). After the final exam is administered, further comparisons among the test questions will inform how to modify the final exam and what, in any, steps need to be taken to improve student performance. In addition, and following the intent of focusing on improvements related to programming skills, the faculty teaching the subsequent programming courses (required in the MIS curriculum) will convene at the end of the spring term to discuss updating the content of the courses comprising to two tracks established by the department during the fall of 1999. These curriculum content discussions will follow a series of focus groups comprised of invited executives from South Florida companies who hire our graduates. These

(1) Section 2346 – 21 out of 27;
(2) Section 2348 – 23 out of 56 students; (3) Section 2349 – 15 out of 31 students; (4) Section 7444 -- 6 out of 7 students; (5) Section 9288 -- 2 out of 2 students. Use of the pooled questions represented an initial effort in developing an exam with a common set of expectations. Given the dispersion of sections across campuses, dates, and times, it is not possible to conduct a “common exam” at the same time. In assessing the results, the faculty teaching this course determined that in the future, 60% of the points allocated on the final exam would be from a common exam and remaining 40% would accommodate the unique pedagogy of each professor and necessary variance to accommodate the fact that the exam would be taken by different students at different times during exam week.

individuals will provide information about the skill sets they are looking for in future employees. The data from these discussions will be transcribed and analyzed by a professor in the department who has received funding to investigate the demand for specific IT skills in South Florida. This process will inform how to make further adjustments in the courses required of MIS majors.

Page 2: **BS Ocean Engineering**

Learning Outcomes	Assessment Method	Criterion	Data Summary -Analysis	Program Improvement
<p>1.An ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems by applying a knowledge of mathematics, science and engineering.</p>	<p>The department chair appoints a two-member faculty committee for each team, including the instructor, to evaluate the senior-year capstone design project (EOC-4804 Ocean Engineering System Design). An evaluation form (attached to plan) is used as an instrument to assess program outcomes, which include students' ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems encountered in the design project by applying a knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering.</p>	<p>For acceptable performance, evaluations of both the faculty members on the committee must show an average score of 5 or above (range is 1 to 10 with 5 as average) in categories I-IV for at least 80% of the class each year: I. basic science/math; II. experimental study/field study; III. computer programming/en gineering software; IV. engineering design.</p>	<p>The 2000-01 senior class was one of the best batches of the department in recent years. All the students in that class (<i>Total number of students N=15.</i>), except for one, had scored above 5 in categories I-IV in the faculty evaluation of the design project, thus meeting the criterion for acceptable performance. <i>The average measures for categories I = 7.46, II=7.66, III=8.23, IV=7.23, V=7.5, VI=8.23, VII=8.13, VIII=7.63 (all out of 10).</i></p>	<p>Fall 2001 The assessment is proposed to be carried out by a committee of more than two faculty members, between three and five, this year 2001-02 for a confirmation of the standard. Even though acceptable per present criterion, the class will place more emphasis on items such as time-management and technical presentation of the project as these are critical for timely completion of the project and transfer of knowledge for subsequent development.</p> <p>Improvements 2002 As proposed in 2001, the Department chair has appointed a five member faculty committee to evaluate the 2001-02 senior design course and projects.</p>